Homelessness and Unstable Housing Plans upon Discharge among a Sample of Sentenced
Offenders in the Richmond City Jail

May 6, 2009

Margot Ackermann, Ph.D.
Homeward
1125 Commerce Rd.
Richmond, VA 23224
(804)343-2045
mackermann@homewardva.org

### Executive Summary

One of the goals of the *Ten Year Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness in the Richmond Region* is to transform the homeless services delivery system to focus on housing stability. One of the strategies in pursuit of this goal is to support ex-offenders and current offenders in obtaining and maintaining housing stability by working with public safety, criminal justice, housing, and workforce officials to develop housing and related services.

Homeward, the Richmond region's coordinating agency for homeless services, in collaboration with the Community Criminal Justice Board, surveyed 50 inmates who were sentenced to serve local jail time (for either misdemeanors or felonies) to learn more about the housing and service needs of offenders. The goal of the survey was to learn more about differences between individuals who had a history of homelessness vs. those who had no such history and differences between individuals who knew where they were going to live after leaving jail vs. those who did not. Significant differences found were:

- Individuals with a history of homelessness were more likely to report having a current substance abuse problem than individuals without a history of homelessness. They were also less likely to have a checking account than people without a history of homelessness.
- On all measures of social support (family, friends, significant others, and overall),
   individuals with a history of homelessness scored significantly lower than those without a history of homelessness.
- Individuals with a stable housing plan (i.e., those who knew where they were going to live after jail) were more likely to be from the city of Richmond. Individuals without a stable housing plan were more likely to have been evicted and have received income from panhandling.

One major limitation of the present study was the small sample size, which affects statistical power to find significant differences. Another limitation was the unavailability of some potential respondents. Both of these issues could suggest that the sample is not entirely representative of the population being surveyed. In addition, data was self-reported by participants, and no effort was made to validate their answers.

In spite of these limitations, the data presented here provide a cross-sectional picture of a sample of inmates in the Richmond City Jail and suggest some ties between homelessness and social and local connections. It is possible that helping inmates maintain connections with friends, family, and significant others may help protect them from homelessness, perhaps by offering them options for housing. Some additional data from the community is also provided to lend support to some of the findings presented here.

Overall, it appears that while individuals with a history of homelessness and those who do not know where they are going to live when they leave jail may face significant barriers to obtaining housing, they are largely similar to other offenders. Based on this small sample of offenders surveyed, it seems likely that many would benefit from additional social support and help integrating into the community when they leave jail.

### Background

Homelessness, as defined by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), refers to a condition in which an individual "lacks a fixed, regular, and adequate nighttime residence" and includes shelters, institutions, and outdoors, as well as other places that are not intended to provide sleeping accommodations (http://www.hud.gov/homeless/definition.cfm).

One of the goals of the *Ten Year Plan to Prevent and End Homelessness in the Richmond Region* is to transform the homeless services delivery system to focus on housing stability. In pursuit of this goal, one of the strategies is to support ex-offenders and current offenders in obtaining and maintaining housing stability by working with public safety, criminal justice, housing, and workforce officials to develop housing and related services.

Homeward, the community's planning agency for homeless services, counts and surveys individuals experiencing homelessness twice a year. See Appendix A for the organization's most recent snapshot of ex-offenders experiencing homelessness. Given that over 70% of adults experiencing homelessness in the Richmond region have a history of incarceration, the Community Criminal Justice Board was interested in learning more about individuals who are currently incarcerated. Learning more about offenders who are currently in jail will enable the community to begin to assess the housing and service needs of offenders with a history of homelessness or potential housing instability in their future.

The purpose of surveying incarcerated individuals was to learn more about their characteristics, including their:

- Demographics, including age, race, gender, veteran status, and education
- History of homelessness

- Housing history and information (including locale of last permanent residence, foreclosures, evictions)
- Employment and income history
- Legal/judicial involvement
- Physical and mental health history
- Experiences with domestic violence
- Availability of social support
- Housing barriers
- Job skills

This information will enable us to better understand their service and housing needs, as well as the supports that are available to them.

## Methodology

#### Procedure

A list of individuals serving time in the Richmond City Jail was produced by staff at the jail. This list included the names of individuals who:

- Had been sentenced to serve local time for misdemeanors or felonies in the Richmond City Jail
- 2. Were fully sentenced at the time of the report
- 3. Were in the Richmond City Jail on November 3, 2008
- Would be released between November 3, 2008 October, 2009 from the Richmond City Jail

This list did not include individuals who were awaiting trial, sentencing, or transfer to another location.

While it was originally planned to select a representative random sample from this list, it was unnecessary due to the limited number of people (N = 97) who met the criteria above and had not yet been released. Note that due to lag time between requesting the reports, obtaining the reports, and beginning interviews, it was decided to request updated reports that included people who were in the Richmond City Jail on or November 14, 2008, and would be released prior to November 14, 2009. These updated lists provided an additional 14 individuals to solicit for participation in the survey for a total of 111 potential respondents.

Participants were recruited with the help of jail staff, who called out each inmate in order for Homeward staff and volunteers to determine whether the individual was willing to take a survey. If the person agreed to take the survey, the survey was verbally administered by a researcher, volunteer, or staff member from Homeward. The survey was accompanied by a brief statement that explained the purpose of the survey and other important details. Text for this statement appears below.

I am working with Homeward to learn about the housing needs of people in the community. This month, we are talking to people in the Richmond City Jail about their experiences with homelessness. Even if you have never been without a place to live, we are interested in talking to you so that we can learn more about differences that may make people more or less likely to experience homelessness.

The survey that you've agreed to take asks questions about your life and experiences and should take 15-20 minutes. The information you provide will be used to learn more about the needs of people experiencing homelessness in the region and possible risk factors for homelessness.

Taking this survey is voluntary, and you can stop at any time. We don't think you will experience any problems by answering the questions, however, some of the questions are personal, and if you are not comfortable with a question or the survey, you don't have to answer the question or you can stop taking the survey.

We do ask for your inmate number so that we can get information about your offense history and plans after you leave jail. The information that we report from the survey will be based on information about groups of people. Your responses will not be singled out, and no jail staff will know how you answered the questions on the survey.

If you want to talk to anyone after taking the survey, please let Bill Hicks know so that he can arrange for this.

## Research Questions/Analysis Plan

The main research question addressed by this study was "among jail inmates, what characteristics distinguish those who have been homeless from those who have not been homeless – and what characteristics predict housing instability at discharge?" A series of questions designed to address this larger question in more detail was designed to compare individuals with a history of homelessness to those without such history, as well as individuals with a stable housing plan to those without a stable housing plan. Please see Appendix B for the original research questions, along with the appropriate variables and statistical tests.

Additional analyses were devised to deal with the small sample sizes, which made attaining statistical significance difficult. Specifically, descriptive data is provided on the entire sample. This type of information can be useful in considering services that are offered to people who have been in jail and determining meaningful ways to keep them out of jail in the future. In addition, data about arrests of individuals experiencing homelessness; the population of homeless ex-offenders in the Richmond region; and differences between homeless and non-homeless individuals is provided to give context around the relationship between homelessness and incarceration and differences between people who are homeless and those who are not. Finally, when there appear to be practically significant differences between the groups that do not attain statistical significance, other methods are used to determine whether there is additional support in the data for differences.

7

#### Measures

Summer 2008 Point-in-Time Count survey. The Summer 2008 Point-in-Time Count survey, developed by Homeward, was administered with minor modifications to individuals in the Richmond City Jail. The survey contains a wide range of questions (approximately 75) with groups of questions that inquire about demographic information (e.g., race, gender, age, education level, marital status, veteran status); housing history; employment/income history; legal/judicial involvement; childhood experiences; physical and mental health; domestic violence; and general medical history. In addition, having a stable housing plan was operationalized as "yes" for individuals who indicated that they have made arrangements for housing for after they leave jail and who did not answer "don't know" to the question "where are you planning to live after you leave jail?" In addition to the original survey, some questions were added to learn more about the types of offenses that were committed. Specifically, these questions inquired whether participants were serving time for child support violations, probation/parole violations, and failure to appear.

Social support. Social support was measured using the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (Zimet, Dahlem, Zimet, & Farley, 1988), a 12-item survey that differentiates among support from a significant other, family, and friends. Some sample items include "I can talk about my problems with my family" and "There is a special person with whom I can share my joys and sorrows." Answer options are strongly disagree, somewhat disagree, neutral, somewhat agree, and strongly agree. Psychometric properties have been looked at in a couple studies (most recently in 2000), and the scale has shown some predictable relationships: high perceived social support is negatively correlated with anxiety and depression symptoms and positively correlated with family support and family caring. (Note that this

8

measure was included on the Summer 2008 Point-in-Time Count survey – it is the last group of questions.)

Housing barriers. Housing barriers were measured using 22 yes/no questions based on the housing barriers assessment used by Virginia Supportive Housing. A sample question is "Have you ever gotten in trouble for a serious lease violation?" Comparative data are available from the January 2008 Point-in-Time Count.

Job skills. Job skills were assessed using a list of skills that Offender Aid and Restoration has used. The list of 11 items asks whether individuals have experience performing different types of work (e.g., doing construction work, doing electrical work, working with computers). Participants responded yes or no to each item and could select as many skills as applied to their experiences. A qualitative question asked whether they had additional job skills.

In addition to the measures listed above, inmates' numbers were written on the survey.

This aided in determining who completed the survey as administration progressed. Inmate numbers have been redacted from the original surveys, and the data file no longer contains the inmate numbers.

A copy of the survey instrument appears in Appendix C.

#### Results

## **Participants**

Out of 111 potential respondents, 50 completed the survey. The most common reason for nonparticipation was being located off-site (e.g., electronic monitoring, work detail, solitary confinement, in other jail locations), with one-fourth (25.2%) of all potential respondents fitting this description. The remainder of potential participants were not surveyed for a variety of reasons, including that scheduling did not allow the opportunity to survey them, they could not

be located on the day they were to be surveyed, they were not asked to take the survey because they left jail earlier than their sentence end date, or they declined to take the survey. Note that while surveys were administered verbally by Homeward staff and volunteers, all answers are self-report based on how participants answered the questions.

Demographic information about participants appears in the table below.

Characteristic	All participants $(N = 50)$
Gender	Male = 82.0%
	Female = 18.0%
Race	White = 18.4%
	African-American = 77.6%
	Two or more races = $2.0\%$
	Other = $2.0\%$
Marital Status	Single = 57.1%
	Married = 12.2%
	Divorced = 22.4%
	Separated = 8.2%
Have children under age 18	56.0%
Have at least a high school education or GED	60.0%
Have served in the U.S. military	14.0%
Were in foster care as a child	12.0%
Were homeless as a child	6.0%
Last place of residence was Richmond city	68.0%
Average age	35.2 years
Average length of time in the Richmond area	~23.8 years
Have past year income from cash benefits	24.0%
Have past year income from panhandling	8.2%
Have past year income from other sources (e.g., friends and family)	40.0%
Have ever had alcohol problem	28.0%

Characteristic	All participants $(N = 50)$
Currently have alcohol problem	14.0%
Have ever had substance abuse problem	48.0%
Currently have substance abuse problem	10.0%
Have ever had mental health problem	20.0%
Currently have mental health problem	4.0%

The table below provides descriptive information on housing barriers for all participants.

Barrier	All participants $(N = 50)$
Don't have valid ID	32.0%
Have language barrier	4.0%
Have ever had lease in their name	62.0%
Had lease in past year	22.0%
Do not have current lease	90.0%
Have not had lease that lasted one year	78.0%
Been evicted	12.0%
Been evicted in past year	4.0%
Caused serious damage to property	0.0%
Gotten in trouble for serious lease violation	0.0%
Don't know credit score	88.0%
Can't obtain credit	25.0%
Have outstanding debts	64.0%
Unable to provide documentation of income	38.0%
Do not have savings account	78.0%

Barrier	All participants $(N = 50)$
Do not have checking account	74.0%
Unable to pay 1/3 of income for housing	34.7%
Need housing accommodations	12.0%
Have legal issues	40.0%
Currently on probation/parole	44.0%
Have large family	2.0%
Have special needs children	8.2%

## Job Skills

The table below provides descriptive information about the percentage of respondents who indicated that they had each of the job skills listed.

Do you have experience in	Frequency (N = 50)
Repairing cars/trucks	44.0%
Working with computers	52.0%
Doing housekeeping or janitorial work	82.0%
Doing construction work	66.0%
Cosmetologist or barber	10.0%
Doing landscaping	70.0%
Working in customer service	48.0%
Doing electrical work	24.0%
Doing plumbing work	24.5%
Working in a restaurant	78.0%
Working in a warehouse	80.0%

Participants were asked, "Are there any other job skills that you have that are not listed above?" Qualitative answers are reported below.

- forklift, etc.
- nursing
- has forklift license, cooking
- truck driver, bellwood facility, desc kitchen
- delivering packages, driver, was a mechanic in the service
- working on a production line, packing cigarettes/ink cartridges
- operate forklift and bobcat
- driver, deliveries
- carpet and tile
- private dances, entertainment
- CDL, forklift, pallett jack, cherry picker
- hvac technician, tattoos
- painting, sheet rock
- owns own construction company
- roofing, wood carving
- mechanic
- promoting, marketing, management
- management skills
- moving company, stocking at grocery store
- communication, education, management
- engineer land surveying, butcher

- land surveying, sandblast technician, meat cutter
- machine operation, equipment and industrial sanitation (food equipment, warehouses), worked at Philip Morris and other places
- cooking

## Research Questions on Demographic Differences

The table below summarizes results for the research questions comparing individuals with prior episodes of homelessness and those with no such episodes. Significant findings appear in bold.

Characteristic	Prior	No prior	Statistic/Interpretation
	homelessness $(N=18)$	homelessness $(N=32)$	
Have at least a high school education or GED	50.0%	65.6%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N$ = 50) = 1.17, $n.s.$ Level of education is not significantly dependent on prior homeless status; individuals who have been homeless are just as likely to have at least a high school education or GED as those who have not been homeless.
Have served in the U.S. military	16.7%	12.5%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N$ = 50) = .71, $n.s.$ Veteran status is not significantly dependent on homeless status; individuals who have been homeless are just as likely to be veterans as those who have not been homeless.
Were in foster care as a child	5.6%	15.6%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N = 50$ ) = 1.11, $n.s.$ Foster care experience is not significantly dependent on homeless status; individuals who have been homeless are just as likely to have been in foster care as those who have not been homeless.

Characteristic	Prior homelessness	No prior homelessness	Statistic/Interpretation
	(N=18)	(N=32)	
Were homeless as a	11.1%	3.1%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = 1.30, n.s.$
child			Childhood homelessness is not
			significantly dependent on homeless
			status; individuals who have been
			homeless are just as likely to have
			been homeless as a child as those who
			have not been homeless.
Last place of residence	38.9%	32.3%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = .22, n.s.$
was Richmond city			Last permanent residence is not
			significantly dependent on homeless
			status; individuals who have been
			homeless are just as likely to have last
			lived in Richmond as those who have
Ayoraga aga	27.61 years	33.87 years	not been homeless.
Average age	37.61 years	33.87 years	t(48) = .94, n.s. There are no significant differences in
			age between those who have been
			homeless and those who have not
			been homeless.
Average length of time	~21.9 years	~24.9 years	t(48) = .85, n.s.
in the Richmond area	21.5 years	21.5 years	There are no significant differences in
v v v v v v v			length of time in the Richmond area
			between those who have been
			homeless and those who have not
			been homeless.
Income from cash	33.3%	18.8%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = 1.34, n.s.$
benefits			Income from cash benefits is not
			significantly dependent on homeless
			status; individuals who have been
			homeless are just as likely to have had
			income from cash benefits as those
	22.50/	0.007	who have not been homeless.
Income from	23.5%	0.0%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 49) = 8.2, n.s.$
panhandling			Income from panhandling is not
			significantly dependent on homeless
			status; individuals who have been
			homeless are just as likely to have had
			income from panhandling as those
			who have not been homeless.

Characteristic	Prior homelessness (N = 18)	No prior homelessness (N = 32)	Statistic/Interpretation
Income from other sources (e.g., friends and family)	72.2%	53.1%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N$ = 50) = 1.75, $n.s.$ Income from other sources is not significantly dependent on homeless status; individuals who have been homeless are just as likely to have income from other sources as those who have not been homeless.
Lifetime alcohol problem	16.7%	34.4%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N$ = 50) = 1.80, $n.s.$ Having a lifetime alcohol problem is not significantly dependent on homeless status; individuals who have been homeless are just as likely to have had an alcohol problem in their lifetime as those who have not been homeless.
Current alcohol problem	11.1%	15.6%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N$ = 50) = .20, $n.s.$ Having a current alcohol problem is not significantly dependent on homeless status; individuals who have been homeless are just as likely to currently have an alcohol problem and those who have not been homeless.
Lifetime substance abuse problem	55.6%	43.8%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N$ = 50) = .64, $n.s.$ Having a lifetime substance abuse problem is not significantly dependent on homeless status; individuals who have been homeless are just likely to have had a substance abuse problem in their lifetime as those who have not been homeless.
Current substance abuse problem	22.2%	3.1%	$\chi^2(1, N=50) = 4.67, p < .05$ Having a current substance abuse problem is significantly dependent on homeless status; individuals who have been homeless are more likely to have a current substance abuse problem than those who have not been homeless.

Characteristic	Prior	No prior	Statistic/Interpretation
	homelessness	homelessness	
	(N = 18)	(N = 32)	
Lifetime mental health	33.3%	12.5%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = 3.13, n.s.$
problem			Having a lifetime mental health
			problem is not significantly dependent
			on homeless status; individuals who
			have been homeless are just as likely
			to have had a mental health problem
			in their lifetime as those who have not
			been homeless.
Current mental health	5.6%	3.1%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = .18, n.s.$
problem			Having a current mental health
			problem is not significantly dependent
			on homeless status; individuals who
			have been homeless are just as likely
			to have a current mental health
			problem as those who have not been
			homeless.

The table below summarizes results for the research questions comparing individuals with a stable housing plan at discharge and those with no such plan. Significant findings appear in bold.

Characteristic	Unstable housing plan (N = 11)	Stable housing plan (N = 39)	Statistic/Interpretation
Have at least a high school education or GED	54.5%	61.5%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N$ = 50) = .18, $n.s.$ Level of education is not significantly dependent on stable housing status; individuals who do not have a stable plan housing plan are just as likely to have at least a high school diploma/GED as those who have a stable housing plan.
Have served in the U.S. military	27.2%	10.3%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N$ = 50) = .32, $n.s.$ Veteran status is not significantly dependent on stable housing status; individuals who do not have a stable housing plan are just as likely to be veterans as those who have a stable housing plan.

Characteristic	Unstable housing plan (N = 11)	Stable housing plan (N = 39)	Statistic/Interpretation
Were in foster care as a child	0.0%	15.4%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N$ = 49) = 1.92, $n.s.$ Foster care experience is not significantly dependent on stable housing status; individuals who do not have a stable housing plan are just as likely to have been in foster care as a child as those who have a stable housing plan.
Were homeless as a child	9.1%	5.1%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N$ = 49) = .24, $n.s.$ Childhood homelessness is not significantly dependent on stable housing status; individuals who do not have a stable housing plan are just as likely to have been homeless as a child as those who have a stable housing plan.
Average age	38.1 years	34.4 years	t(48) = .94, $n.s$ . There are no significant differences in age between those who do not have a stable housing plan and those with a stable housing plan. Individuals in both groups report similar ages.
Average length of time in Richmond	~27.5 years	~22.8 years	t(48) = .85, $n.s$ . There are no significant differences in length of time in the Richmond area between those who do not have a stable housing plan and those with a stable housing plan. Individuals in both groups report similar lengths of time.
Last place of residence was Richmond city	9.1%	42.1%	$\chi^2$ (1, N = 50) = 4.10, p < .05 Last permanent residence is significantly dependent on stable housing status; individuals who do not have a stable housing plan are less likely to have last lived in Richmond than those who have a stable housing plan.

Characteristic	Unstable housing plan (N = 11)	Stable housing plan (N = 39)	Statistic/Interpretation
Income from cash benefits	36.4%	20.5%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N$ = 50) = 1.18, $n.s.$ Income from cash benefits is not significantly dependent on stable housing status; individuals who do not have a stable housing plan are just as likely to have had income from cash benefits as those who have a stable housing plan.
Income from panhandling	75.0%	25.0%	$\chi^2$ (1, N = 49) = 7.99, p < .01 Income from panhandling is significantly dependent on stable housing status; individuals who do not have a stable housing plan are more likely to obtain income from panhandling than those who have a stable housing plan.
Income from other sources (e.g., friends and family)	27.3%	43.6%	$\chi^2$ (1, N = 49) = .95, n.s. Income from other sources is not significantly dependent on stable housing status; individuals who do not have a stable housing plan are just as likely to have had income from other sources as those who have a stable housing plan.
Ever had alcohol problem	9.1%	33.3%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N$ = 50) = 2.50, $n.s.$ Having a lifetime alcohol problem is not significantly dependent on stable housing status; individuals who do not have a stable housing plan are just as likely to have had an alcohol problem as those who have a stable housing plan.
Have current alcohol problem	9.1%	15.4%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N$ = 50) = .28, $n.s.$ Having a current alcohol problem is not significantly dependent on stable housing status; individuals who do not have a stable housing plan are just as likely to have a current alcohol problem as those who have a stable housing plan.

Characteristic	Unstable	Stable	Statistic/Interpretation
	housing	housing	
	plan	plan	
	(N = 11)	(N = 39)	_
Ever had a substance	72.7%	41.0%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = 3.46, n.s.$
abuse problem			Having a lifetime substance abuse
			problem is not significantly dependent
			on stable housing status; individuals
			who do not have a stable housing plan
			are just as likely to have had a
			substance abuse problem in their
			lifetime as those who have a stable
			housing plan.
Have current substance	18.2%	7.7%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = 1.05, n.s.$
abuse problem			Having a current substance abuse
			problem is not significantly dependent
			on stable housing status; individuals
			who do not have a stable housing plan
			are just as likely to have a current
			substance abuse problem as those who
			have a stable housing plan.
Ever had a mental health	30.0%	70.0%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = .47, n.s.$
problem			Having a lifetime mental health
			problem is not significantly dependent
			on stable housing status; individuals
			who do not have a stable housing plan
			are just as likely to have had mental
			health problems in their lifetime as
			those who have a stable housing plan.
Have current mental	27.3%	17.9%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 49) = .59, n.s.$
health problem			Having a current mental health
			problem is not significantly dependent
			on stable housing status; individuals
			who do not have a stable housing plan
			are just as likely to have a current
			mental health problem as those who
			have a stable housing plan.

## Research Questions on Social Support

The Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (Zimet, Dahlem, Zimet, & Farley, 1988) contains three subscales, which deal with the social support of significant others, family, and friends. The table below summarizes the means and standard deviations on these subscales for individuals with and without prior experiences with homelessness, along with the results of the independent *t*-tests performed. Significant findings appear in bold.

Subscale	Prior homelessness (N = 18)	No prior homelessness (N = 32)	Statistic/Interpretation
Social support from significant others	M = 3.43, $SD = 1.40$	M = 4.42, $SD = .83$	t(48) = 2.75, p < .01 There are significant differences between those who have been homeless and those who have not been homeless, with those who have not been homeless reporting higher levels of social support from a significant other than those who have been homeless.
Social support from family	M = 2.93, $SD = 1.37$	M = 4.11, SD = 1.26	t(48) = 3.08, p < .01 There are significant differences between those who have been homeless and those who have not been homeless, with those who have not been homeless reporting significantly higher levels of social support from their families than those who have been homeless.

Subscale	Prior homelessness (N = 18)	No prior homelessness (N = 32)	Statistic/Interpretation
Social support from friends	M = 2.41, $SD = 1.10$	M = 3.61, $SD = 1.23$	t(48) = 3.43, p < .01 There are significant differences between those who have been homeless and those who have not been homeless, with those who have not been homeless reporting significantly higher levels of social support from their friends than those who have been homeless.
Overall support	M = 2.90, SD = .98	M = 4.05, SD = .86	t(48) = 4.25, p < .01 There are significant differences between those who have been homeless and those who have not been homeless, with those who have not been homeless reporting significantly higher levels of overall social support than those who have been homeless.

The table below summarizes the means and standard deviations on these subscales for individuals with and without a plan for housing when they leave jail, along with the results of the independent *t*-tests performed. Significant findings appear in bold.

Subscale	<b>Unstable housing</b>	Stable housing plan	Statistic/Interpretation
	plan (N = 11)	(N=39)	,
Social support from significant others	M = 3.66, $SD = 1.33$	M = 4.18, $SD = 1.10$	t(47) = -1.43, n.s. There are no significant differences between those with a stable housing plan and those without a stable housing plan, with both groups reporting similar social support from significant others.
Social support from family	M = 3.00, SD = 1.38	M = 3.88, $SD = 1.37$	t(47) = -1.99, n.s. There are no significant differences between those with a stable housing plan and those without a stable housing plan, with both groups reporting similar social support from family.
Social support from friends	M = 2.84, $SD = 1.20$	M = 3.27, $SD = 1.34$	t(47) =92, <i>n.s.</i> There are no significant differences between those with a stable housing plan and those without a stable housing plan, with both groups reporting similar social support from friends.
Overall support	M = 3.17, $SD = 1.15$	M = 3.78, $SD = .97$	t(47) = -1.83, n.s. There are no significant differences between those with a stable housing plan and those without a stable housing plan, with both groups reporting similar levels of overall social support.

# Research Questions on Housing Barriers

The table below summarizes results for the research questions comparing individuals with prior episodes of homelessness and those with no such episodes. Significant findings appear in bold.

Barrier	Prior	No prior	Statistic/Interpretation
	homelessness	homelessness	
	(N = 18)	(N = 32)	
Don't have valid	50.0%	25.0%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = 2.00, n.s.$
ID			Having a valid ID is not significantly
			dependent on homeless status; individuals
			who have been homeless are just as likely to
			not have valid ID as those who have not been
			homeless.
Have language	0.0%	6.2%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = 1.17, n.s.$
barrier			Needing housing assistance due to a
			language barrier is not significantly
			dependent on homeless status; individuals
			who have been homeless are just as likely to
			need housing assistance due to a language
			barrier as those who have not been homeless.
Have ever had	66.7%	59.4%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = .26, n.s.$
lease in their			Having ever had a lease is not significantly
name			dependent on homeless status; individuals
			who have been homeless are just as likely to
			have had a lease in their name as those who
** 11	44.40/	20.10/	have not been homeless.
Had lease in	11.1%	28.1%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = 1.94, n.s.$
past year			Having had a lease in the past year is not
			significantly dependent on homeless status;
			individuals who have been homeless are just
			as likely to have had a lease in the past year
Do not have	100.0%	84.4%	as those who have not been homeless.
current lease	100.0%	04.470	$\chi^2(1, N = 50) = 3.13, n.s.$ Hereing a compant lesse is not significantly.
current lease			Having a current lease is not significantly
			dependent on homeless status; individuals who have been homeless are just as likely to
			not have a current lease as those who have
			not been homeless.
			not occii nomeless.

Barrier	Prior	No prior	Statistic/Interpretation
Barrier	homelessness	No prior homelessness	Stausuc/Interpretation
	(N=18)	(N=32)	
Have not had	61.1%	50.0%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = .57, n.s.$
lease that lasted	01.170	30.070	Having ever had a lease that lasted for at
one year			least a year is not significantly dependent on
one year			homeless status; individuals who have been
			homeless are just as likely to have not had a
			year-long lease as those who have not been
			homeless.
Been evicted	16.7%	9.4%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = .58, n.s.$
			Having ever been evicted from a property is
			not significantly dependent on homeless
			status; individuals who have been homeless
			are just as likely to have been evicted as
7	0.007	6.00/	those who have not been homeless.
Been evicted in	0.0%	6.2%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = 1.17, n.s.$
past year			Having been evicted from a property within
			the past year is not significantly dependent
			on homeless status; individuals who have been homeless are just as likely to have been
			evicted within the past year as those who
			have not been homeless.
Caused serious	0.0%	0.0%	No one in the entire sample has ever caused
damage to	0.070	0.070	serious damage to a property in which they
property			lived.
Gotten in	0.0%	0.0%	No one in the entire sample has ever gotten
trouble for			in trouble for a serious lease violation.
serious lease			
violation			
Don't know	94.4%	84.4%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = 1.11, n.s.$
credit score			Knowledge of credit score is not significantly
			dependent on homeless status; individuals
			who have been homeless are just as likely to
			not know their credit score as those who have
C24 -14 :	17.60/	20.00/	not been homeless.
Can't obtain	17.6%	29.0%	$\chi^{2}(1, N = 50) = .76, n.s.$ Ability to obtain or division at significantly
credit			Ability to obtain credit is not significantly
			dependent on homeless status; individuals
			who have been homeless are just as likely to be unable to obtain credit as those who have
			not been homeless.
			not occii nomeress.

Barrier	Prior	No prior	Statistic/Interpretation
Darrier	homelessness	homelessness	Statistic/Interpretation
	(N=18)	(N=32)	
Have	72.2%	59.4%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = .83, n.s.$
outstanding	12.2/0	39.470	Having outstanding debts is not significantly
debts			dependent on homeless status; individuals
deois			who have been homeless are just as likely to
			have outstanding debts as those who have not
			been homeless.
Unable to	44.4%	34.4%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = .50, n.s.$
provide	44.4/0	34.470	$\chi$ (1, $N = 30$ ) = .30, $n$ .s. Ability to provide a documentation of
documentation			income is not significantly dependent on
of income			homeless status; individuals who have been
of income			homeless are just as likely to be unable to
			provide documentation of income as those
			who have not been homeless.
Do not have	88.9%	71.9%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = 1.94, n.s.$
savings account	00.970	/1.9/0	Having a savings account is not significantly
savings account			dependent on homeless status; individuals
			who have been homeless are just as likely to
			not have a savings account as those who have
			not been homeless.
Do not have	94.4%	62.5%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = 6.11, p < .05$
checking	74.470	02.570	Having a checking account is significantly
account			dependent on homeless status; individuals
account			who have been homeless are more likely to
			not have a checking account than those
			who have not been homeless.
Unable to pay	44.6%	29.0%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 49) = 1.19, n.s.$
1/3 of income	11.070	27.070	Being unable to pay a third of one's income
for housing			for housing expenses is not significantly
101 housing			dependent on homeless status; individuals
			who have been homeless are just as likely to
			be unable to pay a third of their income as
			those who have not been homeless.
Need housing	0.0%	18.7%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = .14, n.s.$
accommodations	0.070	10.770	Needing housing accommodations for
			disabilities is not significantly dependent on
			homeless status; individuals who have been
			homeless are just as likely to need housing
			accommodations as those who have not been
			homeless.
	1	I	11011101000.

Barrier	Prior	No prior	Statistic/Interpretation
	homelessness	homelessness	
	(N=18)	(N=32)	2
Have legal	50.0%	34.4%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = 1.17, n.s.$
issues			Having legal issues is not significantly
			dependent on homeless status; individuals
			who have been homeless are just as likely to
			have legal issues as those who have not been homeless.
Currently on	38.9%	46.9%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = .30, n.s.$
probation/parole			Being currently on probation or parole is not
			significantly dependent on homeless status;
			individuals who have been homeless are just
			as likely to be currently on probation or
			parole as those who have not been homeless.
Have large	5.6%	0.0%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = 1.81, n.s.$
family			Having eight or more people in a household
			is not significantly dependent on homeless
			status; individuals who have been homeless
			are just as likely to have eight or more people
			in a household as those who have not been
			homeless.
Have special	11.1%	6.5%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = .33, n.s.$
needs children			Having special needs children is not
			significantly dependent on homeless status;
			individuals who have been homeless are just
			as likely to have special needs children as
			those who have not been homeless.

The table below summarizes results for the research questions comparing individuals with a stable housing plan and those without a stable housing plan. Significant findings appear in bold.

Barrier	Unstable	Stable	Statistic/Interpretation
	housing plan	housing plan	
	(N = 11)	(N = 39)	
Don't have valid	54.4%	35.6%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = 3.29, n.s.$
ID			Having a valid ID is not significantly
			dependent on stable housing status;
			individuals who do not have a stable housing
			plan are just as likely to lack a valid ID as
			those who have a stable housing plan.

Barrier	Unstable housing plan (N = 11)	Stable housing plan (N = 39)	Statistic/Interpretation
Have language barrier	0.0%	5.1%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N = 50$ ) = .60, $n.s.$ Needing housing assistance due to a language barrier is not significantly dependent on stable housing status; individuals who do not have a stable housing plan are just as likely to need housing assistance as those who have a stable housing plan.
Have ever had lease in their name	81.8%	56.4%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N = 50$ ) = 2.35, $n.s.$ Having a lease is not significantly dependent on stable housing status; individuals who do not have a stable housing plan are just as likely to have a lease in their name as those who have a stable housing plan.
Had lease in past year	27.3%	20.5%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N$ = 50) = .23, $n.s.$ Having had a lease in the past year is not significantly dependent on stable housing status; individuals who do not have a stable housing plan are just as likely to have had a lease in the past year as those who have a stable housing plan.
Do not have current lease	24.4%	75.6%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N = 50$ ) = 1.57, $n.s.$ Having a current lease is not significantly dependent on stable housing status; individuals who do not have a stable housing plan are just as likely to not have a current lease as those who have a stable housing plan.
Have not had lease that lasted one year	63.6%	51.3%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N$ = 50) = .53, $n.s.$ Having ever had a lease that lasted for at least a year is not significantly dependent on stable housing status; individuals who do not have a stable housing plan are just as likely to have not had a year-long lease as those who have a stable housing plan.
Been evicted	36.4%	5.1%	$\chi^2$ (1, N = 50) = 7.93, p < .01 Having ever been evicted from a property is significantly dependent on stable housing status; individuals who do not have a stable housing plan are more likely to have been evicted than those who have a stable housing plan.

Barrier	Unstable housing plan (N = 11)	Stable housing plan (N = 39)	Statistic/Interpretation
Been evicted in past year	9.1%	2.6%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N$ = 50) = .95, $n.s.$ Having been evicted from a property within the past year is not significantly dependent on stable housing status; individuals who do not have a stable housing plan are just as likely to have been evicted from a property within the past year as those who have a stable housing plan.
Caused serious damage to property	0.0%	0.0%	No one in the entire sample has ever caused serious damage to a property in which they lived.
Gotten in trouble for serious lease violation	0.0%	0.0%	No one in the entire sample has ever gotten in trouble for a serious lease violation.
Don't know credit score	100.0%	84.6%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N = 50$ ) = 1.92, $n.s.$ Knowledge of credit score is not significantly dependent on stable housing status; individuals who do not have a stable housing plan are just as likely to not know their credit score as those who have a stable housing plan.
Can't obtain credit	30.0%	23.7%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N = 50$ ) = .17, $n.s.$ Ability to obtain credit is not significantly dependent on stable housing status; individuals who do not have a stable housing plan are just as likely to be unable to obtain credit as those who have a stable housing plan.
Have outstanding debts	81.8%	59.0%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N$ = 50) = 1.94, $n.s.$ Having outstanding debts is not significantly dependent on stable housing status; individuals who do not have a stable housing plan are just as likely to have outstanding debts as those who have a stable housing plan.
Unable to provide documentation of income	45.5%	35.9%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N$ = 50) = .33, $n.s.$ Ability to provide documentation of income is not significantly dependent on stable housing status; individuals who do not have a stable housing plan are just as likely to be unable to provide documentation of income as those who have a stable housing plan.

Dawnian	Unstable	Ctable	Statistic/Intermedation
Barrier	Unstable housing plan	Stable housing plan	Statistic/Interpretation
	(N=11)	(N=39)	
Do not have	90.9%	74.4%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = 1.37, n.s.$
savings account			Having a savings account is not significantly
			dependent on stable housing status;
			individuals who do not have a stable housing
			plan are just as likely to lack a savings
			account as those who have a stable housing
			plan.
Do not have	90.9%	69.2%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = 2.10, n.s.$
checking			Having a checking account is not
account			significantly dependent on stable housing
			status; individuals who do not have a stable
			housing plan are just as likely to lack a
			checking account as those who have a stable
			housing plan.
Unable to pay	45.5%	31.6%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 49) = .73, n.s.$
1/3 of income			Being able to pay a third of one's income for
for housing			housing expenses is not significantly
			dependent on stable housing status;
			individuals who do not have a stable housing
			plan are just as likely to be unable to pay a
			third of their income as those who have a
			stable housing plan.
Need housing	9.1%	12.8%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 49) = .11, n.s.$
accommodations			Needing housing accommodations for
for disability			disabilities is not significantly dependent on
			stable housing status; individuals who do not
			have a stable housing plan are just as likely to
			need housing accommodations as those who
		20.50/	have a stable housing plan.
Have legal	45.5%	38.5%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = .18, n.s.$
issues			Having legal issues is not significantly
			dependent on stable housing status;
			individuals who do not have a stable housing
			plan are just as likely to have legal issues as
C 1	27.20/	40.70/	those who have a stable housing plan.
Currently on	27.3%	48.7%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = 1.60, n.s.$
probation/parole			Being currently on probation or parole is not
			significantly dependent on stable housing
			status; individuals who do not have a stable
			housing plan are just as likely to be currently
			on probation or parole as those who have a
			stable housing plan.

Barrier	Unstable housing plan (N = 11)	Stable housing plan (N = 39)	Statistic/Interpretation
Have large family	0.0%	2.6%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N = 50$ ) = .29, $n.s.$ Having eight or more people in a household is not significantly dependent on stable housing status; individuals who do not have a stable housing plan are just as likely to have eight or more people in a household as those who have a stable housing plan.
Have special needs children	9.1%	7.9%	$\chi^2$ (1, N = 49) = .02, n.s. Having special needs children is not significantly dependent on stable housing status; individuals who do not have a stable housing plan are just as likely to have special needs children as those who have a stable housing plan.

# Research Questions on Recent Offenses

The relationship between the reason people were serving time and their prior experiences with homelessness and future housing plans was also investigated. The table below summarizes these results for individuals with and without prior experiences with homelessness. Significant findings appear in bold.

Offense	Prior	No prior	Statistic/Interpretation
(Current)	homelessness	homelessness	
	(N = 18)	(N = 32)	
Child support violation	11.1%	21.9%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N$ = 50) = .90, $n.s.$ Serving time for a child support violation is not significantly dependent on homeless status; individuals who have been homeless are just as likely to be serving time for a child support violation as those who have not been
			homeless.
Probation/parole violation	16.7%	28.1%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N$ = 50) = .83, $n.s.$ Serving time for a probation/parole violation is not significantly dependent on homeless status; individuals who have been homeless are just as likely to be serving time for a probation/parole violation as those who have not been homeless.

Offense (Current)	Prior homelessness	No prior homelessness	Statistic/Interpretation
	(N=18)	(N=32)	2
Failure to	0.0%	6.3%	$\chi^2 (1, N = 50) = 1.17, n.s.$
appear			Serving time for failure to appear is not
			significantly dependent on homeless status;
			individuals who have been homeless are just
			as likely to be serving time for failure to
			appear as those who have not been homeless.

The table below summarizes data on the reason people were serving time for individuals with and without a stable housing plan. Significant findings appear in bold.

Offense (Current)	Unstable housing plan (N = 11)	Stable housing plan (N = 39)	Statistic/Interpretation
Child support violation	27.3%	15.4%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N$ = 50) = .83, $n.s.$ Serving time for a child support violation is not significantly dependent on stable housing status; individuals who do not have a stable housing plan are just as likely to be serving time for a child support violation as those who have a stable housing plan.
Probation/parole violation	27.3%	23.1%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N$ = 50) = .08, $n.s.$ Serving time for a probation/parole violation is not significantly dependent on stable housing status; individuals who do not have a stable housing plan are just as likely to be serving time for a probation/parole violation as those who have a stable housing plan.
Failure to appear	0.0%	5.1%	$\chi^2$ (1, $N$ = 50) = .59, $n.s.$ Serving time for failure to appear is not significantly dependent on stable housing status; individuals who do not have a stable housing plan are just as likely to be serving time for failure to appear as those who have a stable housing plan.

#### Discussion

Two sets of research questions were considered. The first set of questions had to do with whether there were differences in demographics, housing barriers, and social support between people who had been homeless before and those who had not. Findings included that individuals with a history of homelessness were more likely to report having a current substance abuse problem than individuals without a history of homelessness. They were also less likely to have a checking account than people without a history of homelessness. In spite of a dearth of significant findings, it is notable that, particularly on the questions related to housing barriers, a higher percentage of people who had been homeless before tended to have these barriers. For example, out of the 22 questions on housing barriers, three questions are not necessary positive or negative. Out of the 19 remaining questions for which a "yes" answer is a housing barrier, a higher percentage of people who had been homeless before endorsed 12 of the questions; on two questions, both groups endorsed at the same rate; and on just five questions, people who had not been homeless before scored higher. However, previous research conducted in the Richmond area that examined differences in housing barriers between homeless and non-homeless individuals similarly found few significant differences between the two groups. See Appendix D for a summary of these findings. Perhaps the most interesting difference between people with and without prior experiences of homelessness was that on all measures of social support (family, friends, significant others, and overall), individuals with a history of homelessness scored significantly lower than those without a history of homelessness.

The second set of research questions had to do with whether there were differences in demographics, housing barriers, and social support between people who knew where they were going to stay when they left jail and those who did not. Individuals with a stable housing plan

(i.e., those who knew where they were going to live after jail) are more likely to be from the city of Richmond. Individuals without a stable housing plan are more likely to have been evicted and have received income from panhandling. Similar to the findings for people with and without experiences of homelessness, individuals without a stable housing plan tended to endorse the housing barriers at a higher rate than those with a stable housing plan.

Overall, there were very few differences between homeless/non-homeless and stable/unstable housing groups. This is not surprising given previous research (Burt, 2001; Burt, Aron, Lee, Valente, 2001). However, the high percentage of people who are homeless in our community who have spent time in jail or prison suggests that at some point, something needs to be done to help ex-offenders transition back into the community (Burt, 2005; <a href="http://www.urban.org/toolkit/fivequestions/MBurt.cfm">http://www.urban.org/toolkit/fivequestions/MBurt.cfm</a>).

One question that this research did not address was the percentage of individuals in the Richmond City Jail who had experienced homelessness. Additional data that provides an estimate of the volume of people who might have contact with the jail appears in Appendix E, which provides a summary of crimes in 2008 that were likely committed by individuals experiencing homelessness.

One major limitation of the present study was the small sample size, which affects statistical power to find significant differences. Another limitation was the unavailability of some potential respondents. Both of these issues could suggest that the sample is not entirely representative of the population being surveyed. In addition, data was self-reported by participants, and no effort was made to validate their answers.

In spite of these limitations, the data presented here provide a cross-sectional picture of inmates in the Richmond City Jail and suggest some ties between homelessness and social and

34

local connections. It is possible that helping inmates maintain connections with friends, family, and significant others may help protect them from homelessness, perhaps by offering them options for housing.

Overall, it appears that while individuals with a history of homelessness and those who do not know where they are going to live when they live jail may face significant barriers to obtaining housing, they are largely similar to other offenders. Based on this small sample of offenders surveyed, it seems likely that many would benefit from additional social support and help integrating into the community when they leave jail.

## References

- Burt, M.R. (2001). Homeless families, singles, and others: Findings from the 1996 National Survey of Homeless Assistance Providers and Clients. *Housing Policy Debate*, *12*(4), 737-780.
- Burt, M.R. (2005). Five questions for Martha Burt. Accessed 04/08/09 from <a href="http://www.urban.org/toolkit/fivequestions/MBurt.cfm">http://www.urban.org/toolkit/fivequestions/MBurt.cfm</a>)
- Burt, M.R., Aron, L.Y., Lee, E., & Valente, J. (2001). *Helping America's Homeless: Emergency Shelter or Affordable Housing?* Washington, D.C.: Urban Institute.

## January 2009 Snapshot of Ex-Offenders

## **Experiencing Homelessness in the Richmond Region**

The following data were collected in Homeward's eleventh winter (January 29, 2009) count of individuals and families experiencing homelessness in the Richmond region. A total of 1014 adults and 136 children were counted, and 68.2% of adults completed the Homeward point-in-time survey. The statistics reported below represent the 465 individuals (73.0% of adults who completed the survey) who indicated that they had spent time in jail or prison.

- 81.8% of ex-offenders are males, 17.7% are females, and .4% are transgendered. Most are single, never married adults (56.3%). 5.7% are married, and 43.7% have been in families, including those who are married, as well as those who are widowed, separated, or divorced.
- A majority of ex-offenders report that they are African-American (70.1%), followed by White (23.6%). 3.6% indicated that they are Hispanic.
- The average age for adult ex-offenders is 44.8 years.
- 56.7% have a high school education or GED. 23.0% attended some college, and 5.5% have a college degree or higher.
- 19.7% are veterans.
- A majority of ex-offenders have served time in jail (59.1%). 10.3% indicated that they served time in prison, and 30.5% reported that they had served time in both jail and prison.
- 27.2% experienced domestic violence in their lifetime. Of those experiencing domestic violence, 2.6% had experienced it in the past month, and 30.4% had experienced it in the past year.
- 52.2% report having a problem with alcohol sometime in their lifetime. Of those reporting a problem with alcohol, 79.3% are currently in recovery.
- 59.7% report having a problem with substance abuse sometime in their lifetime. Of those reporting a problem, 78.3% are currently in recovery.
- 31.9% report having a mental health problem sometime in their lifetime. Of these, 69.9% are currently being treated and 60.3% are taking medication for mental health problems.
- 26.9% report having a long-term disability.
- 25.6% are employed. Of those who are employed, 45.9% work full-time, 27.5% work part-time, and 26.6% do day labor or temp work.
- 50.6% of respondents have lived in Greater Richmond for 6 years or more; 37.4% have lived in the area for 17 years or more.
- Most (53.0%) reported having their last housing in Richmond. Others indicated previous housing in Henrico (9.9%), Chesterfield (6.6%), and Hanover (1.8%). 18.2% of respondents last lived elsewhere in Virginia, and 9.7% lived in other states.
- In the past three years, most homeless ex-offenders have been homeless once (57.2%) or twice (24.5%); 18.3% have been homeless three or more times during this time period.
- A little more than half (50.5%) have been homeless for 5 months or less.

#### For more information:

Margot Ackermann, Ph.D. ♦ Research and Evaluation Director (804)343-2045 x11 ♦ mackermann@homewardva.org

## Appendix B

The table below presents the original research questions, along with the appropriate variables and statistical tests.

Research question	Statistics
Among jail inmates, are there demographic differences between those who have been homeless and those who have not been homeless?	$\chi^2$ with homeless in lifetime (yes/no) or stable housing plan (yes/no) as the first variable and the following variables: education level (high school grad + vs. less than high school diploma), veteran status (yes/no), disability status (yes/no),
Among jail inmates, are there demographic differences between those with a stable housing plan at discharge and those without a stable housing plan?	childhood foster care (yes/no), childhood homelessness (yes/no), substance abuse problem in lifetime (yes/no), mental health problem in lifetime (yes/no), last permanent residence (Richmond city/not Richmond city)
Among jail inmates, are there age differences between those who have been homeless and those who have not been homeless?	<i>t</i> -test with homeless in lifetime (yes/no) or stable housing plan (yes/no) as independent variable and age as dependent variable
Among jail inmates, are there age differences between those with a stable housing plan at discharge and those without a stable housing plan?	
Among jail inmates, are there differences in length of time in the Richmond area between those who have been homeless and those who have not been homeless?	<i>t</i> -test with homeless in lifetime (yes/no) or stable housing plan (yes/no)as independent variable and length of time in the Richmond area as dependent variable
Among jail inmates, are there differences in length of time in the Richmond area between those with a stable housing plan at discharge and those without a stable housing plan?	
Among jail inmates, are there differences in past year's income sources between those who have been homeless and those who have not been homeless?	$\chi^2$ with homeless in lifetime (yes/no) or stable housing plan (yes/no) as the first variable and the following variables: income from benefits (yes/no), income from other sources like friends and family (yes/no), income from panhandling (yes/no)

Research question	Statistics
Among jail inmates, are there differences in past year's income sources between those with a stable housing plan at discharge and those without a stable housing plan?	
Among jail inmates, are there differences in lifetime/past year's substance abuse between those who have been homeless and those who have not been homeless?	$\chi^2$ with homeless in lifetime (yes/no) or stable housing plan (yes/no) as the first variable and the following variables: lifetime drug problems, past year drug problems, lifetime alcohol problems, past year alcohol problems
Among jail inmates, are there differences in lifetime/past year's substance abuse between those with a stable housing plan at discharge and those without a stable housing plan?	
Among jail inmates, are there differences in lifetime/past year's mental health problems between those who have been homeless and those who have not been homeless?	$\chi^2$ with homeless in lifetime (yes/no) or stable housing plan (yes/no) as the first variable and the following variables: lifetime mental health problems and past year mental health problems
Among jail inmates, are there differences in lifetime/past year's mental health problems between those with a stable housing plan at discharge and those without a stable housing plan?	
Among jail inmates, are there differences in social support between those who have been homeless and those who have not been homeless?	<i>t</i> -test with homeless in lifetime (yes/no) or stable housing plan (yes/no) as independent variable and social support as dependent variable
Among jail inmates, are there differences in social support between those with a stable housing plan at discharge and those without a stable housing plan?	
Among jail inmates, are there differences in housing barriers between	$\chi^2$ with homeless in lifetime (yes/no) or stable housing plan (yes/no) as the first variable and

Research question	Statistics
those who have been homeless and those who have not been homeless?	each of the housing barriers questions (yes/no) as the second variable
Among jail inmates, are there differences in housing barriers between those with a stable housing plan at discharge and those without a stable housing plan?	
Among jail inmates, are there differences in most recent offenses between those who have been homeless and those who have not been homeless?	$\chi^2$ with homeless in lifetime (yes/no) or stable housing plan (yes/no) as the first variable and information about the most recent offense (category 1/category 2/child support violation;
Among jail inmates, are there differences in most recent offenses between those with a stable housing plan at discharge and those without a stable housing plan?	whether or not it was a crime against person – yes or no; whether or not it was a crime against property – yes or no; whether or not it was a crime against the administration of justice – yes or no) as the second variable

Appendix C

me to jail? (check one)  Outdoors, abandoned or condemned building, vehicle, ridge, rail yard, campsite, or other place not meant for uman habitation  Emergency shelter  Transitional shelter
Outdoors, abandoned or condemned building, vehicle, ridge, rail yard, campsite, or other place not meant for uman habitation  Emergency shelter  Transitional shelter
☐ Transitional shelter
7 Don't know
<b>→</b> 12011 UK110W
Other: (write answer on line)
If your answer is in this column (above), please answer these questions:
months, or years) days weeksmonths years  1f. Was the time you were homeless (checone):  Less than 1 week  More than 1 week but less than 1 month  1-3 months  More than 3 months but less than 6 months  6-9 months

<b>4. What is your race?</b> (Any of ☐ White ☐	f these could include Hispanic African-American/Black	or Latino ethnicity #	<del>₹5)</del>	☐ American Indian or Alaskan Native
☐ Native Hawaiian or ☐ Pacific Islander	Two or more races	Other (write	answer on line)	
5. Are you Hispanic or Latin	no? (check one)	☐ Yes	□ No	
6. What is your age? (write	answer on line) _	Years		
7. What is your birthday (n	nonth and date)? (write	e answer on line	.)	
8. What is the highest level	of education that you	ı completed? (	(check one)	
☐ Elementary School	☐ Middle School	☐ High	School Diploma or	GED
☐ Some College	☐ College Degre	e 🗆 Post	-Graduate	
9. What is your marital state ☐ Single (never married)	`	dowed	☐ Divorced	☐ Separated
10. Do you have any long-t your ability to work and/or		our children?	=	ıbstantially limits
11. Have you ever served in		<u></u>	∕es □ No	
	If you answered <b>YES</b> ,			
	12a. Are you a combound of the Yes No  12b. What kind of the Medical Less than honorable General	lischarge did y	•	ck one)
12. Do you have any childre	<u> </u>	<b>3?</b> (check one) Yes □ N	lo	
	If you answered <b>YES</b> ,	please answer t	:hese questions:	
	12a. Before you car children live with your lives □ No 12b. How old are your lives □ 12b. How old are your lives □ 12b.	ou?		ers
Homeward	on line)		<u>.</u>	

## 13. How long have you lived in this area? (write in your best guess of the number of days, weeks, months, or years) \_days \_\_\_\_ weeks \_\_\_\_months \_\_\_\_ years **14. Where was your last permanent place to live?** (check one) → \* If "Richmond": Was that in the City of Richmond or Chesterfield or Henrico? ☐ Richmond ☐ Chesterfield ☐ Henrico ☐ Hanover ☐ Other city/county in VA (write answer on line) ☐ Never had permanent address ☐ Other state outside VA (write answer on line) ☐ Yes **15.** Have you ever lived in subsidized or public housing? (check one) 16. Have you ever been evicted from an apartment where your name was on the lease? (check one) ☐ Yes 17. Have you ever lived in a property that was foreclosed on? (check one) $\square$ Yes, I owned a home that was foreclosed on $\square$ Yes, I rented a home that was foreclosed on If you answered **YES**, please answer these questions: 17a. How long ago did this foreclosure happen? (write in your best guess of the number of days, weeks, months, or years) \_\_\_\_days \_\_\_\_ weeks \_\_\_\_months \_\_\_\_ years 17b. Where did you live after the foreclosure? ☐ Home I rented ☐ Lived with friends/family ☐ Home I owned ☐ Other: ☐ In hospital ☐ In jail/prison **17c. What events led to the foreclosure?** (write answer on line) **Employment/Income History and Information** ☐ Yes □ No **18. Before you came to jail, were you employed?** (check one) If you answered **YES** to this question, please answer this question: **18a. What type of job was it?** (check one) ☐ Day labor/temp work ☐ Part-time ☐ Full-time **19. Please answer the questions below.** (check one on each line) 19a. In the past year, have you had any income from cash benefits like ☐ Yes □ No welfare, social security or VA benefits? 19b. In the past year, have you had any income from other sources, like ☐ Yes ☐ No friends or family?

**Housing History and Information** 

19c. In the past year strangers for money?		ncome from panhandling or asking	☐ Yes	□ No	
				□ No	
				□ No	
19f. In the past year,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u> </u>	☐ Yes	□ No	
. , ,	<u> </u>	<u> </u>			
Legal/Judicial Histo	ory and Involveme	nt			
20. Have you ever b	een in prison? (che ☐ Yes	eck one)			
21. How many time	s have you been ir	a jail or prison? (write answer on lin	e)		
<b>22. How long is you</b> or years)		e? (write in your best guess of the nu weeks wears	mber of days,	weeks, months,	
23. Are you serving  ☐ Yes ☐ N	_	r a child support violation? (check	one)		
<b>24. Are you serving</b> ☐ Yes ☐ N	_	r a probation/parole violation? (c	heck one)		
25. Are you serving ☐ Yes ☐ N	_	r failure to appear? (check one)			
<b>26. Were you home</b> ☐ Yes ☐ N	-	ou came to the Richmond City Ja	il? (check one	•)	
27. Do you have any	y <i>felony</i> convictior	s?			
		If you answered <b>YES</b> , please answe	r the question	s below:	
		27a. Was your last felony convidence (check one)  ☐ Yes ☐ No	ction a violer	nt offense?	
27b. Was your last felony conviction a drug-related offense? (check one)  ☐ Yes ☐ No					
Childhood History					
28. Were you ever h	nomeless as a child	<b>!?</b> ☐ Yes ☐ No			
29. Have you ever b	een in foster care	?			
	If you answered YI	<b>ES</b> , please answer this question:			
Homeward	29a. Did you bed (check one) □ Yes □ No	ome homeless within 6 months o	f leaving fos	ter care?	

<b>Physical and Mental Health His</b>	tory		
30 Please answer the question	ns below. (check one on each line)		
30a. Do you currently have health		☐ Yes	□ No
30b. Are you currently pregnant?		☐ Yes	□ No
30c. Have you ever had a problem	n with alcohol?	☐ Yes	□ No
30d. Do you have a problem with		☐ Yes	□ No
30e. Are you currently in recovery	for alcohol problems?	☐ Yes	□ No
30f. Have you ever had a drug or		☐ Yes	□ No
30g. Do you have a problem with	drug or substance abuse now?	☐ Yes	□ No
30h. Are you currently in recovery	for drug or substance abuse problems?	☐ Yes	□ No
30i. Have you ever been in treatm	ent for mental health problems?	☐ Yes	□ No
30j. Are you currently being treate	ed for mental health problems?	☐ Yes	□ No
30k. Are you currently taking any	medication for a mental health problem?	☐ Yes	□ No
30l. Have you ever gotten counsel problems?	ling or treatment for mental health	☐ Yes	□ No
Domestic Violence			
31. Have you ever experienced	violence at the hands of a spouse or i	ntimate partn	er?
	If you answered <b>YES</b> , please answer thes	se questions:	
	31a. How long has it been since the the hands of a spouse or intimate pa guess of the number of days, weeks, more days weeks	rtner? (write in this, or years)	n your best
	31b. Did you seek help or counseling program? (check one) ☐ Yes ☐ No	from a dome	stic violence
	31c. Did you get help or counseling f program? (check one) ☐ Yes ☐ No	rom a domes	tic violence

General Medical		
Please answer the questions below. (check one on each line)		
32a. In the past year, have you needed to see a dentist?	☐ Yes	□ No
32b. In the past year, have you tried to see a dentist?	☐ Yes	□ No
32c. In the past year, have you been to the dentist?	☐ Yes	□ No
32d. In the past year, have you needed to see a doctor?	☐ Yes	□ No
32e. In the past year, have you tried to see a doctor?	☐ Yes	□ No
32f. In the past year, have you been to the doctor?	☐ Yes	☐ No
32g. In the past year, have you been treated in an emergency room?	☐ Yes	□ No
32h. In the past year, have you needed counseling or treatment for substance abuse?	☐ Yes	□ No
32i. In the past year, have you tried to get counseling or treatment for substance abuse?	☐ Yes	□ No
32j. In the past year, have you gotten counseling or treatment for substance abuse?	☐ Yes	☐ No
32k. In the past year, have you needed counseling or treatment for mental health problems?	☐ Yes	□ No
32l. In the past year, have you tried to get counseling or treatment for mental health problems?	☐ Yes	□ No
32m. In the past year, have you gotten counseling or treatment for mental health problems?	☐ Yes	□ No

33. We are interested in how you feel about the following statements. Read each statement carefully and circle the answer that best describes how you feel.

carefully and circle the answer that best describes how you feel.					
33a. There is a special person who is around	Strongly	Somewhat	Neutral	Somewhat	Strongly
when I am in need.	disagree	disagree		agree	agree
33b. There is a special person with whom I	Strongly	Somewhat	Neutral	Somewhat	Strongly
can share my joys and sorrows.	disagree	disagree		agree	agree
33c. My family really tries to help me.	Strongly	Somewhat	Neutral	Somewhat	Strongly
	disagree	disagree		agree	agree
33d. I get the emotional help and support I	Strongly	Somewhat	Neutral	Somewhat	Strongly
need from my family.	disagree	disagree		agree	agree
33e. I have a special person who is a real	Strongly	Somewhat	Neutral	Somewhat	Strongly
source of comfort to me.	disagree	disagree		agree	agree
33f. My friends really try to help me.	Strongly	Somewhat	Neutral	Somewhat	Strongly
	disagree	disagree		agree	agree
33g. I can count on my friends when things	Strongly	Somewhat	Neutral	Somewhat	Strongly
go wrong.	disagree	disagree		agree	agree
33h. I can talk about my problems with my	Strongly	Somewhat	Neutral	Somewhat	Strongly
family.	disagree	disagree		agree	agree
33i. I have friends with whom I can share	Strongly	Somewhat	Neutral	Somewhat	Strongly
my joys and sorrows.	disagree	disagree		agree	agree
33j. There is a special person in my life who	Strongly	Somewhat	Neutral	Somewhat	Strongly
cares about my feelings.	disagree	disagree		agree	agree
33k. My family is willing to help me make	Strongly	Somewhat	Neutral	Somewhat	Strongly
decisions.	disagree	disagree		agree	agree
33l. I can talk about my problems with my	Strongly	Somewhat	Neutral	Somewhat	Strongly
friends.	disagree	disagree		agree	agree

34. Have you made arra	angements for where yo	u are going to live after you leave jail?
☐ Yes ☐ N	No	
35. Where are you plan	ning to live after you lea	ive jail?
☐ Home I own	$\square$ Home/apartment I rent	☐ With friends
☐ With family	☐ With girlfriend/boyfriend	☐ Don't know
		☐ Other:

Homeward 050609 MEA FINAL

47

# **Housing Barriers**

Please circle the answer to the following questions that relate to housing.

1. Do you have a valid picture ID?	Yes	No
2. Do you require assistance in obtaining housing due to a	Yes	No
communication or language barrier?		
3. Have you ever had a lease in your name?	Yes	No
4. Within the past year, have you had a lease in your name?	Yes	No
5. Do you currently have a lease in your name?	Yes	No
6. Have you ever had a lease that lasted for at least 12 months?	Yes	No
7. Have you ever been evicted from a property?	Yes	No
8. In the past year, have you been evicted from a property?	Yes	No
9. Have you ever caused serious damage to a property in which	Yes	No
you lived?		
10. Have you ever gotten in trouble for a serious lease violation?	Yes	No
11. Do you know what your credit score is?	Yes	No
12. Are you able to obtain credit?	Yes	No
13. Do you have any outstanding debts that you know of?	Yes	No
14. Would you be able to provide a potential landlord with	Yes	No
documentation of income?		
15. Do you have a savings account?	Yes	No
16. Do you have a checking account?	Yes	No
17. It is typical to pay 1/3 of your total income (before taxes) for	Yes	No
housing expenses. Would this be possible for you to do?		
18. Do you or anyone in your family have a physical disability	Yes	No
that would require special housing accommodations?		
19. Do you have any legal issues that might impact your getting a	Yes	No
lease?		
20. Are you currently on probation or parole?	Yes	No
21. Are there eight or more people in your household?	Yes	No
22. If you have children, do any of them have special needs?	Yes	No

# Job Skills

Below are some questions about job skills that you may have. Please indicate whether or not you have each of the job skills by circling yes or no.

Do you have experience ...

Repairing cars/trucks?	Yes	No
Working with computers?	Yes	No
	1 03	110
Doing housekeeping or janitorial work?	Yes	No
Doing construction work?	Yes	No
As a cosmetologist or barber?	Yes	No
Doing landscaping?	Yes	No
Working in customer service?	Yes	No
Doing electrical work?	Yes	No
Doing plumbing work?	Yes	No
Working in a restaurant?	Yes	No
Working in a warehouse?	Yes	No

Are there any other job skins that you have that are not fisted above?	

#### Appendix D

In Homeward's January 2008 Point-in Time Count, questions on housing barriers were administered to people experiencing homelessness in the region. Because both homeless and non-homeless individuals were intentionally surveyed at one local meals program, it was possible to compare the housing barriers faced by homeless (N = 59) and non-homeless (N = 80) individuals. Significant findings were:

- **Previous issues with housing**: Homeless individuals were less likely to have had a lease in the past year (No = 93.0%/65.4%) or currently have a lease (No = 100.0%/74.4%).
- **Disabilities**: Homeless individuals were marginally less likely (Yes = 10.6%/23.1%) to have a family member with a physical disability or have one themselves.
- Mental health and substance abuse problems (ever): Homeless individuals were marginally more likely to have been in treatment for mental health problems (Yes = 39.0%/24.7%, p = .07) and significantly more likely to have ever had a drug or substance abuse problem (Yes = 47.5%/29.9%).

## Appendix E

The data below summarize crime information provided by Sargeant Shane Waite from the Richmond Police Department on incidents that occurred between 1/1/2008 and 12/31/2008 for which the offender address is listed as "homeless" or the narrative mentions "homeless." My understanding is that this should be a good representation of the charges being brought against individuals who are homeless.

VIOIGING CHIMICS	
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT	26
AGGRAVATED ASSAULT DOMESTIC	3
FORCIBLE RAPE	1
ROBBERY/INDIVIDUAL	23
Violent Crimes Total	<u>53</u>
Property Crimes	
ALL OTHER LARCENY	18
BURGLARY/B&E/COMMERCIAL	3
BURGLARY/B&E/RESIDENTIAL	9
MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT	7
PICKPOCKET	2
PURSE SNATCHING	2
SHOPLIFTING	36
THEFT FROM BUILDING	12
THEFT FROM COIN OPERATED MACHINE OR DEVICE	1
THEFT FROM MOTOR VEHICLE	14
THEFT OF MOPED/OTHER VEHICLE TYPE	2
THEFT OF MOTOR VEHICLE PARTS/ACCESSORIES	3
UNAUTHORIZED USE OF A MOTOR VEHICLE	1
Property Crimes Total	110
All Oth or Origina a	
All Other Crimes ACCIDENTAL DEATH	1
	1
ALL OTHER OFFENSES ANNOYING PHONE CALLS	14
BOMB THREAT	3 1
CITY CODE VIOLATIONS	9
COURT DOCUMENTS	9 68
DESTRUCTION PROPERTY/CITY PROPERTY	2
DESTRUCTION PROPERTY/CITY PROPERTY  DESTRUCTION PROPERTY/PRIVATE PROPERTY	23
DESTRUCTION PROPERTY/PRIVATE PROPERTY DESTRUCTION PROPERTY/PRIVATE/GRAFFITI	23
DISORDERLY CONDUCT	2 10
DRUG/NARCOTIC VIOLATION	_
DRUNKENNESS	LΩ
	68 127
	127
DUI, ALCOHOL	127 1
EMBEZZLEMENT	127 1 1
,	127 1

**Violent Crimes** 

FAMILY OFFENSES, NONVIOLENT	1
FIRE INVESTIGATION	1
FORCIBLE SODOMY	1
FORGERY BY CHECK	8
FORGERY/COUNTERFEITING/ALL OTHER	2
FOUND PROPERTY	3
FRAUD, ATM	1
FRAUD, CREDIT CARD	1
FUGITIVE (OUT OF STATE)	1
HIT AND RUN	4
IMPERSONATION	3
INDECENT EXPOSURE	4
JUSTIFIABLE HOMICIDE	1
KIDNAPPING/ABDUCTION	2
LIQUOR LAW VIOLATIONS	42
LOST / MISSING / SUSPICIOUS PROPERTY	12
MISSING PERSON	11
NATURAL DEATH	2
OBSCENE/THREATENING PHONE CALL	1
OBSTRUCTING JUSTICE	3
OPERATING MOTOR VEHICLE BY HABITUAL OFFENDER	1
PROSTITUTION	3
PUBLIC SWEARING OR INTOXICATION	1
RECOVERED VEHICLE-STOLEN OTHER JURIS.	1
ROBBERY/CARJACKING	1
ROBBERY/RESIDENCE	2
SEARCH WARRANT - DRUGS	1
SEARCH WARRANT - OTHER	1
SIMPLE ASSAULT	86
SIMPLE ASSAULT, DOMESTIC	25
STOLEN PROPERTY OFFENSES	2
SUDDEN DEATH	1
SUICIDE	1
SUSPICIOUS SITUATION/PERSON	27
THREATEN BODILY HARM	6
THREATEN TO BURN	1
TRESPASS OF REAL PROPERTY	115
TRESPASSING	1
WARRANT SERVED FROM OTHER JURISDICTION	2
WEAPON LAW VIOLATIONS	4
WEAPON LAW VIOLATIONS, CONCEALED WEAPON	2
All Other Crimes Total	724