

Classifying housing situations: Homeless people in general classifications

François Clanché

The French version of this text was first published as chapter 6 of *La Rue et le foyer. Une recherche sur les sans-domicile et les mal-logés dans les années 90*, Travaux et Documents de l'INED, n°144, 2000.

For more than two years, between 1993 and 1996, the meetings of the homelessness working group (*groupe sans-abri*) of the Conseil National de l'Information Statistique (CNIS), the French national statistical council, brought together statisticians, researchers, officials, social work professionals and representatives of voluntary agencies working with the victims of housing exclusion.

The group had the task of devising improved methods for the statistical investigation of homeless populations.¹ When the participants in these meetings began to pool their information and experiences, some of it in the form of quantitative data, the lack of a common language to describe the living conditions of families and individuals suffering from housing exclusion was quickly identified as a handicap. Government departments, voluntary agencies, and others active with the homeless each possessed their own more or less formalized system for describing and classifying situations of housing exclusion, thus limiting the scope for organizing and accumulating knowledge and forming an obstacle to its use.

Box 1

An initiative of the homelessness working group of the CNIS

As part of the work of the CNIS homelessness working group (see the introduction to *La Rue et le foyer*) a smaller group was set up to elaborate the classifications that would facilitate development of observation instruments and ensure the overall consistency and comparability of the research on homelessness. Reflecting the membership of the CNIS itself, the team comprised statistics specialists and social service professionals and voluntary organizations working with victims of housing exclusion, each of whom contributed their knowledge and experience in this field.

These classifications had to satisfy a number of requirements—to be suitable for use in both face-to-face interviews and self-administered questionnaires, and on the existing body of administrative sources; to be compatible with the concepts employed by the organizations that already held information (INSEE, CNAF, Statistical Services of the Ministry of Social Affairs and the various other official agencies); to be usable outside the administrative field by all those working in this area, particularly in the voluntary sector, to allow them to organize and exchange information based on a shared terminology.

¹ I would like to thank Hank de Feijter of the University of Amsterdam and Antonio Tosi of the Politecnico di Milano, for their comments and criticisms on projects for classifications with possible application to other European countries. The text has also benefited greatly from the remarks and encouragement of Patrick Simon of INED.

As a basis for establishing the correspondence between experience and discourse, a smaller group, drawn from across the working group's varied membership (Box 1), assumed the task of developing classificatory schemes for describing the housing conditions of homeless people. The aim was not that of producing a standardized questionnaire with which to study homeless populations, but of describing the situations of housing exclusion and insecurity and the populations exposed to them, in the most detailed and comparable way possible.

Spontaneously, the initial temptation might have been to elaborate an operational definition of the homeless or the "excluded from housing" category, to identify its objective limits, and then to break it down into sub-groups that combined statistical significance with maximum analytical relevance. But such an approach would have been at odds with one of the fundamental lessons to emerge from the group's discussions, namely the rejection of any *ad hoc* statistical instrument (survey method and classificatory device) that was distinct from that used to describe the general population.

One of the principles guiding the group's work was never to treat the homeless as forming populations that were permanently cut off from mainstream society, and instead to reveal the continuum of situations existing between individuals "with" and "without" housing, and also the speed and frequency with which any individual passes in and out of the housed and non-housed states. For the same reasons that the group refused to treat the homeless population as a separate population, so it did not want to establish a list or classification of situations of exclusion that was distinct from that for "ordinary" situations. Although effective observation of these situations clearly required specific procedures, it was decided to develop a set of classifications that described the full range of housing situations, from the most conventional and most stable, to the least secure and least habitable.

We propose to set out briefly the reasons that led the working group to adopt this position. They are illustrated by passages from the group's final report (CNIS, 1996).

Avoid stigmatization

"[...] an understanding of the homeless and of the processes of exclusion must be integrated in a whole-of-society approach. By acknowledging insecurity (*précarité*) as one of the components of our society and by developing the means to observe it in national-level surveys, we can avoid the illusion of specific approaches which necessarily reinforce the stigmatization of the socially excluded and encourage the idea that their problems can only be resolved by specific measures."

The processes which lead to housing exclusion (unemployment, relationship breakdown, housing market changes) operate throughout society. Situations can only be analysed in relation to the broader patterns of societal change if they are treated as the extreme positions on a *continuum* of situations that spans the whole of society.

Not create a statistical ghetto

"Even if some targeted investigations appear to be necessary, the group takes the view that coverage of the populations without independent, stable housing should be a concern for everyone involved in designing large-scale traditional surveys and in census-taking"

National surveys, including the population census, can contribute valuable information to our knowledge and understanding of the housing exclusion phenomenon. For this information to be usable, however, the analytical and descriptive classification applied to housing exclusion must be compatible with the categories employed in these statistical operations and also cover the most common housing situations. Accordingly, the description of “non-ordinary” housing types should be integrated into the standard housing classifications.

Observe and analyse the moves between “housing” and “non-housing”

A homeless person has not always been—and will not always be—homeless: homelessness is a transitional state, corresponding to one—possibly short—episode in a lifetime. Moreover, the lives of many people without permanent homes of their own are made up of a succession of back and forth moves between “housing” (often insecure) and lack of housing. Analysing these moves—in both directions—and their causes requires application of a common classificatory framework to all situations.

Analyse the housing supply accessible to disadvantaged people

“At the level of housing supply, neither the social nor private sector contain a ‘stock’ of dwellings specifically intended to house poor households. An examination of the conditions in which households move out of dwellings and of what then happens to those dwellings, will enable us to understand the functioning of the housing market and the proportion of the housing stock accessible to the poorest members of society, and also the measures likely to expand their access.”

To understand and change the housing types inhabited by very low income households, and to identify the housing which no longer fulfils this role (due to evictions, renovation of the stock of sub-standard, low cost dwellings), we need to track and observe the distribution of the population across all segments of the housing stock, and not restrict attention to the housing that we assume is reserved for poor households.

These recommendations were followed when producing the classifications presented below. The classifications are designed to encompass the full diversity of housing situations in the population as a whole, and to provide a suitable base for international comparisons. The latter objective added to the task’s complexity, given the difficulty of incorporating heterogeneous national experiences in one single classification. As will be seen, the international dimension of the categorization makes it necessary to consider the object at a more general level.

I. The homeless: from self-evidence to complexity

The first difficulty to overcome when constructing a classification for the housing situations of the homeless concerns the actual definition of the population involved. The common-sense solution is straightforward—a “homeless” person is someone with nowhere to live, i.e. a person who sleeps rough and, more directly, who is *seen* on the street. The statistician, however, finds it harder to specify an operational criterion for designating what in reality is not a population but rather a transient group of individuals passing through a *state*. The

popular image of the homeless is hard to express as a statistical category, simply because not all “beggars” are homeless and because many rough sleepers sleep rough only intermittently. Definitional problems are compounded by those of data collection, since the characteristic of the “homeless” is precisely that of being mobile and relatively hard to reach. Finally, conducting surveys on extremely disadvantaged people raises ethical questions which, though not fundamentally different in nature from those of survey epistemology in general, mean that special attention must be paid to the procedures employed (see chapter 4 in *La Rue et le foyer*). These characteristics are all complicating factors for the statistical undertaking.

Notwithstanding its capacity to stigmatize, the label of *SDF*, the usual French shorthand term for the homeless, standing for *sans domicile fixe* or “with no permanent residence”, is in fact more accurate than it appears. Being “*sans domicile fixe*” refers not to sleeping rough but to having no fixed or permanent residence. The nuance here concerns both the “residence” and its “permanent” nature.

Having a “residence” is not simply having a roof over one’s head. The term denotes more than a bed in a hostel or with a voluntary organization, and more than a makeshift shelter. What is meant is a “legal and usual place of residence”. Consequently “*sans domicile fixe*” can be applied to anyone who spends the night in a place that is not a place of residence—cellars, car parks, huts, hallways, corridors, stair wells, though also in hostels, night shelters, dormitories run by religious or voluntary organizations, and hotel rooms. The task of establishing a statistical definition of the homeless needs to go beyond “the street” and include all the forms of accommodation that are intermediate between the street and the place of residence.

An individual cannot be described as having a “permanent” residence if this is liable to change on a weekly or even daily basis, depending on, for example, the willingness of a friend or relative to put them up or help out, the refusal of a hotel or lodging house to give any more credit, a landlord’s initiation of eviction proceedings for rent arrears, hostel rules that strictly limit the length of stay, or the person who happens to get first to the cellar, staircase, or hut where the previous night was spent. The “quality” of homeless person is thus determined by the physical characteristics of the place where he or she lives but also by the “occupancy status” of this place.

Carrying less stigma and with a lower media profile than “*sans domicile fixe*”, though almost synonymous with it, the term “*personne sans domicile propre et permanent*” (“no permanent place of residence of their own”) indicates clearly the definition’s entirely negative character, which presents problems for an exercise based on enumeration, classification and description. To proceed from analysis of the phenomenon to the “operational” phase of statistical collection and production, we had to construct a classificatory system that combined three dimensions—the physical dimension (in what kind of “premises” does the person spend the night?), the legal dimension (by what right or with what statute does the person occupy this place?) and the temporal dimensions (for how long can the person stay there?).

II. What shelter?

Establishing a classification of the physical types of shelter runs up against two difficulties. The first is *exhaustivity*, since it is hard to imagine all the places, visible and hidden, and in both urban and rural settings, which could serve as shelter or offer basic protection. The second is that of *rational organization*, since an inventory that makes use of sometimes unfamiliar categories is to form the basis for a classificatory framework into which

investigators and data managers must be able to incorporate their observations without difficulty.

As regards exhaustivity, the statistician can turn for help to those active on the ground—the social services and voluntary sector agencies—but also to the trials, pilots, and non-directional interviews, which have revealed the situations classed under the “other cases” heading to be less marginal than was thought. Concerning the classification, there is a strong temptation to construct this by descending order of comfort, or rather by ascending order of insalubrity—with the house at one end, the place under a bridge at the other, and between them the cellar, the hut, the entrance halls to blocks of flats, and the abandoned industrial site. The divisions are drawn between open and closed (open to the weather, open to other people, open to the “legal” owner), between private and public, between individual and collective. A choice also has to be made between comprehension and extension, between category headings and lists.

A definition in terms of shared characteristics is necessary for making international and inter-regional comparisons, or simply for achieving a descriptive coverage that encompasses both town and country, centre and periphery, small and large settlements. Clearly no single list could ever provide a sufficiently detailed description of housing contexts as diverse as the slums of Naples, the *chambres de bonne* (attic rooms) of Haussmann’s Paris, the shanty towns outside Lisbon, and London’s bed and breakfast hotels (Murie and Jeffers, 1987). The first level of the classification² is thus based on definitions that are sometimes abstract and hard to use in unmodified form in a questionnaire, but that are sufficiently precise for every actual situation to be classified unambiguously.

Let us examine them in more detail. The first five general headings describe so-called “ordinary” housing, corresponding to the cases where an individual household occupies premises intended for permanent habitation. Categories 1, 2, and 3 concern fully “independent” dwellings usually of several rooms, whereas categories 4 and 5 are single-room dwellings that are either part of another dwelling (category 5: attic rooms, converted garages, garden sheds and outhouses) or in a building composed entirely of such accommodation (category 4: hotels, furnished rooms). The next two categories group together the institutional providers of accommodation, distinguishing between those whose vocation is accommodation (category 6: shelters, supervised flats, long-stay hostels) and those that provide temporary accommodation for specific reasons linked to people’s health or professional situation (category 7: hospitals, barracks, prisons, school boarding facilities, communities, and so forth). Next come the last types of dwellings that are actually intended for habitation, namely mobile homes. People who for reasons of work or lifestyle chose a mobile home as their principal residence are classified separately from those who, for lack of anything else, have as their only home something that was designed to be mobile, by putting the dwellings that are “actually mobile” in category 8, while the other homes originally intended to be temporary are grouped in category 9.

The four final headings of the classification are reserved for “makeshift” forms of housing, i.e. not intended for human habitation, even on a temporary basis. An initial distinction was made between “private spaces” and “public spaces” by isolating in category 13 the places that are entirely open and provide no security, privacy or protection. Among the “private” places—i.e. at least out of public view—a further distinction was made between those that offer a relative security (so that personal belongings can be left from one night to the next) and those that do not (category 12). Finally, the “secure” accommodation was in turn divided

² See Appendix 1 “Classification of habitat types”.

between private accommodation (category 10) and collective accommodation (category 11) depending on whether or not it was particular to the household.

These categories can be filled up with examples drawn from the particular geographical context under consideration, and sub-categories can be constructed that are in fact closer to a list-based definition. A second level is proposed here, which can be said to correspond to present-day conditions in urban France.

It is not always enough to know the housing type in order to judge its quality, especially in the case of flats and houses. There is a strong chance of classifying as correctly housed a household whose dwelling is run down, uncomfortable or overcrowded. In response to this problem, the system of classification was expanded to include housing quality³. This information—derived from criteria which though arbitrary are consistent with what can be considered a minimum standard of amenities or habitability⁴—is used to identify bad housing conditions, resulting perhaps from an inability to find anything better or to pay for improvements. A sub-standard dwelling is often the alternative to housing insecurity, although in extreme situations the two may go together (Clanché, 1995).

III. What rights?

Less innovation is required for the description of occupancy status. The existing administrative classifications used by the statistical system to describe “ordinary” situations provide a reference base that can handle most “marginal” situations. Thus in the case of France we can distinguish among subtenants those who are housed by voluntary organizations, among tenants those who are in transferable tenancies, and among people being “lodged” those who are sharing (“doubled up”) with family or friends or living in social or voluntary sector accommodation. Within the “hostels” category we distinguish in particular those that come under the regime of the CHRS (state-funded long-stay hostels).

The first main categories⁵ (owner-occupier, tenant of an unfurnished dwelling, tenant of a furnished dwelling, housed for free, sharing someone else’s home, subtenant of an individual) can be used for international comparisons with few difficulties. A distinction needs to be made simply between the household that is “housed for free” and has an individual dwelling to itself, usually loaned by a relative, friend or employer who does not live in the dwelling, and on the other hand the household that is sharing someone else’s home and hence is not the legal occupant.

Going beyond this general level and looking at the less common forms of occupancy, the work of classification is soon seen to be highly sensitive to the legislative measures that shape the diversity of statutes and the norms of observation. Disregarding the multitude of specific measures and marginal statutes specially created for the most disadvantaged, the central concept of “social housing” is itself resistant to any convenient and straightforward cross-national comparison, the variety of state intervention in the housing market being matched only by its international diversity. The main instruments of housing policy, however, are everywhere of two main kinds. One is help towards the cost of construction (either directly to owner-occupiers, on a means-tested basis, or to future landlords, in return for an undertaking on the conditions of tenant selection and occupancy). The other is help with the housing costs

³ See Appendix 3 “Criteria for assessing the quality of housing”.

⁴ According to the norms prevailing in the present-day industrialized countries.

⁵ See Appendix 2 “Classification of occupancy statutes”.

of households, either as tenants paying rent or as owner-occupiers making loan repayments. The situation in France is described by the following table:

	Assistance with construction costs	Assistance with housing costs
Tenants	HLM system (loans to social housing agencies)	Personal housing support, tenants (AL*, APL*)
Owner-occupiers	Subsidized loans to households (PAS*, interest-free loans)	Personal housing support, owner-occupiers (AL*, APL*)
* AL = Allocation de logement (Housing allowance); APL = Aide personnalisée au logement (Housing benefit); PAS = Prêts à l'accession sociale (state loan to new owner-occupiers)		

The first two headings of the occupancy status classification (owner-occupiers and tenants) cover these types of state housing subsidies, whatever their exact details and relative levels, which vary greatly across countries.

Turning to the other measures targeted at specific populations,⁶ the beneficiaries can be classified in the first two sub-categories of the category “Resident, sub-tenant or housed in accommodation run by the state or by a charitable, voluntary, religious or other organization”. The first sub-category, which in France is devoted to the CHRS (state-funded long-stay hostels), includes all the systems of public funding devoted to accommodation and social support for highly vulnerable populations. The second sub-category brings together all the accommodation providers (except those in the previous sub-category) whatever their legal status and client profile. This grouping is therefore not limited either to state-funded establishments or to those intended specifically for the most destitute. Combining very disparate situations in a single category may conflict with the desire to isolate segments that are important to measure in their own right, or with the need to distinguish clearly certain situations that are similar in definition but very different in concrete significance. These categories are highly sensitive to specificities of the legal framework and of the forms of voluntary organization that vary from place to place and over time. In addition, confusion can easily occur, even in the minds of the households actually involved, between situations that are very similar, as for example, subletting a bed-sit from a voluntary association that is itself renting from an HLM (social housing) agency, and temporary paid accommodation provided by the same voluntary association in a flat loaned to it by a local authority.

The eighth heading brings together under the label “other non-legal occupants” the informal or illegal statutes not covered by the previous headings. These range from the squat that is unknown to the legal owner, to the occupancy that is paid but “under the table”, as well as the occupancy that continues while waiting for eviction. Included therefore are the informal housing sector, which is particularly large in Italy, but also the highly publicized operations to take over vacant dwellings in France. The subdivision between situations that have the owner’s agreement and the others corresponds partly to this difference between an informal but potentially lasting relationship and a situation that is much more uncertain and insecure.

⁶ In France, in addition to these main types of financing arrangements (which benefit a large proportion of the population, including the middle classes), there are specific measures designed for the most destitute, in particular the funding of the CHRS (Centres d’hébergement et de réadaptation sociale—long-stay hostels run by public or voluntary agencies with state-funding).

IV. For how long?

The question of the duration of the housing situation is addressed by the “stability/insecurity” classification. This is much more experimental in nature, being completely new and not based on any statistical experience. It attempts to graduate the *continuum* that runs from the owner-occupier or tenant who is “problem free” (i.e. not threatened by eviction for unpaid rent, loan repayments or household bills, or threatened by demolition for insalubrity), through to the person who has to look for somewhere different to sleep each night. This new classification⁷ is of course related to the first two, and knowing someone’s position in those often enables them to be located in the fourth.

Some fundamental characteristics, however, such as the risk of eviction, the type of contract—usually tacit—with the landlord or person providing the accommodation, the hostel rules, whether or not the attic door has a padlock, provide a basis for making distinctions not captured by the conventional classificatory schemes. It is important to bear in mind that the life of a homeless person is made up of heterogeneous sequences—weeks when they receive the RMI (Minimum Social Insertion Income), weeks when they do not; periods of cold weather, periods of warm weather; periods of strong police control and periods of being left alone; episodes of solidarity and phases of solitude. An appreciation of the situation at any one time is thus inadequate for understanding a person’s existence over a year, a month or even a week. Whether determined by housing duration or occupancy status, the “security” criterion represents a distinction that is fundamental for the homeless population.

A distinction also needs to be made between the statute of the individual and that of the household. The owner’s partner who has no claim on the dwelling in the case of separation, or the lawful tenant’s son who may not be allowed to stay on in the case of death, are thus classified as “having a dwelling or accommodation for a period of apparently longer than one year but without security”. Studies of incomes and living standards have long had to contend with this problem of the difference between individual and household, and it is especially critical when dealing with isolated individuals, unstable households, and with complex housing and accommodation situations where the inhabitants of the dwelling do not form a single economic unit. Someone living in another person’s home can make very little claim on that person’s income; and is not directly “covered” by his or her tenancy agreement or ownership rights. The stability/insecurity dimension is therefore essential, since it alone takes into account the personal situation of individuals relative to their housing, the situation of their household relative to this housing, and their own situation relative to their household. Depending on how it is employed, the classification of statutes can apply at two levels: the individual or the household.

V. Using the classifications

These classifications were originally conceived with twin aims. First, to define categories in sufficient detail for the collection of relevant statistical data in a field where both quantitative information and even broadly accepted concepts were lacking. Second, to provide an

⁷ See Appendix 4 “Classification of stability/insecurity”.

operational tool for assessing individual situations (see Box 1) that was suitable for use by the actors, public and private, statutory and voluntary, working with the homeless.

Given their length and the abstract nature of some of their definitions, the classifications are not suitable for direct completion by non-specialists. They certainly cannot be used in unmodified form as questionnaire answer categories. A short questionnaire was therefore produced in which a limited number of questions were asked in order to situate each person (or each household) in each of the four classifications. The principle involved asking the household to describe the place (in a physical sense) where it had spent the previous night, then to describe its “legal” connection with this place, and finally to assess its degree of stability in relation to the place. The type of population involved led to the construction of simple questions with non-technical answer categories, and multiple filters were used so as to limit the number of questions to the absolute necessary. In all, twenty-five questions were designed to locate all situations in the four classifications, but no situation required more than ten questions. This questionnaire was several times tested and underwent successive improvements (see Box 2).

Box 2

Testing the questionnaires

The quality of the short questionnaire produced from the classifications and its capacity to situate individuals correctly in the classifications were assessed in two series of trials carried out by INED. Between October 1995 and January 1996, 120 individuals were interviewed by a team of investigators led by Pascal Arduin, thanks to funding from the Solidarity Mission of the French National Railway Company (SNCF).

Because the purpose of these operations was to test methodology and not to produce a statistical measurement, sample construction aimed not at representativity but at maximizing coverage of “rare” situations. To help in this, sampling frames derived from the census were used to survey households living in social housing, hotels, furnished accommodation, makeshift shelter and temporary or substandard housing. Thanks to partnership with voluntary associations working in the field of housing for the most vulnerable, we obtained access to addresses of transferable tenancies, flats in the non-HLM social housing sector, dwellings that had been requisitioned, and emergency shelters. Interviewers also made contact with individuals in service sites for the homeless (day drop-in centres, clothes distributions) or directly with the sellers of street newspapers.

The knowledge of some of those involved concerning the real occupancy status of surveyed households and the regular meetings to review work in progress with the investigators allowed us to measure the questionnaire’s capacity to capture correctly the situation of households, and thus improve the classifications according to the situations observed in the field.

The findings from these trials were used in the INED survey on young homeless people (1998) and in preparation of the national homeless survey conducted by INSEE in early 2001.

To measure the degrees of housing stability/insecurity of individuals (or households), respondents are asked, depending on the legal situation, questions on the lines of: “Are you having difficulty paying your rent, housing costs, financial contribution, or keeping up your

loan repayments?”, or “Do you sleep in this place: every day? nearly every day? once or twice a week? Less than once a week?” or “For how long do you expect to be able to stay in this housing or place: As long as you want? A year or more? Between six months and one year? Between a month and six months? Between a week and one month? Less than a week?”. Testing was used to prove the relevance of these questions and their potential for distinguishing different levels of insecurity within the same legal situation.

The classifications thus conceived satisfy the requirements fixed by the CNIS working group. They do not delimit an arbitrary “homeless” category but provide the means for constructing this category on the basis of actual housing situations. In this sense, the imperative of not creating a “statistical ghetto” provides a double guarantee—an ethical one, by not singling out *a priori* a population that is already deeply stigmatized. Second, that of not violating statistical epistemology, by securing the best possible match between the research problematic on the “homeless” and the object as given form by the surveys.

References

CLANCHE F., 1995, “Le confort des logements dessine aussi l’espace social”, INSEE, *Economie et Statistique*, n°288-289, 91-114.

MURIE A., JEFFERS S., 1987, *Living in Bed and Breakfast : The Experience of Homeless in London*, Bristol, SAUS.

Cnis 1996, “Pour une meilleure connaissance des sans-abri et de l’exclusion du logement”, report, n°29, March.

Appendix 1. **Classification of housing types**

1. Individual dwelling

1. agricultural (dwelling part of farm buildings)
2. non-agricultural

2. In a block of flats

1. block with fewer than 5 dwellings
2. block with 5-9 dwellings
3. block with 10 or more dwellings

3. In a building whose function is not housing

(for example, caretaker's flat in factory or sports ground, housing attached to schools, stations, hospitals)

4. Hotel accommodation

1. tourist sector hotel
2. rooming hotel

5. Independent room with its own entrance

(e.g. former maid's room; converted garage, outhouse or shed in garden: room part of an ordinary dwelling but self-contained)

6. Hostel or shelter

1. hostel dwelling (independent living collectively run) or social residence
2. collective hostel (collective living) on permanent basis. (e.g. hostel for the disabled or infirm.)
3. temporary shelter open all the year
4. seasonal shelter

7. Other institutional accommodation

1. hospital or nursing institution
2. prison
3. barracks
4. religious institution
5. boarding schools, halls of residence

8. Mobile dwellings that are actually mobile (gypsies, sailors ...)

Caravans, houseboats, motor-home, camping car)

9. Personal dwellings that are temporary or intended to be

1. caravan or houseboat (fixed position), site hut
2. individual (single household) mobile-home, unable to move unaided
3. collective (several households) mobile-home, unable to move unaided.

10. Individual makeshift shelter where personal effects can be stored (the shelter is particular to the person or to their household)

1. cellar, garage, attic, shed (or any more or less lockable place, permanent structure)
2. car, trailer, boat (but not houseboat cabin or caravan)
3. factory, office, warehouse, farmbuilding or disused non-residential building
4. derelict building, building site, cave, tent

11. Collective makeshift shelter where personal effects can be stored (shelter shared with other households)

1. cellar, garage, attic, shed (or any more or less lockable place, permanent structure)
2. car, trailer, boat (houseboat cabin or caravan excluded)
3. factory, office, warehouse, farmbuilding or disused non-residential building
4. derelict building, building site, cave, tent (not closed place)

12. Makeshift shelter with no possibility of storing personal effects

1. cellar, garage, attic, shed (or any more or less lockable place, permanent structure)
2. car, trailer, boat (but not houseboat cabin or caravan)
3. collective parts of a building (corridor, staircase, landing)
4. factory, office, warehouse, farmbuilding, disused non-residential building
5. factory, office, warehouse, farmbuilding, non-residential building in daytime use
6. derelict building, building site, cave, tent (not closed place)

13. Use of public places

1. Métro, corridors of shopping centre, public building
2. street, bridge, park, railway

Appendix 2 Classification of occupancy status

1. Owner-occupier

1. making loan repayments
 - receiving state aid
 - not receiving state aid
2. not making loan repayments

2. Tenant of unfurnished accommodation

1. HLM social housing agency
2. social housing not HLM
3. private landlord

3. Tenant of furnished accommodation

1. tourist sector hotel
2. rooming hotel
3. furnished flat

4. Housed without charge (with a dwelling for the individual or their household)

1. provided by employer
2. agricultural accommodation
3. provided by family or friends
4. provided by an institution, voluntary organization or other establishment

5. Housed by a private individual (the household that occupies the dwelling)

1. person housing them is a family member
2. person housing them is a friend

6. Sub-letting furnished or unfurnished accommodation from a private individual

(sub-tenant has a legal tenancy agreement)

7. Resident, sub-tenant or housed in accommodation run by the state or by a charitable, voluntary, religious or other organization

1. accommodation subject to CHRS (Centre for Shelter and Social Readaptation) legislation

- in return for payment or work
- without charge

2. hostel (including emergency shelter), hostel housing (young or immigrant workers, disabled, elderly) or social residence, regardless of legal status (except CHRS)

- in return for payment or work
- without charge

3. voluntary organization whose principal activity is not housing

- in return for payment or work
- without charge

4. other structure whose principal activity is not housing (voluntary organizations excluded)

- in return for payment or work
- without charge

8. Other non-legal occupant

1. with agreement of owner (undeclared, evicted but staying on in dwelling)
2. without agreement of owner

9. Homeless

1. with an address where can receive mail
2. without an address

Appendix 3. Criteria for evaluating housing quality

- Have you running water in your housing or, if not, access to a water supply?
- Are there indoor toilets?
- Is there a shower or bath inside your housing?
- How many rooms does your housing have (not counting the kitchen if less than 12m², bathroom, corridors)?
- How many people live there?
- In the last twelve months, has your housing had any problems with damp (ingress, leaks, flooding)?

Appendix 4. Classification of stability/insecurity

- 1. Owner-occupier, tenant, sub-tenant, or housed without charge and at no clear risk of having to move out in less than a year**
- 2. Owner-occupier, tenant, sub-tenant, or housed without charge but at risk of having to move out in less than a year**
- 3. Has a dwelling or shelter for a period apparently longer than one year but with no security**
- 4. Has a dwelling or shelter for between 6 months and one year**
- 5. Has a dwelling or shelter for between 1 and 6 months**
- 6. Has no housing security beyond 1 week**
- 7. Has no security but usually sleeps in the same place**
- 8. Has no security and no regular sleeping place**