12-1991

The stabilizing roles of the homeless

Michael Séan Mills

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Michael Séan Mills entitled "The stabilizing roles of the homeless." I have examined the final electronic copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Sociology.

Suzanne B. Kurth, Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

Chip Hastings, Roger Nooe

Accepted for the Council:
Carolyn R. Hodges

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Michael Séan Mills entitled "The Stabilizing Roles of the Homeless." I have examined the final copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Sociology.

Suzanne B. Kurth

Suzanne B. Kurth, Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Donald W. Hastings

Lynn M. Rose

Accepted for the Council:

Lew Minkel

Associate Vice Chancellor
and Dean of The Graduate School

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master's degree at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library. Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of the source is made.

Permission for extensive quotation from or reproduction of this thesis may be granted by my major professor, or in her absence, by the head of Interlibrary Services when, in the opinion of either, the proposed use of the material is for scholarly purposes. Any copying or use of the material in this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature Michael Sean Mills

Date November 21, 1991

The Stabilizing Roles of the Homeless

A Thesis
Presented for the
Master of Arts
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Michael Séan Mills
December 1991

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

First and foremost I want to thank my God for seeing me through to the completion of this undertaking. He sustained me and provided strength when I had none of my own. He renewed my strength by exchanging it with His. He enabled me by showing me new thoughts and abilities, and He shaped me by using the talents of other special people.

Three of those special people have been an important part of this project. I would like to thank my wife Denise and my children Séan and Bryana; without them this project would not have been worth doing. We have been changed in a positive way as we have endured the process of earning a Masters Degree. Many sacrifices were made that have drawn us closer as a family. I am grateful for their willingness to sacrifice.

Another special person I would like to thank is my major professor, Dr. Suzanne Kurth. She provided critical insights and comments, without which this thesis would not have been possible. I am thankful for her many hours of hard work as she continued to direct my steps in a forward direction always with my welfare in mind, danke schon!!

I would also like to thank the members of my committee, Chip Hastings for his editing abilities, and Dr. Roger Nooe for the use of his data and expertise. I would especially like to thank them for their helpful comments.

ABSTRACT

This research examined whether differences exist among homeless people in their connectedness to society as reflected in their role involvements. Many researchers use typologies to identify homeless people. None of the typologies directly examined the social connectedness of these people.

Interviewers questioned forty-five homeless people from Knoxville shelters, and four people who were located on the streets in May 1988. Specific questions that centered on the symbolic interactionist perspective were extracted from the original interview schedule. The responses to these questions were cross-tabulated and chi-square was used. The analysis of the data reported many relationships among the variables.

The thesis concluded that females and black males who claimed familial roles were more connected to society and had not been on the streets long. An examination of the role involvements of homeless people may have substantive value for homeless care providers and policy makers because it may assist them in identifying effective solutions.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

"Homeless" is an umbrella term which groups diverse underprivileged people under one social label. These people face multiple problems. Their individual problems are often reflective of the more macro problems of society: lack of affordable housing, unemployment and underemployment, deinstitutionalization of the mentally ill, abuse of drugs and alcohol, and violence in families.

These problems often cannot be separated at the societal or individual levels. Substance abuse can lead to unemployment and family violence or mental illness can lead to unemployment. If these problems are the spokes of the wheel of homelessness, then poverty is the hub.

The importance of social involvement is established in chapter two with the review of the symbolic interactionist framework. Key concepts from the interactionist framework are self, role, and role-identity. This framework emphasizes social involvements and social processes. Attribution is a compatible social psychological theory which through its focus on assignment of external or internal causality directs attention to the types of explanations the homeless and society offer for homelessness.

Chapter three identifies and critiques the typologies of the homeless. Popular images of the homeless often are very negative, but the homeless do not all fit the

stereotypical image of the bowery or skid row inhabitant. Some types of people who were not often found on the streets began appearing more frequently leading some researchers to talk about the "new" homeless (Lee 1989). In the 1980s the "new" homeless were presented as different from the "old" homeless; they were younger, more likely to have friends, and more temporary victims of circumstance than substance abusers who had contributed to their own downfall. Profiles of the "old" and "new" homeless are presented.

Chapter four presents the properties of a sample of Knoxville homeless interviewed in 1988. The variables selected for analysis are described and data analysis procedures are addressed.

Chapter five distinguishes the respondents by key demographic characteristics gender, race, and age which are associated with differences in role involvements (friendships, family relations, work). Also examined were whether people had served time in jail, experienced alcohol problems, or chosen the lifestyle.

Chapter six concludes by advocating a more role involvement based differentiation of the homeless to explain the "new" and "old" homeless dichotomy. Focusing on differences in role involvement may help care providers and policy makers. Research limitations are discussed: the small size of the sample, the representativeness of the sample, and the lack of attention to the role of mental illnesses. The section on future research discusses the potential value of reporting and analyzing homeless data separately by type of shelter.

This research is exploratory and suggests that homeless people may range on a continuum with stable and unstable as the end points. "Stable" and "unstable" refer to lifestyles (not psychological states) that reflect length of time on the street and the likelihood of leaving the street. The "stable" maintain to some extent mainstream social roles; the unstable homeless are those involved in the stereotypical "deviant" lifestyle.

CHAPTER TWO

THEORY

Historical Overview: Symbolic Interaction

The symbolic interaction perspective is the general theoretical framework used for this research into the roles of the homeless. A historical review of symbolic interactionist thought is presented, noting some of the major contributors, and the concepts they developed. Following the review, a contemporary view of symbolic interaction is presented. The theoretical concepts of self, role, and role-identity have been used by other researchers to study the homeless. These concepts will be utilized to examine the role involvements of homeless people.

William James

The self was classified into three components by William James, two of which are of contemporary importance, the material self and the social self. The material self incorporates physical items that are important to the person's identity. These items include all that a person can call his or her own. The social self includes the self-feelings and recognition that people gain through interaction. The person has multiple social selves generated through interaction with others. So

compartmentalized are these selves that only certain people will recognize facets of the portrayed social self. Other people are key to the actor's evaluation of self. The thought of being unworthy of attention, or remaining unnoticed by members of society is the worst punishment which can be inflicted on another person. This treatment may culminate in rage and deep despair for the individual (James 1892).

Charles Horton Cooley

The idea that the self emerges through interaction was elaborated by Charles Horton Cooley. The concept of the looking glass self, developed by Cooley, refers to the process of interpreting the meaning of others' gesture for one's self. This process involves self-reflection: thoughts of how other views our appearance; thoughts of the other's judgment of our appearance; and the self-feelings generated from this imagined other's judgments. Thus, others' gestures generate the images that people use to evaluate their selves (Cooley 1902).

The importance of others to a person's development was emphasized in his arguments about the development of human nature. The primary group, best represented by the family, was the nursery of human nature. The primary group shapes the feelings and attitudes about the self. Primary groups have few members and those members have strong emotional ties resulting from their frequent face-to-face interaction (Cooley 1902).

George Herbert Mead

George Herbert Mead synthesized the works of his predecessors, James (1902) and Dewey (1930). Mead asserted that the mind is a process rather than a structure. People are conscious beings, able to think and communicate with others of their kind. The mind gives them the ability to think reflexively allowing them to take action.

Humans adjust to their life conditions by learning the behavioral patterns which reward them intrinsically and extrinsically. During interaction humans take the role of the other. Role-taking is based on human's abilities to create and use shared symbols (Mead 1934). With role taking they can anticipate the other's response and modify their behavior accordingly.

Mead following James argues that the self emerges from the social experience. Children have to gain this experience, and they do that by imitating, or as Mead says "role-taking." Younger children when left to entertain themselves may take the part of someone else. The acting out of a role develops in the child an opportunity to check out his or her "own responses to these stimuli which he makes use of in building a self" (1934, p. 150).

Self development. In the play stage children might pretend that they are police officers; they can pretend to be mothers scolding themselves for getting into makeup after applying it to their faces.

The game stage is next in Mead's development of self theory. The game stage is different from the play stage in that it requires the understanding of multiple roles

and the rules of the game, the generalized other. At this stage Mead thought that a child's self was developed enough to consider multiple perspectives in his or her thinking.

Generalized other. The "generalized other" is the abstract community, the governing rules, the laws, which influences people. For example, children must learn to take on the role of each position involved with the game of Little League baseball. If a child assumes the role of pitcher, he or she must also be aware of the first baseman's role, the catcher's role, the batter's role, and so on (Hewitt 1979). Children must organize the different relationships of others to themselves. The mental organization is in the form of rules. In the game stage children learn how to take the perspective of the generalized other. (As symbolic interactionism has developed, theorists argue that the individual may have more than one generalized other, although not more than a few.)

Lines of Action

People take on the attitude of the group to which they belong, bringing elements of the group into their field of experiences. Once the norms of the group are internalized by actors these norms will guide their lines of action. The group could be a political group, a church group, or any social group (Mead 1934).

People are unique in that they can refer to themselves about themselves. They are rational, able to judge events or even their own actions. Humans rehearse lines

of action toward objects in their environment. After an "imaginative rehearsal," they have the ability to select what they perceive to be the most appropriate action (Mead 1934).

People interact with their environments by pursuing lines of action based on their symbolic interpretations. For example, as people walk they may observe aluminum cans on the sidewalk, by the road, or in trash cans. Most environmentally inactive people who happen upon these cans would interpret these symbols as trash. Homeless people may assign these objects other symbolic value. These cans are "money" for homeless people who pursue the line of action of picking them up and taking them to a recycling center for cash.

Contemporary Symbolic Interactionism

Definition of the Situation

Sociologists investigate the social reality that people create as these people define their situations. People do not simply react to the stimuli they receive from their environment. They assign these stimuli meanings and formulate lines of action based on these meanings. The term "definition of the situation" is credited to W. I. Thomas based on his statement, "define situations as real, they are real in their consequences" (Thomas and Thomas 1928, p. 572). The meanings people assign to their situation, and the lines of action they choose shape the outcomes they experience.

For people to interact they must agree on a common definition of their situation. Once these meanings are agreed on by actors in a situation, they can act on their definitions. For example, actors may enter a room filled with desks facing toward the front. Actors may define this room as a classroom. If the same room were filled with pews and had an altar in front, actors might perceive this room as a chapel. Definitions of situations organize social interactions.

A person may exhibit different social selves depending on the situation. Graduate students may see themselves as very knowledgeable instructors, and they might be very self-confident and have high self-esteem in a teaching role. Yet, they might exhibit low confidence when they are in a student role. Depending on how the situation is defined graduate students have different images of their "self," and different evaluations of their "self."

A homeless person might encounter another person coming toward him or her in a car, late at night. This situation might be defined as one in which the other may be a potential ride until another symbol is defined--the car is a police car. Definitions of the other as a police officer leads to redefinition of the situation and most likely pursuit of a different line of action.

Roles

Role originally was a theatrical term describing a parchment wrapped around a wooden scroll which contains various parts to be acted out. Role now is

a "metaphor intended to denote that conduct adheres to certain "parts" (or positions) rather than to the players who read or recite them" (Sarbin and Allen 1968, p. 489). Various social scientists have elaborated on the concept of role. Some emphasize the importance of structure; others, particularly symbolic interactionists, perceive roles as more negotiable.

Linton (1945) had a structural view of roles. He argued that every status (position) has an associated role. Status is a place in the social system that a person occupies. Roles are the expectations associated with being an occupant of a status or position. Occupants of positions are expected to meet normative expectations associated with them (role expectations) (Sarbin and Allen 1968). There are two forms of expectations: obligations--what the role player should do, and rights--what the role partner should do. These expectations simplify and organize interactions between actors making behaviors to some degree predictable. Consistency in role performance among actors allows social order to be maintained.

Symbolic interactionists have a more emergent view of role related behavior. They believe that a "mechanistic conformity to a role script is observed only in unusual circumstances, as in fairly tightly structured organizations in which roles in this sense are formally defined" (McCall and Simmons 1966, p. 7). All roles do not have specific scripts. People in unstructured situations construct roles and role expectations through role improvisation and negotiation (McCall and Simmons 1966; Stryker 1987).

When negotiating a role actors assess significant cues, define them, and select appropriate behaviors to facilitate the interaction. An actor will "use role-taking to put himself in the place of other and to deduce, among other things, what other's expectations are" (Heiss 1981, p. 116). People learn through interaction the behaviors others will tolerate during role performances. As a father reflects on the meaning of his role and interacts with role partners, he negotiates the role of father.

Roles can be formal or informal. Formal roles are father, mother, and teacher, while informal roles are looser social categories such as, hard worker, good provider, good citizen, and mission tramp. Social categories are not formally recognized statuses, yet may have associated behavioral expectations (Heiss 1981).

Role-identity

Identities are established by the process of naming and locating the self in socially recognizable categories. Using a name for oneself establishes a frame of reference from which the person can interact with others in the social world. As humans negotiate definitions of situations, they project cues about their identities. Identities (or social selves) become the major objects that humans include in their definitions of situations.

Role-identities are the role based conceptions that people have of themselves as they imagine themselves performing a particular role. A person's identity as father, including all of the person's role related idiosyncrasies, is referred to as a

role-identity (Burke and Reitzes 1981; McCall 1987; McCall and Simmons 1966; Stryker 1968).

Role-identities are in need of social support and legitimization. At times there is a tension between the identity one is trying to present and what others perceive is the reality. For example, those labeled homeless may say, "this is not the real me, I work for a living." People look for opportunities to confirm their role-identities.

The self encompasses these role-identities. The idea of a hierarchy of multiple selves was established by James (1892). Other researchers recognized that role-identities are organized in a hierarchy of salience (Stryker 1968; McCall and Simmons 1966). The hierarchy of salience or situational self is shaped by the situation. Role-identities are selected, and even reranked, according to the situation. For example, a person on the streets may enact the role of good citizen in the presence of a police officer.

In contrast the hierarchy of prominence or ideal self is more stable. The prominence of any role-identity depends on many factors, for example, the level of commitment to an identity. Role-identities which are most rewarding receive greater prominence (McCall and Simmons 1966).

The homeless are confronted with the problem of constructing and maintaining positive self images. They often cannot effectively manage the impressions members of mainstream society have of them. Their interactions with

the non-homeless frequently result in stigmatization, assignment of spoiled identities (Snow and Anderson 1987). Some homeless may have prominent role-identities not supported on the street which if activated and supported might lead to changes which would help them leave the streets.

Attribution Theory

Attribution theory developed by psychological social psychologists is compatible with the sociologists' symbolic interaction framework. An assumption of attribution theory is that people are rational problem solvers. Individuals make common-sense, cause and effect explanations of human behaviors. Heider (1958) defines these processes of understanding as naive psychology. He believed that people are lay scientists observing and analyzing events to ascertain the causes of behaviors much like scientists do using experimental methods. People engage in these attribution processes to shape and simplify their environments, so they might control them, and possibly, predict behaviors (Jones 1972; Kelley 1972; Rotter 1966; Crittenden 1983; Palenzuela 1984; Harré and Lamb 1986).

Attribution theorists emphasize people's perceptions of their environment. Once they are aware of their own perceptions, actors perceive why others are doing what they are doing.

Kelley (1973) explains how actors make attributions through covariation. Covariation is based on the amount of information available to the actor.

Observing another over a span of time affords the actor information from which to base his or her perceived attributions. For example, if a group of homeless people, with occasional access to different houses, noticed that one person always decided to sleep outside, then they likely would attribute this behavior to the person rather than the situation.

Attribution and Symbolic Interaction

The attribution and the symbolic interactionist approaches do not disagree, they merely are focused on different aspects of the same social processes reflecting their roots in psychology and sociology, respectively. Symbolic interactionism and attribution theory share a common belief that people pursue subjective understanding of the environment (Stryker and Gottlieb 1981; Hewstone 1983). From a symbolic interactionist approach actors must take others into account when interpreting and modifying their behaviors. Others are involved in the formation and maintenance of identities, and roles are negotiated (Meltzer, Bernard, Petras, and Reynolds 1975; Hamilton 1978).

Some researchers have posed the idea that attribution theory and symbolic interaction can be merged by focusing on expectations (Turner 1978; Kelley 1972). A normative view of roles says that actors manifest rules of their society through their behaviors. The expectations for roles become internalized by the actor. Attributions can be perceived by studying the actor's standards of accountability

within the normative context of social roles (Hamilton 1978). Actors who perform contrary to the expectations of a role are judged as having more dispositional attributions than those who conform to a role (Jones, Davis, and Gergen 1961).

Problematic Roles

The symbolic interactionist perspective proposes that people have the ability to engage in reflexive behavior, interpret meanings from other actors, and acquire social selves or identities through interaction. Symbolic interaction is a useful theory for this research because it centers on the ideas that others are involved in the formation and maintenance of identities, and that roles are negotiated. The theory chapter suggested the importance of social roles and involvement with other people to "normal" social life. The connections people have with others, through roles, anchor them to their society. Connections with others are vital for the legitimization of the role-identities which people have and if supported may help to return the homeless to mainstream society.

This research posits that there is not a single homeless role with specific role expectations (obligations and rights). All homeless people do not share the same statuses (positions). Many people are on the streets for varying reasons and lengths of time. Rather than a homeless role, this researcher suggests that people who are on the streets for a number of years enact looser social categories (e.g. mission tramp)

associated with their statuses. They may be involved in many roles which may be of more importance to them (e.g., alcoholic and panhandler).

Self, roles, and role-identities are important for this research because examining these concepts gives the researcher a framework from which to examine how connected homeless people are to their society. When positions and roles are lost or inactive, daily lives may lose structure. The symbolic interactionist approach may be useful when analyzing "problematic roles" of the homeless.

Problematic roles emerge when unexpected, rapid, and perhaps undesired changes occur in one's life. When actors lack sufficient role knowledge and ability to successfully maintain a role, or the role is inadequately defined, then the role is problematic (Heiss 1981). The generic term homeless is a problematic or role-less role because even though it is associated with a status, the expectations for behavior are unclear. Inactive roles, such as breadwinner, are problematic also.

Three strategies for handling problematic roles are: temporary withdrawal, redefinition of the situation, and trial and error responses (Heiss 1981). A temporary withdrawal from a role performance would be effective if the actor could return to the role more competent.

People on the streets may use the strategy of redefining their situation in order to cope with initial stages of homelessness. Redefining the situation allows the actor to use an identity for which he or she has more role knowledge even if it is based on a less valued role (Heiss 1981).

If the strategy is not successful, then the actor cannot negotiate with other on the alternative role. If the actor cannot negotiate another role, he or she must endure the situation and suffer the negative responses from others for inadequate role playing (Heiss 1981). Actors may attempt to reduce the negative consequences for their identities by defining the situation as meaningless or unimportant.

In the trial and error strategy actors try various roles which may have been performed in other situations. Actors may not know which roles to try. Failing to select appropriate roles may be costly to them.

Those who are homeless may vary considerably in how involved they are in maintaining conventional roles, efforts to keep them "unproblematic" and how permanent their withdrawal is from such roles. Also, they probably vary in the extent to which they identify themselves as homeless and enact behaviors which they believe are appropriate for a homeless person. Some homeless people may be involved in social roles; they may act "normal." Others may be uninvolved in social roles; they may behave according to the expectations connected with a "deviant" lifestyle.

CHAPTER THREE

LITERATURE REVIEW

Curiosity in the perceived differences in the role involvements among homeless people led to the review of the literature. This research topic emerged after reading some of the classics, and the homeless literature. Attitudes are briefly mentioned because typologies of the homeless to some extent are based on attitudes about the homeless. This chapter presents the many typologies researchers have established to categorize the homeless, including the recent old/new dichotomy.

Attitudes Toward the Homeless

The American Dream suggests everyone can succeed if only they work hard enough. Conversely, there is a tendency to blame those who do not succeed for "their failures." According to a poverty theorist, Nilson (1981), such a belief system is individualistic rather than structural. Those who do not succeed feel like they should have been in control of their own destinies and blame themselves for their failures, not society (Ryan 1971; Hope and Young 1986).

In American society among various population groups and in some time periods, a structuralist view of poverty dominated. The structuralist approach holds society accountable for the problems of the poor and for providing solutions (Nilson

1981). The structuralist view was reflected in recent public opinion studies in which people attributed the homeless problem to factors such as: shortages in low-cost housing, changes in the economy, and other factors outside of the individual's control (Lee, Jones, and Lewis 1990).

People may not consistently hold an individualist or structuralist view, they may hold them alternately or to some extent simultaneously (Nilson 1981). For most Americans poverty is an abstract issue and not personally relevant. Thus, their attitudes or beliefs may be subject to influence by new events and information. Current media coverage concerning the plight of the homeless, or interactions with homeless people may influence some people's attitudes toward the homeless. Various empirical and theoretical typologies are examined and then profiles of the "old" and "new" homeless presented.

Empirically Based Typologies

Worthy and Unworthy

Data on nearly 30,000 homeless people were collected for a year by Wright (1988) through the Health Care for the Homeless Program (HCH). Wright used a typology of worthy and unworthy, based on types that he perceived to be important in American society. This typology located categories of people along a worthiness dimension. The "worthy homeless" are victims of a catastrophic illness, people who

lose their jobs due to a plant closing, or families that lose their home after a natural disaster. Families were the most worthy, lone women and children were next, and lone adult men last. Finally, those who choose the streets were the only group labeled unworthy. The unworthy represent 5% of the homeless population (Wright 1988).

This typology implicitly attributes responsibility. Wright presented arguments to show that the people in most categories (homeless families, lone women and children, lone adult men) had external reasons for their status. Only the unworthy 5% of the homeless were the way they were because of internal causation, i.e., they were "lazy and shiftless bums."

McMurry (1990, p. 331) criticized Wright (1989) for limiting his data presentation and analysis to "selected rates and percentages." Further, he criticized Wright for relying primarily on data from the Health Care for the Homeless project (HCH) participants in 16 large cities because they would not be representative of the general homeless population. McMurry also criticized Wright's worthy/unworthy dichotomy and focus on the problems the homeless experience, as an attempt to appeal to readers' emotions.

Sleep Location

Interviews with 979 homeless people in 19 counties of Ohio were the basis for a location based typology of street, shelter, and resource people (Roth and Bean 1986). The three types were operationalized by asking the respondents "Where did you sleep

last night?" Street people had no contact with shelters or other services during the month except for emergencies. Shelter people used shelters and available services at least once in the preceding month. Resource people used a network of friends to secure food and lodging and did not use shelters in the preceding month (Roth and Bean 1986).

Roth and Bean's typology is overly simplistic and does not allow for people who do not fit neatly into prescribed categories. For example, people who used shelters once a month were considered shelter people, even though the rest of the month they functioned like resource persons.

Conventional Dwelling Access

Interviews with 722 homeless people in Chicago were conducted using shelter and street surveys (Rossi, Wright, Fisher and Willis 1987). The authors arrived at the typology of literal and precariously (or marginally) housed persons. The typology was developed by analyzing the access people had to conventional dwellings. Conventional dwellings are rooms in hotels or other structures, single room occupancy (S.R.O.) hotels, shared homes, or mobile homes.

The marginally housed people were also the extremely poor. They stayed out of the literal homeless category by spending most of their income on housing. These people relied on the service agencies for survival assistance. They drifted in and out

of homelessness depending on how long their limited funds and assistance from social networks kept them off the streets (Rossi, et al. 1987).

Locating the marginally housed homeless who are staying with friends or sharing rent with families is not feasible, so Rossi, et al. (1987) and many other researchers, focus on the literal homeless category. Three salient characteristics of the literal homeless were extreme poverty, disability, and social isolation. The Chicago data indicated that the literal homeless survive on "substantially less than half the poverty-level income" which makes paying for housing impossible (Rossi, et al. 1987). Disability was the relative severity of physical and mental conditions; the literal homeless suffered from varying degrees of disability making employment difficult to obtain. Social isolation was established by the absence of networking ties.

Resistors, Teeterers, Accommodators

In-depth interviews were given to 37 homeless at a drop-in center in the Minneapolis metropolitan area (Hertzberg 1988) and a typology was developed: resistors, teeterers, and accommodators. Resistors, the largest group, had a strong work ethic suggesting a connectedness to mainstream values. These people still exhibited control over their lives and gave external causes for their current homeless condition (e.g., apartment fire or promised employment never materialized). Disabilities were not used as a reason for unemployment.

Teeterers indicated that they had no control over their lives. They also expressed severe family dysfunction. Physical and mental illness were problems in this group. Reasons for homelessness were beyond their control, such as lack of employment opportunities.

The accommodators had adapted to surviving on the streets. They had no expectation of returning to the values of the dominant society. They had internalized the street life as their preferred lifestyle. Leaving the street was not a goal (Hertzberg 1988).

Hertzberg listed nine variables, but no decision rules were presented for how the variables were used to place the homeless into the three categories. It would be difficult to replicate this study. The study is also limited due to the sample size, only 37 homeless people were interviewed (Hertzberg 1988).

Theoretically Based Typologies

Benign and Malignant

A typology differentiating benign and malignant homelessness is presented by Jahiel (1987). Her typology focuses on the consequences of being without a house. The benign homeless were characterized by few hardships, a short time on the streets, and the relative infrequency of the condition. A temporary crisis, like a fire, would generate benign homelessness regardless of a person's access to resources.

The malignant homeless experience considerable hardships and permanent damage to their ability to re-establish themselves from losses. Malignant homelessness lasts for a relatively long time and recurs at frequent intervals. Any attempts to re-establish a home are met with no success. The malignant category is further sub-divided into two stages each containing four identifying characteristics.

The first stage classifies the onset of homelessness with the following characteristics: poverty, lack of employable skills, lack of resources to obtain shelter, unavailable low-income housing. (The poverty condition includes the lack of stable significant others who have the resources to keep their friends or family member from ending up on the streets.)

The second stage has additional characteristics which are used to identify those people who are more embedded in the street life. For these people: the struggle for subsistence and shelter consumes most of their time; their appearance declines as they change to street persons; their physical, mental, and financial resources are further strained; and psychological functioning declines from constant failures, rejections, and depressions.

This typology implicitly declares that the homeless are homeless for reasons external to them (Jahiel 1987). The typology is too simplistic, for the homeless do not fit into two such neat categories. Compared with other typologies, the people in the benign category would not even be considered homeless. These people have the coping skills, resources, and social networks to avoid the streets. The extremely poor

who weave in and out of homelessness are ignored in this typology. The idea of stages may be useful.

A Time Based Typology

Another typology, presented by Rivlin (1986), includes three dimensions: time, alternative shelter available, and social network. The typology labels the homeless as chronic-marginal, periodic, temporary, and total. The chronic-marginal homeless included the stereotypic homeless--bum, alcoholic, and drug abuser. Members of this group lived out on the streets most of the day; they may have social networks.

The periodic homeless are migrant or seasonal workers who are constantly on the move to find work. Alternative shelter may be available, even though it may be deficient. Social networks are temporarily disconnected. Others in the periodic category move to the streets and shelters when the pressures at their homes become too great.

The temporary homeless category is more time-limited than the first two categories. This category includes only short term crisis situations, such as, when a divorce occurs and one family member must move. The ability to restore social networks ties continues to exist.

The most severe form in this typology is total homelessness. This category includes those who experience a sudden loss of home through natural, economic, or

interpersonal disaster. The severity of the situation threatens the ability of people to regain any control over their lives (Rivlin 1986).

Rivlin makes the undocumented assertion that "total homelessness" is increasing. Homelessness is not increasing in the United States because of natural disasters. Even Roper's typology (1986) estimates natural disasters as a precipitating factor for only 5% of the homeless.

Critique

The typologies described in this chapter are organized, in varying degrees, according to where the homeless were located. Roth and Bean (1986) operationalized the subtypes of their typology by asking the respondents, "Where did you sleep last night?" Rossi, et al. (1987) ordered the data for their typology of literal homeless by the access people on the streets had to conventional dwellings. Jahiel (1987) focused on the consequences of being without a house. Rivlin (1986) based her typology, in part, on alternative housing availability.

A review of the literature reveals that "new" typologies keep emerging. The development of numerous typologies suggest that researchers have not identified what is important in categorizing the people on the streets.

Poor sampling is a criticism of most empirical studies and raises questions about the typologies derived from them. People on the streets are not an easy population to measure. The use of location (where people are found at the time of the

data collection) and duration (how long or how often people are on the streets) to identify people as homeless and to distinguish types of homelessness have limitations.

Theoretically based typologies tend to categorize people from the perspective of the "welfare industries." Categorizing people using a "welfare" perspective may yield an inaccurate analysis of their social connectedness. Instead of observing the social connectedness of the homeless, the welfare industries (by necessity) may concentrate attention on the needs of their clients.

Instead of implicitly assigning attribution, researchers would strengthen their work on the homeless if they organized their typologies around role involvement and the nature of attributions. Such approaches would yield stronger indicators of social connectedness.

The typology based presentations of the homeless differ from older material on the homeless which described a way of life. The homeless of today are sometimes contrasted, i.e., the "new" homeless with the "old" homeless.

A View from the Past

The classics (Anderson 1923; Bogue 1963; Wallace 1965; Bahr and Caplow 1974) about homeless men on skid row, described them as transient, migrant workers. People on skid row were physically, socially, and economically impoverished. Skid row was a collection place where these people could receive aid and acceptance. Aid to the homeless was in the form of cheap lodging, food, and minimal social services.

Skid row housed people: who often migrated; who were elderly or disabled; who could work but chose not to; who were alcoholics; or who wanted to hide out for various reasons. Skid rows were noted for single room occupancy (S.R.O.) hotels and cheap restaurants. A single room was cheap costing the homeless individual anywhere from a dime to a dollar. The rooms typically consisted of a six by eight foot cubicle, which offered no privacy or security, but they were an alternative to sleeping on the streets. S.R.O.s afforded the majority of men in these areas steady shelter (Bogue 1963).

In the Chicago area, agencies created to help the skid row inhabitant were located in these areas for the convenience of the homeless. Agencies like the Salvation Army operated outpatient clinics to take care of immediate health care needs of the homeless. Large rooms were provided for recreation, writing, or for reading newspapers. Employment services were provided to find jobs or daily labor for those who were willing to work. Other agencies focused on providing food and shelter (Bogue 1963).

Acceptance of one another appeared to be the norm among the skid row inhabitants of that day. Being poor was a common bond which led people to rely on one another for word of mouth information about employment and other survival facts (Hoch 1986). Skid rows were the networking and often the employment hubs for migratory workers, possibly because these areas were located in the inner cities near railroad lines, warehouses, and other businesses.

Profile of the "Old" Homeless

Gender

Almost exclusively males were described in the studies of earlier time periods. In Anderson's (1923, p. 5) study, he mentioned an "almost complete absence of women" on the streets, and that "cultural convention forbids" them from living on the streets. Bogue's analysis of Chicago's skid row during the 50s revealed that the total population was comprised of 96% males and 4% females (1963, table 1-5).

Women on the streets were considered "deviant" (Anderson 1923; Wallace 1965). Indigent women were not among "the homeless" because societal norms dictated that relatives should provide for women. Women might be forced to be streetwalkers to survive, but they were not recognized as homeless.

Race

Blacks were found on the streets, but the white male was the predominant resident of skid row. A comparison among five major cities in 1958 revealed that the inhabitants of the skid row in Chicago were 88% white and 9% black and in Minneapolis 95% white and 3% black (Bahr and Caplow 1974, table 2-1). Bogue's study of Chicago produced a sample of 96% white and 1% black (1963, table 1-5).

Age

Bogue's (1963) study revealed that 71% of the Chicago skid row males during the 50s were 45 to 75 years of age. The median age was about 50. Bahr and Caplow's (1974) study of the Bowery of New York also found 72% of the people in the 45 to 75 age category. Older men apparently gravitated to skid row because it was a place which required little money to survive. If problems associated with their age (or problems they created) "displaced" them from society (i.e., low income, alcohol, mental illnesses, disabilities), skid row was available.

Social network ties

The homeless reported having family, but they typically reported not maintaining contact with their kin or friends off the streets. Often friendships on the streets were superficial based primarily on sharing resources (bottles) and information. Bahr and Caplow (1974) reported that four fifths of the men on skid row did not contact relatives within the year and lacked social connections with friends. They concluded the homeless were in a state of disaffiliation. Whether the homeless are affiliated or disaffiliated is an issue which is debated in more current literature.

Affiliation/Disaffiliation

Some research indicates that the general population experiences some fear of the homeless (Snow, Baker, and Anderson 1989). People in society no longer have

leverage over a disaffiliated person. A person who breaks social network ties without reaffiliating "moves beyond the power of particular organizations and ultimately beyond the reach of organized society. He poses a threat because he has moved out of the reward system" (Bahr and Caplow 1974, p. 58). This person no longer may be motivated by the norms and sanctions of society.

Detachment from assigned statuses and social roles "may be imposed on individuals through various forms of social, economic, and political displacement, as well as the idiosyncratic aspects of their personal lives" (Ropers 1988, p. 121). People on the streets, assigned the status of homeless are playing "role-less" roles.

One of the problems in studying the situation of the homeless is separating causes and effects. For example, the homeless have fewer social ties than members of the general population. We do not know to what extent the reduced level of ties is both cause and effect. A person may over time engage in behaviors which lead to a loss of social ties. A limited number of social ties may further reduce the opportunities to form and maintain other social ties which would make it possible for the person to stay off the streets. Families at poverty level do not have the resources to support other family members who need assistance because of a crisis. Any friction in the home will be enough impetus to send someone with frayed or disconnected network ties to the streets.

Two opposing views of the homeless appear in the literature. Some argue that people on the streets are detached from the social ties of family and friends (Bahr and

Caplow 1974; Ropers 1988; Lee 1989; Kivisto 1989; Rossi 1989). Others argue that the homeless have many ties (Snow and Anderson 1987; Cohen and Sokolovsky 1989; La Gory, Ritchey, O'Donoghue, and Mullis 1989).

A modified affiliation position has emerged; the homeless interact in many friendship and relational ties, but they are detached from significant social roles which could enable them to get off the streets. For example, homeless people may establish friendship ties with the administrators of a shelter, and they may begin working there (making their friendship network denser). They may earn some money and have some friends, yet they are still homeless because neither change is sufficient to remove them from the streets. Affiliations with significant others may not be enough to avoid the stigma of being labeled homeless (Rooney 1976; La Gory, Ritchey, and Fitzpatrick 1991).

According to this perspective, relationships with other people on the streets are very complex, with their own hierarchy, negotiated norms and sanctions (Cohen and Sokolovsky 1989; La Gory, Ritchey, and Fitzpatrick 1991). New people may gain entrance into a group of people on the streets by contributing money for a shared pack of cigarettes. People may learn quickly a norm that sharing does not allow them the privilege of asking questions about the members' past. An example of an extreme sanction was reported in Knoxville when a homeless man was fatally beaten because he earned money and failed to buy a bottle of alcohol to share with his street friends (Cornelius 1991).

Often bonds with "confidants, friends, relatives, and acquaintances...differ somewhat from the general population's and do not satisfy most homeless individuals' expressed needs for support" (La Gory, Ritchey, and Fitzpatrick 1991, p. 209). These affiliations aid homeless people in surviving on the streets, but they do not provide the necessary resources of income, coping skills, or contacts which will increase personal efficacy, "the ability perceived or real, to control one's life" (La Gory, Ritchey, and Fitzpatrick 1991, p. 203).

The affiliation question is related to the larger question, are the causes of homelessness primarily located within the individual or society? Those who argue that the homeless are disaffiliated suggest they are not able to interact in "normal" society. Those who say the homeless are affiliated, that they interact and form ties, tend to locate or attribute the problem to society. These opposing views were earlier identified by C. Wright Mills (1959) when he distinguished "personal troubles" and "public issues of the social structure." Personal troubles happen to people who have character flaws, or are socially deficient in some way. When public issues affect many individuals then society has a problem (Gioglio 1989).

A Contemporary View

The state of the economy and the cost of living space are increasingly important factors influencing who is homeless. Downtown areas across the nation are changing. Skid row areas are being systematically eliminated in the interest of more

living space and better living conditions in downtown areas. Some of the homeless may actually be the same people who off and on lived in the low rent districts of the inner cities. Some may be forced to sleep in public places which attracts media attention and public concern. The homeless may be more visible to the public due to the process of gentrification, the process of renovating the deteriorated portions of inner cities.

In the 1980s media attention was directed to the "new" homeless. Of particular interest were families which appeared to have "fallen" on hard times, i.e., people who at other times might be the working poor. To a lesser extent attention was given to the consequences of policies of deinstitutionalization which released people from mental institutions.

Profile of the "New" Homeless

A profile of the "new" homeless is drawn using Momeni's (1989) state surveys and other studies. The "new" homeless are less likely to be migrant workers and more often the situationally homeless, displaced by unemployment and rising housing costs. Discussions of the "new" homeless do not suggest the "old" homeless have disappeared, but rather that there is increased diversity in the homeless population.

Gender

Women represent from 15 to 30% of the homeless population in some studies (Nooe 1988b; La Gory et al. 1989) with 15% being more typical. Part of the explanation is that battered women's shelters are in sample plans. Battered women's shelters are a relatively recent development in response to increased public concern about family violence. There are more shelters available strictly for women (and their children).

Another possible reason for the increase of women in the shelters may be due to the changing norms of our society. Women are not expected to remain in "bad" family situations, but they may not have the resources to establish themselves independently. The model of women requiring protection is changing. Families do not have to support "problem" female members if they do not want to do so.

Race

Blacks are over-represented based on their numbers in the general population. For example, blacks represented 4% of the Massachusetts population, and 30% of shelter users were black (Garrett and Schutt 1989). A Birmingham study had 35% non-white in a sample (LaGory et al. 1989).

Blacks are disproportionately located on the lower end of the income scale. Blacks often come from families which have fewer resources. Thus, when someone loses a job or home others do not have the necessary resources to render aid (Elliott

and Krivo 1991; La Gory et al. 1991). Blacks may be more visible on the streets when the economy is in poorer shape.

Age

Homeless people now are younger. The mean ages in Momeni's (1989) surveys were in the 30s. One study conducted in Massachusetts revealed that out of the 500 shelter users 75% of them were younger than 45 (Garrett and Schutt 1989). Another study in Birmingham conducted in 1987 revealed that 62% of the sample were younger than 39 (LaGory et al. 1989).

Social network ties

Views of affiliation were presented earlier in the "Affiliation/Disaffiliation" section. Recent studies tend to take an affiliated or modified affiliation position. Researchers describe the "new" homeless as having network ties with family and friends off the streets. These social ties also include friendships on the streets.

Substance abuse

Alcoholic dependency is a well documented problem among the homeless. What is difficult to ascertain is whether alcoholism contributes to homelessness or vice versa. If any difference exists between the "new" and the "old" homeless, it could be an increase in drug dependency (Rossi 1989). The cost of drugs may result in

alcoholism continuing to be a more prevalent problem than drug abuse for the homeless.

Summary and Research Directions

Reviewing these typologies reveals that elements of each typology may be useful but overall they are inadequate to examine the social connectedness of the homeless. Many articles described in this chapter offered typologies which were pragmatically based (e.g., where did you sleep last?), but they did not seem to address fully the role involvements of the homeless, or explain the differences between the "old" and "new" homeless.

The relationships I am interested in exploring are: 1) Are the "new" homeless more likely to be affiliated, to have role involvement than the "old" homeless; and 2) Are the "old" homeless more likely to exhibit deviant lifestyles than the "new" homeless.

Hoch (1986) suggested four characteristics that distinguish the "new" from the "old" skid row homeless: race, age, gender, and marital status. These characteristics are used for this study. This research also examines the involvement of the homeless in various other roles (family, friend, parental, and employee).

CHAPTER FOUR

METHODS

The methods section identifies the difficulties in sampling homeless people and presents the variables useful for distinguishing the differences in their role involvements.

Sample

The homeless population is difficult to identify for purposes of sample selection. Problems exist because the category incorporates people with divergent characteristics who temporarily or permanently share the lack of a home. Definitions vary depending on who is discussing the homeless and why. Advocacy groups broadly define homelessness to increase government programs. City officials argue that the homeless were under-counted in the U.S. Census because larger population sizes increase federal dollars under current funding formulas. Researchers narrowly define the homeless to facilitate sample selection.

Homeless people lack permanent addresses and phone numbers, characteristics often used by investigators in selecting samples. Shelter inhabitants often are sampled because they are available. Shelter logs provide the best available data from which to draw a sample, although some homeless people never use shelters and others use

them sporadically. Lacking better bases for sample selection many researchers collect data from shelter inhabitants in a limited number of hours on a selected day. The representativeness of these samples to the homeless population is questionable. More than one strategy may be used for sample selection to address the problem of representativeness.

This research is based on 50 interviews conducted on May 10th and 11th of 1988. The data were collected for the Community Action Committee, which in turn was responsible for a Tennessee State project on the homeless. The Knoxville shelters used were: Knoxville Union Rescue Mission; Salvation Army, Volunteers of America (services families and single women), Volunteer Ministry Center, Serenity Shelter (for battered women), and Traveler's Rest (now defunct). (For more information on Knoxville services and shelters see Appendix A).

Data collection was supervised by Dr. Roger Nooe, in the School of Social Work, at the University Tennessee, Knoxville. Twelve individuals met the evening of May 10th for training on interviewing techniques, sampling procedures, and the interview schedule. They interviewed in pairs, and each pair had at least one member who had participated in previous interviews. In sampling shelter inhabitants every fifth person on the shelter's evening roster was included. Respondents were offered two dollars for their participation. This inducement reduced the number of refusals.

Some homeless people are not found in shelters and would prefer not to be officially identified for various reasons. A different strategy was used to select a

sample of the homeless not in shelters. On the morning of May 11th a team of interviewers went to outside locations where the homeless gathered. Interviews were conducted in the early morning hours before the shelters released their inhabitants to prevent any overlap. When interviewers located a group of six homeless people, they interviewed two. Four people were interviewed in this manner.

Social Survey

The face-to-face interviews were conducted at shelters except for the four collected at outside locations. One interview was terminated on the sixth question because the individual lived at a residence for more than 60 days with her own money. Unless otherwise stated the sample size is constant, N=49.

The interviewers used an interview schedule that did not directly ask about social roles (see Appendix B). The instrument was reviewed for items that related to roles. For example, questions about having children and friends in the area provided the researcher with information about the social connectedness of the people in the sample. Of the 71 questions on the interview schedule 41 were selected. Some questions along with their follow-up questions were dropped because of the low response rates. Other questions were collapsed and recoded. Demographic information and items germane to the research questions were selected (see Appendix C).

Self-reported data may be inaccurate. Validity problems may be greater with a special population such as the homeless. The interviewer asked for the date of birth. Date of birth presumably reduces the number of incorrect age responses. Some people may refuse to answer regardless of the question format. Another white female who refused to answer the age question gave responses to other questions that suggested that she was older. For example, she earned a Ph.D., was an executive sales representative for an insurance firm, and had not worked for the eight years prior to the interview. The interviewer commented that this individual seemed overly cautious about answering the questions. On age she was coded as a non-respondent.

The interview schedule was designed for use throughout the state. Local administrators had no control over the wording or inclusion of questions. Some questions were vague; one in particular asked if respondents chose their homeless lifestyle. This item was atypical in that it yielded high positive responses. Yet when respondents were asked what caused their homelessness, few reported free choice. This lack of consistency reveals that the item on homeless lifestyle lacks content validity.

Gender

Traditionally the homeless were assumed to be male. In the 1980s and 1990s women appeared among the homeless. This sample was biased because males represented 86% of the sample. Many other studies of the homeless reflect this bias.

Age

Individual ages were derived from the question "in what year were you born?" Ages were grouped into "less than or equal to 35" (N=18, 37%), "36-50" (N=16, 33%), and "greater than 51" (N=15, 30%).

Education

The responses to the question "how many years of school did you complete?" were collapsed into three categories: "did not finish public school," "completed public school," and "some college." The frequency distribution showed 43% (N=21) of the sample had "less than public school," 31% (N=15) had "completed public school," and 26% (N=13) had "some college."

Residence

The majority (65%) responded "no" to the question "were you born in Tennessee."

Family

The homeless were asked if they had children. The majority of respondents were parents (N=28, 57%). When asked "is your family with you now?" a minority (N=6, 14%) had "family members" on the streets with them, although the nature of that relationship was not specific.

Social Contacts

When asked "do you have any friends in the area who are not homeless?" 39% said "yes." A follow-up question asked about the last time these friends were contacted. The response categories were "days" and "weeks" recoded as "frequently" (N=15, 83%), and "months" and "years" recoded as "infrequently" (N=3, 17%). Another question asked "Do you have family in the area who were not homeless." The most frequent responses reflected the lack of stable family (N=34, 71%). Having family and friends in the area who were not homeless is referred to as stable family and stable friends. A follow-up question asked about the last time they had contact with family members. The same response categories used for the contact of friends were used for the contact of family. Nine respondents ticked "frequently" (69%), and five "infrequently" (31%).

The respondents were asked whether they served time in: "a state or federal prison," "a city or county jail," or "the workhouse?" The majority (N=34, 69%) had served time in the city or county jail. Only 26% (N= 12) had served time in a workhouse locally, and 15% (N=7) in a state or federal prison.

Serving Time

The question "Why did you have to serve time?" was a contingency question based on an affirmative response to the questions about serving time. It was an open-ended question yielding multiple responses and combinations of responses.

Although the responses were scattered, they were collapsed into three categories. The "drug" and "alcohol" responses were combined into "substance abuse." "Other crimes" contained all crimes such as "theft," "disorderly conduct," and "crimes against people." "Substance abuse" was the most frequent response (N=25, 51%), then "other crimes" (N=8, 16%).

Alcoholic Role

The homeless were asked "Do you have a drinking problem?" This question had an additional response choice of "some." One person responded "some" which was counted with the affirmatives (N=18, 38%). When asked "Do you consider yourself an alcoholic?" (with an additional response choice of "recovering") one person responded "recovering" which was included with the alcoholics (N=18, 37%). About one-fourth (N=13, 27%) of the respondents had been patients in a detoxification unit.

Employment Role

The majority of the sample (N=41, 84%) were not currently employed. Slightly over half (N=28, 58%) were looking for work. The respondents were asked about their usual line of work. Identified were 25 different lines of work and a few combinations. These responses were collapsed into three categories: "construction or builder," "service," and "other." "Other" included responses, such as an artist, logger,

and student. The most frequent response was "construction or builder" (N=18, 40%). The next was "other" with 36% (N=16).

Thirty-eight people gave reasons (single and multiple) for not working in response to an open-ended question. The most frequent responses involved "drugs" and "alcohol." A new category was created (withdrawn) which included responses such as "drugs," "alcohol," and "no desire to work" (N=12, 32%). Another category was named "jobs not available" (N=15, 39%). The rest of the responses could be placed in a category named "personal circumstances making employment difficult" (N=11, 29%).

The question "how long ago was the last time you were employed or worked for pay?" had possible replies of "days," "weeks," "months," or "years." These responses were collapsed into "12 months or less," "13 months to 24 months," and "25 months or more." (Charting the distribution by months revealed that these categories would be the best natural break points.) Of these categories "12 months or less" was the most frequent (N=22, 45%) and "13 to 24 months" was next in frequency (N=14, 29%).

When asked how often they found work the homeless' responses fit five categories: "once a week," "twice or more per week," "once a month," "twice or more per month," and "once every two to six months." The responses were collapsed into two categories, "frequently" (N=19, 79%), and "infrequently" (N=5, 21%). The

category "frequently" includes the first two categories. "Infrequently" includes the last three categories.

The question "how do you find out who is hiring?" was open-ended producing 16 combination of responses. (Answering this question was contingent on an affirmative answer to the question "are you looking for work?") The 16 responses were collapsed into two categories: "actively pursuing and accountable to someone" and "pursuing but self reliant." The frequency distribution revealed a fairly even split between the categories with the most frequent being "pursuing but self reliant" (N=17, 37%).

The question "on the average how long do your jobs usually last?" had six possible responses: "1 day or less," "1 week or less," "1 month or less," "1 year or less," "more than a year," and "never had a job." These responses were collapsed into three categories: "one day to one month," "one month to one year," and "more than one year." A frequency distribution revealed that 41% (N=19) of the jobs lasted less than one month, with 30% (N=14) lasting for one month one year, and 28% (N=13) for more than a year.

Recoded Variables

Race

The majority were whites (N= 38, 75%). Native americans and the blacks comprised "non-white."

Sleeping Accommodations

An open-ended question that asked where the respondents usually slept yielded multiple combinations of responses. "Shelter" was the most frequent response (N=32, 67%). Some 15% of the homeless endorsed "street," "park," or "other open spaces." None of the other responses were answered. Thus, I dichotomized sleeping accommodations into "shelter" and "non-shelter" (Non-shelter, N=11, 33%).

Eat

When asked the open-ended question "where do you usually eat?" five responses resulted: "eat out," "purchase for home use," "meals from agencies such as, churches, shelters, and missions," "handouts," and "with relatives." These responses were collapsed into "shelter" and "other." The majority of the sample ate in shelters (80%).

Reasons for Coming to Knoxville

The responses to the question "what was your most important reason for coming to Knoxville?" were trichotomized as "attractions," "chance/circumstances," and "long term/native." The most frequent responses were "chance/circumstances" (N=20, 43%), the next were "long term/native" (N=14, 29%), and then "attractions" (N=13, 28%).

Marital Status

The respondents were asked their marital status. Five responses were possible: "married," "single," "separated," "divorced," and "widowed." Responses were collapsed into: "single," "married/separated," and "divorced/widowed." The not currently married, i.e., single (N=16, 33%), and "divorced/widowed" (N=23, 48%) were disproportionately over represented.

Income

When asked where their income for the past 30 days was obtained, respondents gave 30 combinations of responses. These responses were collapsed into four categories: "employment," "government," "survival money," and "other." "Employment" was created from the responses of full-time or part-time employment. "Government" included money received from any government agencies. "Survival money" was generated from panhandling and similar types of activities. The percentage distribution revealed that 41% (N=20) of the sample responded "employment," 22% (N=11) "government," 25% (N=12)"survival money," and 12% (N=6) "other."

The question "what was your total income received within the last 30 days?" resulted in over 30 different responses. Three natural cutting points existed: "$100 or less," "$101 to $500," and "$500 and more." The percentage distribution revealed

that 45% (N=22) earned $100 or less, 31% (N=15) $101 to $500, and 24% (N=12) $501 or more.

Time on the Street

The respondents were asked to specify "how long they had been homeless" in days, weeks, months, and years. The categories were collapsed into three: "3 months or less," "4 months to 36 months," and "37 months or more." The responses were recoded as follows: "3 months or less" (N=19, 39%), then "37 months or more" at 33% (N=16), and then "4 months to 36 months" at 28% (N=14).

Causes of Homelessness

The question "what caused you to be homeless?" resulted in 32 combinations of responses. They were collapsed into four categories: "housing problems," "family and friends," "trouble," and "other." The category with the most responses was "trouble" (N=17, 39%), followed by "family and friends" (N=13, 30%), and "housing problems" (N=9, 20%). "Other" had 11% (N=5).

Sample Characteristics

Income

The mean monthly income was $494.14, including an outlier of $12,000, and $214.63 without the outlier. Whites without the outlier had a mean of $185 a month; non-whites had a mean of $335 a month. Almost half the non-whites received between $100-500 a month. Of those who reported, sources of income ranged from employment, panhandling, to government assistance.

Time on the Streets

The average length of time on the streets was 3.6 years. This average includes an outlier of 30 years, without the outlier the average is 3 years. The man who reported his age as 81 years old also reported living on the streets for 30 years.

Sample Comparisons

Dr. Nooe supervised other surveys that were sponsored by the Knoxville Coalition for the Homeless. The 1986 study is the most comprehensive and used most often as a comparison study (Knoxville Coalition for the Homeless 1986; Nooe and Lynch 1988a; Nooe and Lynch 1988b; Nooe and (Lynch) Cunningham 1990).

The gender distribution of this sample is comparable with other recent homeless samples, 86% male and 14% female (Ropers 1988; Nooe and Cunningham 1990).

The majority of the people (75%) were white, 25% were non-white. The non-whites were all blacks with the exception of one male native american. Two of the non-whites were females. The number of non-whites in the sample over-represented their proportion of the population in the Knoxville area. This over-representation of non-whites is consistent with other recent homeless research (Hoch 1986; Ropers 1986; Rossi et al. 1987; Rossi 1989).

The mean age of this sample was 43.2, with one non-response; the median age was 40. The mean age was between four and six years older than previous studies of the homeless in Knoxville and other areas (Nooe and Cunningham 1990; Ropers 1988; Kivisto 1989). The mean age for white males was 43.3 years (N=31), for the non-white males 41.8 years (N=11), and for the females 38.5 years (N=6).

The age distribution of this sample is not consistent with other studies because it did not include as high a proportion of younger people. Studies report the mean age for the new homeless as lower (usually in the 30s) than for the older studies (Cohen and Sokolowsky 1989; Ropers 1988; Rossi 1989). Four females were young (18, 23, 29, and 31), none were between being 40 and 50 years of age.

Data Analysis

The sample size was small limiting the types of data analysis which could be conducted. The variables were cross-tabulated and significant chi-squares were reported. (Various cases had low response rates due to the allowance of multiple

answers.) In these cases the percentages were reported. The two general research directions followed in this study were not formulated as hypotheses which could be subjected to a specific test. Rather various relationships were explored.

The findings from this project have been treated as tentative, to the extent that the questions and response distributions resemble those in other studies the issue of reliability is addressed. Nooe and his associates have used similar questions in other surveys of the homeless in Knoxville.

The representativeness of the sample cannot be ascertained, for the population cannot be identified. The fact that the sample has fewer younger respondents than samples from other cities may reflect biases in the sampling or the actual composition of the Knoxville homeless population in May 1988.

CHAPTER FIVE

FINDINGS

The literature review suggested that substantially different sets of homeless people may be identified by separating respondents by a few key demographic characteristics. Three characteristics, gender, race, and age were related to the other variables to identify differences. Then the data were examined using types of role involvement as independent variables.

Demographic Characteristics

Gender and Race

Six of the women reported having children. Three of the seven women, ages 18, 23, and 31, responded affirmatively when asked "is your family with you now?" Additional examination of these women's interviews revealed that their children's ages ranged from eight months to 12 years old. All the younger women and one of the older women claimed stable family in the area. The four younger women and two of the older women reported "stable" friends in the area. Only the older woman who refused to specify her age had neither stable friends nor family in the area.

The white and non-white male data are presented separately because there appeared to be some racial differences. Only 16 of the white males (N=31) had children and none of them reported any family with them.

Of the non-whites males (N=11), six reported having children and two of those six had family with them. Five of six non-white male parents reported having stable family in the area and four of them stable friends in the area.

Overall, 78% of the men (N=42) did not have stable family in the area. The male respondents typically were unemployed (N=42, 88%). Half of the males' jobs did not last longer than a month (N=39). All of the females reported that their jobs typically lasted more than a month to more than a year. Three out of the seven females were currently employed.

The males were more likely to have served time than females. Only a 68 year old black female reported serving time. (The reason she gave for serving time was because she was driving without a license. At the time she was living in her car.) Of the many reasons males gave for serving time, substance abuse was the most frequent response (N=40, 63%).

In addition to the race differences which emerged in the examination of gender differences, there were others. Whites (N=36) typically were not born in Tennessee (72%). The majority of non-whites (58%) were born in Tennessee (N=12). Whites and non-whites gave various reasons for coming to Knoxville. For the whites (N=35) the most frequent answers involved chance (46%) and being attracted to the area

(34%). For non-whites (N=11), answers most frequently referred to being long term residents of Tennessee (64%). All of the non-whites ate at the shelters; 72% (N=36) of whites did.

Age

Half of the people who were between 36 and 50 years old (N=16) reported they usually slept at a shelter, and half usually slept in other locations which ranged from sleeping outside to using abandoned facilities and vehicles. Those older than 50 (N=14) typically slept in the shelters (93%); those 35 and under (N=18) were less likely to do so (39%).

Most people did not answer the question about frequency of visiting friends. All respondents who were under 50 years of age (N=12) indicated they visited friends "frequently." Of the six people over 50, three answered they visited friends frequently and three infrequently.

Of the six people who reported having family with them, all but one were 35 and under (the exception was a 39 year old). Younger people, under 35 years old, were still involved in their family roles evidenced by the more frequent visits with their family (N=8, 88%), those 36 through 50 years old (N=4) were split evenly.

Roles

Parenthood

Parenthood is a social fact. Even if there are infrequent contacts, the parental role may have personal importance; it may be a valued role-identity. People who did not follow social norms by remaining single (N=16) or being childless (N=21) may have consistently been unconventional. These people may have had less reason to maintain conventional lives or had difficulties (e.g., psychological, substance abuse) which led to separation from their families. As the discussion of demographic characteristics indicated, white males were less likely to have been spouses and parents than non-white males and females.

Family

Of the six people who claimed family with them at the time of the interview, one reported serving time in the city or county jail. Five of them reported being employed in the past year.

The relationship between those with stable family in the area and reasons for not working (N=37), reveals that all 11 people who were "withdrawn" lacked stable family in the area. (Being withdrawn means that the person is not working because of: alcohol or drug related problem, got fired from last job, they do not want to work, or they are on the road.) The nine people with stable family were more likely to

report no jobs were available or that personal circumstances blocked their path to employment. Twenty-two people out of 28 (79%) reported withdrawal and job unavailability as reasons for blocked employment.

None of the 14 people who had stable family in the area had been a patient of a detoxification unit. About a third (35%) of the people who did not have stable family in the area (N=34) reported that they had been a patient of a detoxification unit.

Friends

Those with stable friends were looking for work (N=18, 83%). If people had stable friends in the area (N=19), they typically had not been a patient of a detoxification unit (89%).

The vast majority of those without stable friends did not have stable family in the area (N=29, 83%) and, those without stable friends in the area were more likely to be unemployed (N=30, 93%). Only 18 people responded to the item about their contact with friends. Those who were under 30 and over 50 were more likely to respond than those 36 to 50. The only respondents who reported no contact were over 50. There may be a high non-response rate because of social desirability. People may have a difficult time admitting to an interviewer that they have no contacts with friends.

Serving Time in the City or County Jails

The relationship between the variables "have you served time in the city or count jails" and "do you have a drinking problem" revealed that those who had not served time did not report a drinking problem (Chi-square=5.44, d.f.=1, p=.02). Of those who served time in the city or county jail (N=33), 48% acknowledged a drinking problem. People who served time in city and county jail were more likely to have been detoxification patients than those who had not served time (Chi-square=4.38, d.f.=1, p=.04).

To see if the respondents perceived a link between serving time and their drinking, answers to three other questions were examined. Those who reported a drinking problem (N=18, 72%) were more likely to give substance abuse as the reason for serving time. The people who considered themselves alcoholics were more likely to give substance abuse as the reason for serving time (N=18, 72%).

Employment

Six people from Tennessee were working compared to two people not from Tennessee. Of the people who were not born in Tennessee (N=32), 94% were not working at the time of the interviews. Of those who were born in Tennessee (N=17), 65% were not working. None of the people who claimed they were "attracted" to Knoxville, or who "chose" to come were presently working. The other two currently employed came by chance. Work status might be related to why and how long a

person resided in a community or state. Long term residents could have advantages (e.g., contacts).

When sources of income answers were related to employment status, an apparent inconsistency appeared. Twenty people had income from employment, although eight reported that they were working. Twelve people who received money through survival strategies reported that they were not employed. Survival money was gained in the following ways; selling plasma or blood, selling cans, and panhandling. The next set of comparisons focus on the homeless lifestyle.

Cause of Homelessness

When asked what caused them to be homeless, the most frequent response category "trouble" included 17 replies that suggested the person had or was experiencing problems (e.g. drinking problem, ripped off). The next most frequent of the four responses given (13 times) was difficulties with "family and friends." Third in frequency lack of housing (nine times). The few "other" responses included traveling and lack of education. The reasons given for being homeless appear linked at least in part to the alcoholic role. Ten of the 17 people who had "troubles" as the basis for their homelessness identified themselves as alcoholics and none of the nine who had "housing" as the cause perceived themselves to be alcoholics.

Time on the Street

"Time on the street" was related to other variables singly and in combination. Previous research suggests it would distinguish among various types of homeless. "Time on the street" was not significantly related to many other variables, although it may separate the "new homeless" and the "old homeless." The five females reported being on the streets for under three months and the other two had been on the streets from three months to three years and none any longer. Males (N=42) were evenly distributed: 14 had been on the streets for three months and less; 12 had been on the streets from three months to three years; and 16 had been on the streets over three years.

People with family members with them overwhelmingly reported being on the streets for shorter periods of time. Five people (three females and two black males) had been homeless three months or less and one white male from three months to three years. No one who had been on the street for over three years (N=13) had any family with him.

People on the street for longer periods of time resembled the stereotypical or "old" homeless. The longer a person was on the street, the more likely the person was to report serving time in the city or county jail (Chi-square=11.69, d.f.=2, p=.00). Of the 16 people who had been on the streets for over three years, 15 had served time in the city or county jail. The longer a person is "on the street," the greater the time the person is at risk of arrest, although time at risk probably only partially accounts for

the relationship. Alcoholism may be a factor also, for 12 of the men who had been on the streets for over three years reported serving time for substance abuse.

Discussion

When Ropers (1989) considered national data on whether the contemporary homeless resembled the "old" stereotypes of past generations, he concluded that they did not. Based on these data the traditional (stereotypical) homeless appears to be the majority in Knoxville. A segment of people matches the profile of "new" homeless. They have more role connections which may be associated with increased likelihood of changing status.

Whether the "new" homeless will become more like the "old" homeless if they remain on the streets longer or are distinctly different cannot be established. Some argue there are "degrees of homelessness" (Bahr and Caplow 1974, p. 5), meaning that as people are detached from social bonds they become less connected to the structure of society. They may move through various stages from temporary to permanent homelessness.

Before analyzing the data the relative length of "time on the street" was expected to be associated with the level of personal disorganization a person exhibited. This expectation was based on the literature which categorized the homeless by distinct time lengths and indicated that as time on the street increased so did the personal disorganization of the homeless person. For example, Snow and Anderson

(1987) posited that the role-identities of the homeless varied by time on the streets at intervals of six months, two years, and four years. (These models may reflect the progressive effects of alcoholism also.)

Differences in relative amount of time spent on the street were intertwined with differences in gender, race, and family or parental roles. The "new" homeless, young females, and the black males who claimed that they had family with them at the time of the interview had been on the streets for the shortest amount of time.

Dividing the Knoxville sample according to a profile of the "new" and "old" homeless separated those homeless who were stable or unstable. Those who maintained fewer stable social connections appeared to more closely fit an "old" profile associated with being homeless. Those who claimed stable social connections resembled the "new" homeless profile.

Females appeared to reflect the "new" profile with their stable social network ties. These ties were evidenced by their report of having, and visiting family and friends in the Knoxville area. Females seemed more stable than males because they had social ties to family and friends. The connection to family and friends may be linked to the monetary assistance they receive. The three females who reported contact with family also reported that they received money partly from employment and partly from family and friends.

Females had not endured long periods of unemployment, and their jobs typically lasted longer than males. Overall, females had not undergone the

experiences associated with lack of contact with family and friends (serving time, treatment for alcoholism, lack of proximate housed friends). The women do not fit the "old" profile for homeless people, with the exception of two older women who had been on the streets one, and three years respectively.

Non-white males seemed to maintain social connections. Six of the 11 non-white males reported stable family in the area, and five of the 11 reported stable friends in the area. White males, on the other hand, did not have the same social connectedness. Three out of the 31 reported stable family in the area, and seven of the 31 reported stable friends in the area. The profile for white males who did not have stable family or stable friends in the area is consistent with the "old" profile of a skid row inhabitant. Of the 16 white males who reported having children none were with them at the time of the interview.

Because of their connectedness females may have an easier time getting off the streets, with the help of family and friends, than males. People in society may feel that a female should not be on the street and assist her, yet have a quite different view of males. Families may offer to help financially if children are with the homeless adults.

Age was an important variable. The younger homeless person was more likely to have active non-homeless relationships and social roles. As age increases social contacts may decrease as network ties become weaker through lack of maintenance and perhaps active avoidance. The younger these people were the more they reported

visitation with family and friends. The younger the person the less time that person could have spent on the streets. Therefore, the less likely these people may be to have severely damaged social connections. The people in the age category of 50 plus did not visit their families. As people age their contacts with relatives may decrease because of death and relocation as well as choice. Also family members may over the years "give up" on a homeless person with recurrent financial, or substance abuse problems.

Attribution theory can help explain reasons reported for these problems. Those who claimed a parental role were more likely to attribute blame for blocked employment on personal circumstances. Personal circumstances were externally based: health related problems, lack of child care, no phone, no transportation, or age. People on the streets may attribute internal causes for the predicament they encountered. Internal attributions may be due to the inability to perform to the expectations of their role-identities.

At the time of the survey 90% of the males were not working, nor had they worked for six months. When they did work, half of the male's jobs would not last longer than a month. Spot labor may temporarily satisfy the financial needs of these men. A recent example of spot labor was reported in Knoxville when a homeless man earned $60 dollars for unloading a truck of onions for a nearby market (Cornelius 1991).

When the work role is lost, or is unstable, related roles may be affected (HEW 1973). Loss of work roles for males in our society negatively affects their self-esteem. Without the work role an essential tie from the individual to society is missing (Ropers 1988).

The males who were not working also served time. People with records may have a more difficult time being employed, or it may be that a person labeled as "deviant" may not adequately perform the role of employee.

Substance abuse, as mentioned, is a problem which is consistent with both the "old" and "new" profiles. Only males reported serving time for substance abuse. Of the 25 people who reported serving time for substance abuses, the vast majority had been on the streets for more than three months. When people are homeless they may be at higher risk of being arrested for activities such as substance abuse.

Many of the males who served time may have been incarcerated for offenses related to their homeless status as other studies have found (Lee 1989; Snow, Baker and Anderson 1989). Fifteen men reported serving time for alcoholic related, and three men for drug related reasons. They were also more likely to have been patients of a detoxification unit which confirms their problematic role.

The males had a profile of being uninvolved in social roles. They reported being withdrawn as a reason for not working. This profile of males ties them to the past image of the homeless, one of drunken bums (Cohen and Sokolovsky 1989).

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Many typologies of the homeless are based either on length of time on the streets (duration) or the locations in which the homeless sleep (location). Use of time on the street as the primary basis for constructing a typology implicitly suggests there is a progressive movement into increasingly more severe states of homelessness.

Rossi et al. (1987) discuss those who move in and out of homelessness but for methodological reasons they do not study them. In Roth and Bean's typology (1986), people who used the shelter one time during the month were considered homeless. Most research leaves out those who weave in and out of homelessness.

Raymond (1990, p.6) discusses researchers who are suggesting an "ecological resource" approach. This approach focuses on the abilities of the homeless, their networks of family and friends, and their potential for being integrated into the mainstream of society. Research using this approach has established that some people on the street have involvement in roles off the streets and friendship roles formed on the streets. The proposed role involvement research most resembles the ecological resource approach.

Other typologies have been somewhat effective in generally labeling those on the street. Now it is time to develop a typology that categorizes people by their

involvement in social roles. A typology developed not from a top down perspective looking at those on the street, but one that will arise from the perspective of homeless people.

Role Involvement

Of the dimensions used in homeless typologies, another which is of interest focuses on homeless people's social connections. The stable-unstable dichotomy focuses directly on the social statuses of the homeless which may represent their connectedness to that world.

Exploring role involvement can distinguish the networking ties of homeless people regardless of the locations (shelter or non-shelter) in which they are found. It would not exclude those who are homeless on a temporary basis (i.e., the people who weave on and off the streets, or those who face natural catastrophes). These people could be categorized as stable because they would probably be more involved in social roles (e.g., employment roles).

People who were more involved in social roles typically had not been on the streets for long periods of time. Increased time on the street is associated with decreased involvement in conventional roles. A role based typology categorizes people on the street in stages of role involvement.

The strength of using this typology is that it categorizes homeless people around important characteristics, the roles in which they are involved. As expected,

homeless people with non-traditional characteristics (females and non-whites) typically had been on the streets for shorter periods of time and had more involvement in conventional social roles than those who had been on the streets longer. People who claimed and maintained specific social roles also tended to report that jobs lasted longer, did not report serving time in jail or difficulty with substance abuse.

Females were more involved in social roles (employee, parental, familial, and friendship) than males. Shelters provided for battered women allow them to temporarily avoid an abusive situation. This temporary fix may account for some of the reasons why females are on the streets and why they have not been on the streets long.

Social problems (e.g., increased unemployment rate, the changing of policies in mental institutions, and increases in substance abuse, increase in teenage runaways, and reported violence in the home) may also account for the presence of people labeled as the "new" homeless. These people may end up in shelters which are designed specifically to their needs.

As expected the people who fit the "old" homeless profile were unstable and reported time in jails, detoxification units, and had fewer social network ties. The people who were on the streets for more than three years exhibited the least role involvement. Those who were less likely to have contact with their families and friends were more involved in roles. Transitions from being involved in social roles, to being disconnected, to embracing a "homeless lifestyle" may occur gradually.

Future Research

Future research should collect information about involvement in social roles and relationships, specifically investigating the decline in involvement as time on the streets increases. Increased time on the street increases the probability that homeless people will have less social role involvement, and that they may be identified by "deviant" statuses (e.g., alcoholic, drug user, panhandler, ex-con).

The literature suggests that those labeled as homeless vary by the length of time they have been homeless with those homeless the longest least resembling members of mainstream society. Identifying the roles in which homeless people maintain involvements may assist researchers in distinguishing stages of homelessness. Future research might focus on how long a person may remain homeless before the probability of leaving the streets for any reason other than institutionalization or death become extremely low.

New shelters established to temporarily meet the needs of special people (e.g., battered women's shelters, teenage runaway shelters, etc.) may house temporary homeless. A suggestion for future research is to separate the data reported about the new types of shelters from the traditional types of shelters. This separation may be useful in assessing the influence the new shelter people are having on the profile of the homeless.

People on the street may be differentiated through the use of surveys to determine role involvements. Surveys could be part of the registration process. The

results from these surveys may aid in identifying the role involvements of street people. Determining the density of their networks, and verifying any claimed social roles may function to situate the people so that a strategy may be developed to aid people within the context of their defined world. Aid may facilitate changes in the image of the self or bolster existing images. Giving a street person a job behind the shelter's counter does not substantially bolster their non-homeless identities.

The people that have been on the street for the shortest time may have the most network relationships and be most apt to perceive themselves as being able to get off the streets. This argument parallels Hertzberg's argument about resistors. These people may be channeled into activities that will help to strengthen weakened links or re-establish broken network ties.

The more time on the streets the more damage may occur to a person's network. The more people perceive their life circumstances (situations) as changed, then these perceptions become real in their consequences. Transitions in identity from "normal" to homeless probably occurs gradually. An increase in time on the street increases the probability that more conventional roles will be exited and the more roles associated with being homeless will be adopted (e.g., the role of alcoholic, drug user, panhandler, ex-con, etc.). These roles might be used as strategies. For example , if someone on the street needed meals and a warm place they might take the role of an alcoholic. Using this role might gain them entrance into a DRI facility.

The longer people are on the streets the less likely they may be to be involved in conventional social roles and the less active their networks may be. Identifying stages may aid homeless care providers and policy makers in developing different types of programs for different subpopulations. Some programs may provide those relatively recent homeless who maintain some role involvements with information, training programs and other types of assistance which may help them to permanently leave the streets. These people may be channeled into support groups which will help to strengthen weakened ties or reestablish role involvement. People who have homeless identities may receive aid in the form of food, shelter, health care needs (like foot care), and other assistance to make their situation more humane.

Research Limitations

Research on the homeless and various other "deviant" populations is difficult to conduct both because of problems drawing "representative samples and assuring respondents answers are complete and accurate. Dr. Nooe who has trained interviewers for various surveys of the homeless instructed interviewers on how best to obtain information. The representativeness of the sample remains an issue. Also, questions may be raised about the data selected for analysis in this report.

The state of Tennessee commissioned the study. The questions were mandated by the state. Various questions were poorly worded. Some questions had poor response choices. And, as with any analysis of secondary data some relationships

could not be explored or explored more fully because appropriate questions were not asked.

The size of the sample limits the generalizability of the findings. While this research may describe these (N=49) homeless people, it may not be indicative of other homeless people. Collecting data primarily from shelter inhabitants limit the representativeness of the data. Unknown to the researcher other factors may have biased the sample which influence external or internal validity.

The interviews of respondents found in different locations were pooled together. Given the small size this was appropriate. In the future researchers might try to identify differences in the characteristics of people found in different locations.

Questions on mental illnesses were not analyzed for this thesis because deinstitutionalization was not a focus of this research. Emphasis was on conventional statuses and roles. However alcohol and legal problems were examined because they were postulated as indicators of stereotypical homeless lifestyle.

LIST OF REFERENCES

LIST OF REFERENCES

Anderson, Nels. 1923. The Hobo: The Sociology of the Homeless Man. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Bahr, Howard and T. Caplow. 1974. Old Men Drunk and Sober. New York: New York University Press.

Bogue, Donald. 1963. Skid Row in American Cities. Community and Family Study Center: University of Chicago.

Burke, Peter and D. Reitzes. 1981. "The Link Between Identity and Role Performance." Social Psychology Quarterly 44:83-92.

Cohen, Carl and J. Sokolovsky. 1989. Old Men of the Bowery: Strategies for Survival Among the Homeless. New York: The Guilford Press

Cooley, Charles. 1902 Human Nature and the Social Order. New York: Scribner's Sons.

Cornelius, Maria. 1991. "Man, Fatally Beaten, Dies Under Truck Rig." Knoxville News-Sentinel: August 24, p.A3.

Crittenden, Kathleen. 1983. "Sociological Aspects of Attribution." Annual Review of Sociology 9:425-446.

Dewey, John. 1930. Human Nature and Conduct: An Introduction to Social Psychology. New York: The Modern Library.

Elliott, Marta and L. Krivo. 1991. "Structural Determinants of Homelessness in the United States." Social Problems 38:113-131.

Garrett, Gerald and R. Schutt 1989. "Homelessness in Massachusetts: Descriptions and Analysis." Pp. 73-89 in Homelessness in the United States, edited by J. Momeni. New York: Greenwood Press.

Gioglio, Gerald. 1989. "Homelessness in New Jersey: The Social Service Network and the People Served." Pp. 113-129 in Homelessness in the United States, edited by J. Momeni. New York: Greenwood Press.

Hamilton, Lee. 1978. "Who is Responsible? Toward a Social Psychology of Responsibility Attribution." Social Psychology 41:316-328.

Harré, Rom and R. Lamb. 1986. The Dictionary of Personality and Social Psychology. Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Heider, Fritz. 1958. The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. New York: Wiley and Sons.

Heiss, Jerold. 1981. "Social Roles." Pp. 94-129 in Social Psychology: Sociological Perspectives, edited by M. Rosenberg, and R. Turner. New York: Basic Books.

Hertzberg, Edwina. 1988. "Homelessness: From the Client's Perspective." Paper presented at the National Symposium on Doctoral Research and Social Work Practice. Columbus, OH.

Hewitt, John. 1979. Self and Society: A Symbolic Interactionist Social Psychology. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Hewstone, Miles (ed.). 1983. Attribution Theory: Social and Functional Extensions. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.

Hoch, Charles. 1986. "Homeless in the United States." Housing Studies 1:228-240.

Hope, Marjorie and J. Young. 1986. The Faces of Homelessness. Lexington: D.C. Heath and Company.

Jahiel, Rene. 1987. "The Situation of Homelessness." Pp. 99-118 in The Homeless In Contemporary Society, edited by R. Bingham, R. Green, and S. White. Beverly Hills, California: Sage.

James, William. 1892. Psychology. New York: Holt and Company.

Jones, Edward, K. Davis, and K. Gergen. 1961. "Role Playing Variations and Their Informational Value for Person Perception." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 63:302-310.

_____. 1972. "Introduction." Pp. ix-xiii in Attribution: Perceiving the Causes of Behavior, edited by E. Jones, D. Kanouse, H. Kelley, R. Nisbett, S. Valins, and B. Weiner. Morristown, New Jersey: General Learning Press.

Kelley, Harold. 1972. "Attribution in Social Interaction." Pp. 1-26 in Attribution: Perceiving the Causes of Behavior, edited by E. Jones, D. Kanouse, H. Kelley, R. Nisbett, S. Valins, and B. Weiner. Morristown, New Jersey: General Learning Press.

_____. 1973. "The Process of Causal Attribution." American Psychologist 28:107-128.

Kivisto, Peter. 1989. "Homelessness in the Frostbelt: The Case of Illinois." Pp. 57-71 in Homelessness in the United States, edited by J. Momeni. New York: Greenwood Press.

Knoxville Coalition for the Homeless. 1986. Homelessness in Knox County. Knoxville, Tennessee.

La Gory, Mark, F. Ritchey, and K. Fitzpatrick. 1991. "Homeless and Affiliation." The Sociological Quarterly 32:201-218.

_____, F. Ritchey, T. O'Donoghue, and J. Mullis. 1989. "Homelessness in Alabama: A Variety of People and Experiences." Pp. 1-20 in Homelessness in the United States, edited by J. Momeni. New York: Greenwood Press.

Lee, Barrett. 1989. "Homeless in Tennessee." Pp. 181-203 in Homelessness in the United States, edited by J. Momeni. New York: Greenwood Press.

_____, S. Jones, and D. Lewis. 1990. "The Public Beliefs About the Causes of Homelessness." Social Forces 69:253-265.

Linton, Ralph. 1945. The Cultural Background of Personality. New York: Appleton-Century Company.

McCall, George. 1987. "The Structure, Content, and Dynamics of Self: Continuities in the Study of Role-Identities." Pp. 133-145 in Self and Identity: Psychosocial Perspectives, edited by K. Yardley and T. Honess. New York: Wiley and Sons.

_____ and J. Simmons. 1966. Identities and Interactions. New York: The Free Press.

McMurry, Dan. 1990. Book Review. Social Forces 69:331-333.

Mead, George. 1934. Mind, Self, and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Meltzer, Bernard, J. Petras, and L. Reynolds. 1975. Pp. 67-75 in Symbolic Interactionism. Boston: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Mills, C. Wright. 1959. The Sociological Imagination. New York: Pelican.

Momeni, Jamshid. 1989. Homeless in the United States: State Surveys, Volume I. New York: Greenwood Press.

Nilson, Linda. 1981. "Reconsidering Ideological Lines: Beliefs About Poverty in America." The Sociological Quarterly 22:531-548.

Nooe, Roger and M. Lynch. 1988a. Homelessness in Knoxville. Knoxville, Community Action Committee.

_____. 1988b. Homelessness Reexamined: A Two Year Follow-up of Homelessness in Knox County. Knoxville: Coalition for the Homeless.

Nooe, Roger and M. Cunningham (Lynch). 1990. Homelessness in Knox County: Revisited. A report prepared for the Knoxville Coalition for the Homeless. Knoxville: Coalition for the Homeless.

Palenzuela, David. 1984. "Critical Evaluation of Locus of Control: Towards a Reconceptualization of the Construct and its Measurement." Psychological Reports 54:683-709.

Raymond, Chris. 1990. "Scholarship on Homeless Gets Increased Attention from Many Sociologists and Psychologists." The Chronicle of Higher Education 36:4-6.

Rivlin, Leanne. 1986. "A New Look at the Homeless." Social Policy 16:3-10.

Rooney, James. 1976. "Friendship and Disaffiliation Among the Skid Row Population." Journal of Gerontology 31:82-88.

Ropers, Richard. 1986. "The Rise of the New Urban Homeless." Public Affairs Report: Bulletin of the Institute of Governmental Studies 26:1-14.

_____ 1988. The Invisible Homeless: A New Urban Ecology. New York: Insight Books.

Rossi, Peter. 1989. Without Shelter: Homelessness in the 1980s. New York: Priority Press Publications.

_____, J. Wright, G. Fisher, and G. Willis. 1987. "The Urban Homeless: Estimating Composition and Size." Science 235:1336-1341.

Roth, Dee and G. Bean. 1986. "New Perspectives on Homelessness: Findings From a Statewide Epidemiological Study." Hospital and Community Psychiatry 37:712-719.

Rotter, Julian. 1966. "Generalized Expectations for Internal versus External Control of Reinforcement." Psychological Monographs 80:1-28.

Ryan, William. 1971. Blaming the Victim. New York: Vintage.

Sarbin, Theodore and V. Allen. 1968. "Role Theory." Pp. 488-567 in The Handbook of Social Psychology, edited by G. Lindzey and E. Aronson. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Snow, David and L. Anderson. 1987. "Identity Work Among the Homeless: The Verbal Construction and Avowal of Personal Identities." American Journal of Sociology 92:1336-1371.

_____, S. Baker, and L. Anderson. 1989. "Criminality and Homeless Men: An Empirical Assessment." Social Problems 36:532-549.

Stryker, Sheldon. 1968. "Identity Salience and Role Performance: The Relevance of Symbolic Interaction Theory for Family Research." Journal of Marriage and the Family 30:558-564.

_____ and A. Gottlieb. 1981. "Attribution Theory and Symbolic Interactionism: A Comparison." Pp. 425-458 in New Directions In Attribution Research, vol. 3, edited by J. Harvey, W. Ickes, and R. Kidd. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

_____. 1987. "Identity Theory: Developments and Extensions." Pp. 89-103 in Self and Identity: Psychosocial Perspectives, edited by K. Yardley and T. Honess. New York: Wiley and Sons.

Thomas, William I. and D. Thomas. 1928. The Child in America. New York: Knopf.

Turner, Ralph. 1978. "The Role and the Person." American Journal of Sociology 84:1-23.

United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW). 1973. "Work in America, A Report of a Special Task Force to the Secretary." Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Wallace, Samuel. 1965. Skid Row as a Way of Life. New Jersey: The Bedminister Press.

Wright, James. 1988. "The Worthy and Unworthy Homeless." Society. July-August 25: 64-69.

_____ 1989. Address Unknown: The Homeless in America. New York: Walter de Gruyter.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

SERVICES PROVIDED IN KNOXVILLE

KNOXVILLE SERVICES

Food and shelter: are provided to the homeless and potential homeless by the: Knoxville Union Rescue Mission; Salvation Army; Volunteers of America (only services families and single women); Volunteer Ministry Center; Family Crisis Center; Serenity Shelter (for battered women); and Runaway Shelter (for youth); established church food distribution programs; and the American Red Cross.

Medical or dental care: is provided by the Knoxville Union Rescue Mission; or the Knox County Health Department. The health department has a 20 day residency requirement.

Alcohol and drug problems: the following institutions help the homeless with substance abuse; CAC (Community Action Committee) Alcoholism Program; Detoxification Rehabilitation Institution (DRI); The Judy Russell House and Agape, Inc. (women only); Alcoholism Services of Knoxville, Inc.; Midway Rehabilitation Center; East Tennessee Intergroup of Alcoholics Anonymous.

Mental health services: Helen Ross McNabb Center; Overlook Center, Inc.; Epilepsy Foundation of Greater Knoxville (medication payment); Green Valley Developmental Center; Knox County Mental Health.

Child and family services: Child and Family Services; Kent C. Withers Family Crisis Center; Columbus House; County Schools/ PTA Clothing Center; Holston United Methodist Home for Children; Second Start.

Housing: KCDC (provides low-income families/persons with permanent housing).

General information, referral, or other: CAC Homeless Program (many specific services offered depending on the need); Catholic Social Services; United Way; Knox County General Assistance Office; Legal Aid Society; UT Legal Clinic; Knoxville Travelers Aid Society; Veterans Administration Project for Homeless Veterans.

APPENDIX B

CODE BOOK: KNOXVILLE DATA

CODE 98= RESPONSE NOT NECESSARY
IDNUM

VG I. GENDER OF RESPONDENT
(01) Male
(02) Female
(03) Unable to Determine

VR II. RACE OF RESPONDENT
(01) Black
(02) White
(03) Asian
(04) Unknown
(05) Other, Specify
RECODED-RACE
1 = WHITE
2 = NON-WHITE

V1 Q1. WERE YOU BORN IN TENNESSEE?
(01) NO
(02) YES
(96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER

V4 Q4. AS OF TODAY, DO YOU HAVE SOME PLACE HERE IN THIS COUNTY THAT YOU CONSIDER HOME OR PLACE WHERE YOU LIVE?
(01) NO (GO TO Q. 8)
(02) YES (GO TO Q. 5)
(96) DON'T KNOW (GO TO Q. 5)
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER (GO TO Q. 5)

V5 Q5. WOULD THAT PLACE BE
(01) A ROOM
(02) AN APARTMENT
(03) A HOUSE
(04) A SHELTER
(05) THE STREETS
(06) AN ABANDONED BUILDING
(07) GRAVEYARD
(96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER

V6 Q6. WHO'S PLACE WOULD YOU SAY THAT IS?

(01) PARENTS
(02) OTHER RELATIVES
(03) FRIEND'S
(04) SOMEONE ELSE'S, SPECIFY
(05) TEMPORARY SELF PAY (60 DAYS AND LESS)
(06) TEMPORARY SELF PAY (60 DAYS AND MORE)-TERMINATE INTERVIEW
(96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER

V7 Q7. HOW OFTEN DO YOU USE THAT PLACE FOR SLEEPING?

(01) EVERYDAY
(02) ALMOST EVERYDAY
(03) ONCE OR TWICE A WEEK
(04) LESS THAN A WEEK
(96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER

RECODED-USE
1 = FREQUENTLY
2 = INFREQUENTLY

V8 Q8. WHERE DO YOU USUALLY SLEEP?

(01) SHELTER/MISSION
(02) STREET, PARK, OR OTHER OPEN SPACE
(03) PUBLIC PLACE/BUILDING
(04) HOTEL/MOTEL
(05) ABANDONED BUILDING
(06) CAR OR TRUCK
(07) JAIL/WORKHOUSE
(08) RELATIVE OR FRIEND'S PLACE
(09) 6,8
(10) HIS HOME
(11) ON ROAD BETWEEN I-40 AND I-75
(12) 2, ALONG THE RIVER
(13) 2, GRAVEYARD
(14) 1,2,5
(96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER

RECODED-SLEEP
1 = SHELTER
2 = NON SHELTER

V9 Q9. WHERE DID YOU SLEEP LAST NIGHT?

(01) SHELTER/MISSION
(02) STREET, PARK, OR OTHER OPEN SPACE
(03) PUBLIC PLACE/BUILDING
(04) HOTEL/MOTEL
(05) ABANDONED BUILDING
(06) CAR OR TRUCK
(07) JAIL/WORKHOUSE
(08) RELATIVE OR FRIEND'S PLACE
(09) ALONG I-75
(10) 2, ALONG THE RIVER
(11) 1,5
(12) 2, GRAVEYARD

RECODED-LAST
1 = SHELTER
2 = NON SHELTER

V10 Q10. WHAT WAS YOUR MOST IMPORTANT REASON FOR COMING TO THIS COUNTY?

(01) BORN HERE
(02) FAMILY
(03) FRIENDS
(04) JOB RELATED
(05) NATIVE
(06) STRANDED
(07) TRAVELING
(08) WEATHER
(09) GET AWAY FROM HUSBAND
(10) CAME TO GET INCOME TAX FORMS
(11) STRANDED, OUT OF MONEY
(12) STRANDED, WENT TO HIGH SCHOOL HERE
(13) RELIGIOUS REASONS
(14) I THOUGHT I WOULDN'T DRINK
(15) EDUCATION
(16) PAROLED TO SHELTER
(17) 2,4
(18) SOMETHING DIFFERENT
(19) START NEW LIFE
(20) JUST RIDING AROUND DRINKING AND DECIDED TO COME TO TN
(96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER

RECODED-REASONS

1 = ATTRACTIONS-CHOSE TO COME HERE
2 = CHANCE / CIRCUMSTANCE
3 = LONG TERM / NATIVE

V11 Q11. WHAT IS YOUR MARITAL STATUS?

(01) MARRIED
(02) SINGLE
(03) SEPARATED
(04) DIVORCED
(05) WIDOWED
(96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER

RECODED-MRTLSTAT

1 = SINGLE
2 = MARRIED / SEPARATED
3 = DIVORCED / WIDOWED

V12 Q12. DO YOU HAVE ANY CHILDREN?

(01) NO
(02) YES
(96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER

V16 Q16. IS YOUR FAMILY WITH YOU NOW?

(01) NO
(02) YES
(96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER

V17 Q17. DO YOU HAVE FRIENDS IN THIS AREA WHO ARE NOT HOMELESS?

(01) NO
(02) YES
(96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER

V18D,W,M,Y Q18. **WHEN WAS THE LAST TIME YOU CONTACTED THEM?**

(01) ___DAYS
(02) ___WEEKS
(03) ___MONTHS
(04) ___YEARS
(96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER

RECODE-
1 = FREQUENTLY
2 = INFREQUENTLY

V19 Q19. **DO YOU HAVE FAMILY IN THIS AREA WHO ARE NOT HOMELESS?**

(01) NO
(02) YES
(96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER

V20D,W,M,Y Q20. **WHEN WAS THE LAST TIME YOU CONTACTED THEM?**

(01) ___DAYS
(02) ___WEEKS
(03) ___MONTHS
(04) ___YEARS
(96) DON'T KNOW **RECODE- 1=FREQUENTLY**
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER**2= INFREQUENTLY**

V25 Q25. **HAVE YOU EVER SERVED TIME IN A STATE OR FEDERAL PRISON?**

(01) NO
(02) YES
(96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER

V26 Q26. HAVE YOU EVER SERVED TIME IN A CITY OR COUNTY JAIL?

(01) NO
(02) YES
(96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER

V27 Q27. HAVE YOU EVER SERVED TIME IN A WORKHOUSE?

(01) NO
(02) YES
(96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER

SERVE V28 Q28. WHY DID YOU HAVE TO SERVE TIME?

(01) THIEF
(02) CRIMES AGAINST PEOPLE/PERSON
(03) DESTRUCTION OF PROPERTY
(04) ALCOHOL RELATED
(05) DRUG RELATED
(06) DISORDERLY CONDUCT
(07) 1,4,5,6
(08) 1,4,6
(09) LARCENY
(10) 1,4
(11) BAD CHECKS, 4
(12) 4,6
(13) 1,2,3
(14) 2,4,5,6
(15) 4,5
(16) ARMED ROBBERY
(17) 4,6, KIDNAPPING
(18) DRIVING W/O A LICENSE BECAUSE I HAD NO PLACE TO STAY, (LIVING IN CAR)
(96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER

RECODE-
(1) = SUBSTANCE ABUSE
(2) = OTHER CRIMES
(3) = 98

V29 Q29. DO YOU CONSIDER YOURSELF AN ALCOHOLIC?

(01) NO
(02) YES
(03) RECOVERING
(96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER

V30 Q30. DO YOU HAVE A DRINKING PROBLEM?

(01) NO
(02) SOME
(03) YES
(96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER

V31 Q31. HAVE YOU EVER BEEN A PATIENT OF A DETOXIFICATION OR TREATMENT CENTER FOR ALCOHOLIC OR DRUG ABUSE?

(01) NO (GO TO Q. 36)
(02) YES (GO TO Q. 32)
(96) DON'T KNOW (GO TO Q. 36)
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER (GO TO Q. 36)

V52 Q52. ARE YOU WORKING NOW?

(01) NO
(02) YES
(96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER

V54D,W,M,Y Q54. **HOW LONG HAVE YOU BEEN DOING THIS KIND OF WORK?**

(01) ___DAYS
(02) ___WEEKS
(03) ___MONTHS
(04) ___YEARS (96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER

RECODE-WORK
(1) = LE 6 MONTHS
(2) = GT 1 YEAR

V56 Q56. IF NO, WHAT ARE SOME REASONS THAT YOU ARE NOT WORKING NOW?

(01) GOT FIRED FROM LAST JOB
(02) NOBODY WILL HIRE ME
(03) CAN'T FIND A JOB
(04) DON'T WANT TO WORK
(05) ALCOHOL/DRUG RELATED
(06) DISABLED, SPECIFIED
(07) GOT SICK/HEALTH REASONS
(08) TOO OLD
(09) NO PHONE
(10) NO TRANSPORTATION
(11) CHILD CARE,10
(12) 2,7
(13) NOT TRAINED
(14) 3, WAITING FOR AN OPENING
(15) 3,10
(16) 2,3
(17) GOING HOME
(18) 3,9,10
(19) AGE,10
(20) 4,5
(21) PAROLED HERE-NOT ALLOWED FOR 30 DAYS
(22) 5, DRUG PROGRAM AT SHELTER
(23) 6,7
(24) LAID OFF
(25) 8,6
(26) VOLUNTEERING
(27) GOING TO SCHOOL FULL TIME
(28) 2,3,9,10
(29) WANTED TO SEE THE COUNTRY
(30) ON THE ROAD
(96) DON'T KNOW (GO TO Q. 58)
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER (GO TO Q. 58)

RECODED-NOTWORK

1 = WITHDRAWN / DRUGS, DOESN'T WANT TO, SOMETHING ELSE
2 = JOBS NOT AVAILABLE, LOST JOB
3 = PERSONAL CIRCUMSTANCES MAKING EMPLOYMENT DIFFICULT

V57D,W,M,Y Q57. **HOW LONG AGO WAS THE LAST TIME YOU WERE EMPLOYED OR WORKED FOR PAY?**

(01) ___DAYS
(02) ___WEEKS
(03) ___MONTHS
(04) ___YEARS
(05) NEVER BEEN EMPLOYED (GO TO Q. 61)
(96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER

RECODED-EMPLYD

(1) = LE 12 MONTHS
(2) = GT 12 LE 24 MONTHS
(3) = GT 24 MONTHS

V58 Q58. WHAT IS YOUR USUAL LINE OF WORK?

(01) WAITRESS MAID
(02) ARTIST
(03) TRUCKER
(04) LABORER
(05) PIPE FITTER
(06) PAINTER
(07) SALES
(08) 3, MECHANIC
(09) LOGGER
(10) COOK
(11) CARPENTER
(12) SEAMSTRESS
(13) LIVE IN HOUSE KEEPER
(14) NURSING HOME DIETARY DIRECTOR
(15) CONSTRUCTION
(16) JANITORIAL
(17) INSURANCE AGENT
(18) MINISTRY/STUDENT
(19) WELDER
(20) MECHANIC OR SECURITY
(21) CAB DRIVER
(22) CARNIVALS
(23) RESTAURANT MANAGEMENT
(24) 10,3
(25) PRACTICAL NURSE
(26) HANG DRYWALL AND MUD
(95) NO USUAL LINE OF WORK (GO TO Q.61)
(96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER

RECODED-LINE

1 = CONSTRUCTION, BUILDING
2 = SERVICE
3 = OTHER

V61 Q61. **ARE YOU PRESENTLY LOOKING FOR WORK?**

(01) NO (GO TO Q. 64)
(02) YES (GO TO Q. 62)
(96) DON'T KNOW (GO TO Q. 64)
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER (GO TO Q. 64)

V62 Q62. **HOW OFTEN ARE YOU ABLE TO FIND WORK?**

(01) NONE
(02) ONCE PER WEEK
(03) TWO OR MORE TIMES PER WEEK
(04) ONCE PER MONTH
(05) TWO OR MORE TIMES PER MONTH
(06) ONCE EVERY 2-6 MONTHS
(96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER

RECODE-FIND
(1) = FREQUENTLY
(2) = INFREQUENTLY

V63 Q63. **HOW DO YOU FIND OUT WHO IS HIRING?**

(01) JOB SERVICE
(02) NEWSPAPER
(03) WORD OF MOUTH
(04) BY WALKING AROUND
(05) PEOPLE ASKING
(06) PICKED UP
(07) JOB SITE
(08) LABOR POOL
(09) 2,4
(10) 1,2,5
(11) 1,2,4
(12) 1,3
(13) 1,3,4
(14) 1,2
(15) 2,3,4
(16) 3,4

RECODE-HIRE

1 = ACTIVELY PURSUING / ACCOUNTABLE TO SOMEONE
2 = PURSUING / SELF RELIANT
3 = 98

JOBS V64 Q64. **ON THE AVERAGE HOW LONG DO YOUR JOBS USUALLY LAST?**

(01) 1 DAY OR LESS
(02) 1 WEEK OR LESS
(03) 1 MONTH OR LESS
(04) 1 YEAR OR LESS
(05) MORE THAN A YEAR
(06) NEVER HAD A JOB (GO TO Q. 66)

RECODED-JOBS
1 = LE 1 MONTH
2 = GT 1 MONTH LE 1 YEAR
3 = GT 1 YEAR

V66 Q66. WHERE DO YOU USUALLY EAT?

(01) EAT OUT
(02) PURCHASE FOR HOME USE
(03) MEALS FROM AGENCIES, CHURCHES, SHELTERS, MISSIONS
(04) HANDOUTS
(05) WITH RELATIVES
(06) WITH FRIENDS
(07) OTHER SPECIFY

RECODE-EAT
(1) = SHELTER
(2) = OTHER

V67 Q67. **DURING THE PAST 30 DAYS, HAVE YOU RECEIVED ANY MONEY, CHECKS, OR VOUCHERS FROM:**

(01) FULL-TIME OR PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT?
(02) RELATIVES OR FRIENDS?
(03) PENSION?
(04) SOCIAL SECURITY?
(05) SSI (DISABILITY CHECK)?
(06) THE VETERAN'S ADMINISTRATION?
(07) FOOD STAMPS?
(08) AFDC-WELFARE CHECK?
(09) OTHER SOCIAL SERVICES AGENCIES?
(10) GIVING PLASMA OR BLOOD?
(11) CHURCHES OR MISSIONS?
(12) TRADING OR SWAPPING THINGS WITH OTHER PEOPLE?
(13) PANHANDLE
(14) RECEIVED NONE OF THE ABOVE
(15) 2,7
(16) 1,7,10,CANS
(17) 1,7,11
(18) 1,7,10
(19) 7,10
(20) 13
(21) 6,10
(22) 1,2
(23) 1,2,7
(24) 1,9, WIFE WORKS
(25) STATE-PAROLED
(26) 1,13
(27) 1,10
(28) WORKMAN'S COMPENSATION
(29) 11,12, GIRLFRIEND
(30) 13,10
(96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER

RECODE-MONEY

1 = EMPLOYMENT
2 = GOVERNMENT
3 = SURVIVAL MONEY
4 = OTHER

V68 Q68. **WHAT WAS YOUR TOTAL INCOME RECEIVED WITHIN THE PAST 30 DAYS? (IF DON'T KNOW/REFUSE TO ANSWER, CODE 9999).**

LISTED BY INCOME

RECODED-INCOME
1 = LE 100
2 = GT 100 LE 500
3 = GT 500

V69 Q69. **HOW LONG WOULD YOU SAY YOU'VE BEEN HOMELESS?**

(01) ___DAYS
(02) ___WEEKS
(03) ___MONTHS
(04) ___YEARS
(96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER

RECODED-TIMEST (BY MONTHS)
1 = LE 3
2 = GT 3 LE 36
3 = GT 36

V70 Q70. **DID YOU CHOOSE THIS LIFE STYLE?**

(01) NO
(02) YES
(96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER

V71 Q71. WHAT CAUSED YOU TO BE HOMELESS?

(01) LOSS OF HOUSING
(02) LANDLORD KICKED ME OUT (EVICTED)
(03) FAMILY/FRIENDS KICKED ME OUT
(04) NO MONEY FOR HOUSING
(05) BURNOUT VICTIM
(06) LOSS OF JOB/NO MONEY
(07) JOB PRESENTLY PAYS TO LOW
(08) UNABLE TO KEEP A JOB
(09) DRINKING PROBLEM
(10) DRUG PROBLEM
(11) PHYSICAL HANDICAP/MEDICAL REASONS
(12) MENTAL/EMOTIONAL HANDICAPS
(13) LACK OF EDUCATION
(14) FAMILY BREAK-UP/DIVORCE
(15) PREFER IT (BY CHOICE)
(16) TRAVELING
(17) 3,4,6
(18) ATTITUDE
(19) 9, GIRLFRIENDS
(20) 8,9
(21) 9,14
(22) STRANDED
(23) 4,11
(24) 6,13
(25) RIPPED OFF
(26) PRISON
(27) PEOPLE HASSLING
(28) 1,4,6,8,9,11,12,14
(29) 7,8
(30) 8,9,14
(31) 3,4
(32) 2, CITY WILL NOT ALLOW ME TO LIVE ALONE. OVER 65.
(96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER

RECODE-CAUSE

(1) = HOUSING PROBLEMS
(2) = FAMILY / FRIENDS
(3) = TROUBLE
(4) = OTHER

V73 Q73. **IN WHAT YEAR WERE YOU BORN?**

LISTED BY AGE

(96) DON'T KNOW
(97) REFUSE TO ANSWER
RECODED-AGE
1 = LE 35
2 = 36 - 50
3 = GT 51

V74 Q74. **HOW MANY YEARS OF SCHOOL DID YOU COMPLETE?**

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 COLLEGE 13 14 15 16 GRAD SCHOOL
RECODED-SCHOOL
(1) = DID NOT FINISH PUBLIC SCHOOL
(2) = COMPLETED PUBLIC SCHOOL
(3) = SOME COLLEGE

APPENDIX C

SELECTED QUESTIONS
ITEMS FROM HOMELESS INTERVIEW MAY OF 1988
SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE

QUESTIONS

I. Gender of respondent
II. Race of respondent
Q1. Were you born in Tennessee?
Q4. As of today, do you have some place here in this county that you consider home or place where you live?
Q5. Where would that place be?
Q6. Who's place would you say that is?
Q7. How often do you use that place for sleeping?
Q8. Where do you usually sleep?
Q9. Where did you sleep last night?
Q10. The most important reason for coming to this county?
Q11. What is your marital status?
Q12. Do you have any children?
Q16. Is your family with you now?
Q17. Do you have friends in this area who are not homeless?
Q18. When was the last time you contacted them?
Q19. Do you have family in this area who are not homeless?
Q20. When was the last time you contacted them?
Q25. Have you ever served time in a state or federal prison?
Q26. Have you ever served time in a city or county jail?
Q27. Have you ever served time in a workhouse?
Q28. Why did you have to serve time?
Q29. Do you consider yourself an alcoholic?
Q30. Do you have a drinking problem?
Q31. Have you ever been a patient of a detoxification or treatment center for alcoholic or drug abuse?
Q52. Are you working now?
Q54. How long have you been doing this kind of work?
Q56. If no, what are some reasons that you are not working now?
Q57. How long ago was the last time you were employed or worked for pay?
Q58. What is your usual line of work?
Q61. Are you presently looking for work?
Q62. How often are you able to find work?
Q63. How do you find out who is hiring?
Q64. How long do your jobs usually last?
Q66. Where do you usually eat?
Q67. During the past 30 days, have you received any money,checks, or vouchers from: (list)

Q68. What was your total income received within the past 30 days?
Q69. How long would you say you've been homeless?
Q70. Did you choose this lifestyle?
Q71. What caused you to be homeless?
Q73. In what year were you born?
Q74. How many years of school did you complete?

VITA

Michael Séan Mills was born in Brooklyn, New York on December 7, 1957. He lived in Long Island until he was 16 when his family moved to Oxford, New York. After graduating High School in 1975, he joined the Air Force. When his four years were completed he began his college career. He attended five different colleges in four different states. His Bachelor of Arts degree was achieved from Lee College in Cleveland, Tennessee in May of 1988. In August of 1988, he began course work for the Master of Arts in the Sociology Department. This degree was awarded by the University of Tennessee, Knoxville in December of 1991.

While in graduate school, he was elected by his peers as the President of the Graduate Student Organization. In 1990 he co-authored an article for the Journal of Crime and Delinquency. From 1990 to 1991 he worked as a research assistant for the International Society for the Study of Social Problems.