Survey method

Internet survey on the experience of homelessness and housing exclusion

‡ Surveyor

- ‡ The National Homelessness Support Network, a nonprofit organization (NPO).
- ‡ Kakita and Goto were members of the survey.

‡ Survey method

- ‡ We conducted an Internet survey on the experience of homelessness and housing exclusion at a panel held by a research firm.
- ‡ Dates on which survey was conducted: March 9 -17, 2021.
- ‡ First stage - screening survey: A total of 39,998 respondents stratified by region were selected from approximately 140,000 persons aged 18 years or older in 14 prefectures, including large urban areas, and were asked whether they had experienced homelessness and housing exclusion.
- ‡ Second stage - questionnaire survey: Among the respondents found to have experienced homelessness and housing exclusion in the first stage of the screening survey, 725 respondents who had experienced homelessness and housing exclusion within the past five years were selected. The questionnaire asked where they lived when they experienced homelessness and housing exclusion (e.g., living rough, living temporarily with friends, Internet cafe).

Survey results (1)

Internet survey: First stage screening survey

‡We conducted an Internet survey on the experience of homelessness and housing exclusion.

‡We received responses from 39,998 participants above the age of 18 in 14 high-population prefectures, thus targeting approximately 140,000 people.

‡Of them, 2,061 (5.2%) had experienced homelessness and housing exclusion; this rate is similar to the rate reported in results of studies conducted in Europe and the United States.

Survey results (2)

Internet survey: Second stage questionnaire survey

‡Thereafter, from among these 2,061 respondents, we administered a questionnaire to 725 individuals who had experienced homelessness and housing exclusion in the five years before the survey.

‡The characteristics of those who had experienced homelessness and housing exclusion in the five years prior to the survey are shown below .

Sex	Male	52.3%
	Female	47.7%
Age (at the time of the survey)	<40	44.5%
	40-49	22.9%
	50-59	20.6%
	O”	11.9%

Survey results (3)

Internet survey: Second stage questionnaire survey

‡The place where homelessness and housing exclusion was experienced within the past five years (multiple answers) were categorized as follows:

Category	Concrete Example	%(multiple)	Applying to ETHOS
1) Informal sector	Living temporarily with acquaintances and friends	45.9	8.1
2) For-profit sector	Living in employee dormitories	30.9	-
	Internet cafes	26.9	-
	Capsule hotels	24.8	-
	24-hour fast food restaurants	21.1	-
3) Public or Non-profit sector	Living in free and low rent hostels using public assistance benefit	24.6	3 & 4.1 & 7
	Shelters and hostels for homeless people	22.1	2.1 & 3
	Living in welfare institutions using public assistance benefit	18.1	3 & 4.1 & 7
4) Living rough	Living in the streets or public spaces	19.7	1.1

Surveyresults (4)

Overviewand typology ofhomelessness and housing exclusion in Japan

Stable Housing

Living in owned house, rental housing

Homelessness and Housing Exclusion

Informal Sector

Living temporarily with acquaintances and friends

For-profit Sector

Living in employee dormitory, Internet cafe, capsule hotel, 24 -hour fast food restaurant, etc.

Public or Non-profit Sector

Living in free and low rent hostel, hospital, night shelter, homeless hostel , etc.

Living Rough (statutory homelessness)

Living in the streets or public spaces

Surveyresults (5)

Percentage offirst experience place (single answer)of homelessness and housing exclusion

(Adding "other" (14.1%) to these four figures brings the total to 100%.)

Stable Housing

Living in owned house, rental housing

Main target of conventional measures for homelessness

Homelessness and Housing Exclusion

Informal Sector

32.3%

Living temporarily with acquaintances and friends

For-profit Sector

38.5%

Living in employee dormitory, Internet cafe, capsule hotel, 24 -hour fast food restaurant, etc.

Public or Non-profit Sector

10.1%

Living in free and low rent hostel, hospital, night shelter, homeless hostel , etc.

Living Rough (statutory homelessness)

5.1%

Living in the streets or public spaces

Discussion (1)

Characteristics of this study

‡In Japan, the definition of homelessness is limited to "living rough." Japanese government statistics and existing studies do not sufficiently clarify various forms of homelessness and housing exclusion other than living rough.

‡Therefore, this study attempted to grasp the overall picture and characteristics of homelessness and housing exclusion in Japan based on broader concepts such as ETHOS.

‡In this study , we conducted an Internet survey by asking about the experience of homelessness and housing exclusion. This was a challenging research , unprecedented in Japan.

- ‡To the best of our knowledge, this study determined, for the first time, that the rate of homelessness and housing exclusion in Japan is 5.2%. This rate was found to be similar to that reported in studies conducted in Europe and the United States.

Discussion (2)

Major forms of homelessness and housing exclusion in Japan

‡1) Informal Sector: Living temporarily with acquaintances and friends

- ‡Of those who experienced homelessness and housing exclusion within the past five years, 45.9% reported living temporarily with acquaintances and friends. This informal sector is the most major form of homelessness and housing exclusion in Japan.
- ‡While it is possible to emphasize the importance of measures such as ensuring stable housing, people living in the informal sector tends to be invisible, making it difficult to identify their needs and provide support.

‡2) For-profit Sector: Living in employee dormitories, Internet cafe, etc.

- ‡Employee dormitories, Internet cafes, capsule hotels, and 24-hour fast food restaurants each account for 20%-30% of the homelessness experience (multiple answers). These forms of for-profit sector are also major forms of homelessness and housing exclusion in Japan.
- ‡There is no category in ETHOS this form of homelessness can fall into. Are for-profit sector residential forms not considered in ETHOS because they pay their own fees to secure their own accommodation?
- ‡Regarding homelessness and housing exclusion in the for-profit sector, a study on boarding houses in New Zealand is helpful.
  - ‡Amore et al. (2011): Shelter in such boarding houses in New Zealand will qualify as homelessness according to the ETHOS conceptual model (weaker tenancy right and low level of privacy).

Discussion (3-1)

Comparing our survey with the government's national surveys

- Survey methodology
  - Our survey: The target population comprised those who experienced homelessness and housing exclusion within the past five years.
  - National survey: Conducted every four to five years. Interviews are conducted with people living rough at the time of the survey. The latest survey was conducted in November 2021 (N=1,169).
- Results of the comparison (1): Focusing on differences in survey targets
  - The national survey is significantly skewed in terms of sex and age, as it only covers people living rough, many of whom are older men. In contrast, our survey was able to identify homelessness and housing exclusion among women, and young and middle-aged people, who have been overlooked in the government's national survey.

		National Survey (2021) (%) (living rough)	Our Survey (2021) (%) (homelessness and housing exclusion)
Sex	Male	95.8	52.3
	Female	4.2	47.7
Age (at the time of the survey)	<40	2.8	44.6
	40-49	7.5	22.9
	50-59	19.6	20.7
	60-69	35.6	8.6
	O70	34.4	3.3

Discussion (3-2)

Comparing our survey with the government's national surveys

‡ Results of the comparison (2): Focusing on differences in grasping methods

- ‡ The results of our survey, which asked about experiences of homelessness and housing exclusion, and limited its analysis to those living rough, showed that we were able to identify women, young and middle-aged people, and people living rough for short period of time.
- ‡ The national survey is conducted on the specific dates every four to five years. As a result, the respondents to the survey majorly comprise older men who have been living rough for a relatively long period of time.
- ‡ Our survey, which asked about past experiences, was able to grasp a wide range of attributes of people living rough. The difference between the results of the national survey and our survey is obvious.

		National Survey (2021) (%) (living rough)	Our Survey (2021) (%) (living rough)
Sex	Male	95.8	72.7
	Female	4.2	27.3
Age (at the time of the survey)	<40	2.8	52.4
	40-49	7.5	29.4
	50-59	19.6	11.2
	60-69	35.6	4.9
	O"	34.4	2.1

		National Survey (2021) (%) (living rough)	Our Survey (2021) (%) (living rough)
Period of living rough experience	<1 month	7.2	43.4
	1-3 months	4.3	17.5
	3-6 months	3.6	11.9
	6 months-1 year	5.2	7.7
	1-3 years	11.4	7.0
	3-5 years	9.2	3.5
	5-10 years	19.1	3.5
	O" \ H D U V	40.0	5.6

Discussion (4-1)

The significance of this study

‡Significance of understanding the actual situation

- ‡This study was able to grasp the overall picture of homelessness and housing exclusion in Japan based on broader concepts such as ETHOS and disseminate it internationally.
- ‡The study revealed that the informal and for-profit sectors are the main forms of homelessness and housing exclusion in Japan, and that women and young and middle-aged people account for a certain percentage of individuals experiencing homelessness and housing exclusion. This is a different picture from the one obtained by the government surveys.

‡Methodological implications of surveying experiences of homelessness and housing exclusion

- ‡The method of surveying past experiences can be useful in identifying homelessness and housing exclusion conditions that are difficult to identify in practice, such as staying at a friend's house or in an Internet cafe.
- ‡Even when the analysis is limited to experiences of living rough, it is possible to point out the limitation of the method of the national survey, which is conducted one day in a year. In our survey, we were able to understand situations of people living rough that included women, young and middle-aged people, and people living rough for a short period of time by surveying their experiences.

Discussion (4-2)

The significance of this study

‡Policy Significance

- ‡The study revealed a homelessness and housing exclusion situation not covered by Japan's conventional homelessness measures.
- ‡By considering people other than those living rough, we can gain a perspective on preventing people falling into living rough and emphasize the importance of including people other than those living rough in the target population of policies.

Discussion (5)

Study limitations and remaining issues

‡The limitations of our study

- ‡The use of private survey panels.
- ‡The sample bias due to being an Internet-mediated survey.
- ‡The survey was limited to 14 prefectures, including metropolitan areas.
- ‡Difficulty in estimating homelessness and housing exclusion in Japan.

‡Remaining issues

- ‡In this study, we were able to grasp the overall picture and characteristics of homelessness and housing exclusion in Japan. Based on the study results, we would like to carry out an international comparison using categories such as living rough and living temporarily with acquaintances and friends in the future.
  - ‡A useful study for comparison by category is that by Busch-Geertsema et al. (2014).

References

‡ Amore, K. et al., 2011, The ETHOS Definition and Classification of Homelessness: An Analysis, *European Journal of Homelessness* , 5(2).

‡ Baptista, I. & Marlier, E., 2019, *Fighting Homelessness and Housing Exclusion in Europe: A Study of National Policies* , European Social Policy Network (ESPN).

‡ Busch-Geertsema, V. et al., 2014, *Extent and Profile of Homelessness in European Member States: A Statistical Update* (EOH Comparative Studies on Homelessness, No 4), European Observatory on Homelessness.

‡ Edgar, B., 2012, The ETHOS Definition and Classification of Homelessness and Housing Exclusion, *European Journal of Homelessness* , 6(2).

‡ Goto, H., Culhane, D. P., & Marr, M. D., 2022, Why Street Homelessness Has Decreased in Japan: A Comparison of Public Assistance in Japan and the US, *European Journal of Homelessness* , 16(1).

‡ . D N L W D < * X U$— E D U X V K L W H Q Z R P D M L H W H 1 L K R Q Q R K$— [Reexamining on Homelessness and Housing Exclusion in Japan through Global Perspective] *Oosaka hoken'i zasshi* .

‡ OECD (Social Policy Division: Directorate of Employment, Labour and Social Affairs), 2021, HC3.1 HOMELESS POPULATION, Last updated on 27/05/2021.

‡ Toro, P. A., et al., 2007, Homelessness in Europe and the United States: A Comparison of Prevalence and Public Opinion, *Journal of Social Issues* , 63(3).

Acknowledgment

‡This work was supported by Grants -in-Aid for Scientific Research.

‡Fostering Joint International Research (B)
Grant Number: JP19KK0047 (Soshiro Yamada).

‡Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C)
Grant Number: JP17K04206 (Yusuke Kakita).