

Outcomes of living in a self managed shelter

Author(s)

Huber, Max

Publication date

2015

License

CC BY

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Huber, M. (2015). *Outcomes of living in a self managed shelter*. Paper presented at European Research Conference, Copenhagen, Denmark.

**General rights**

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please contact the library: <https://www.amsterdamuas.com/library/contact/questions>, or send a letter to: University Library (Library of the University of Amsterdam and Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences), Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Outcomes of living in a self managed shelter

Max Huber, Amsterdam School of
Social Work

Context



- In 2008 Your Own Place (Je Eigen Stek, JES) started: a self managed shelter for and by homeless people
- In 2013 JES and the municipality of Amsterdam wanted to do a follow up on former residents
- This project is part of larger research program focussing on self managed residential programs

Self managed homeless shelter



- JES has room for 16 residents, who can stay as long as they need. Entrance and exit is decided by the group of residents
- The residents are in charge: from deciding to expand the program to who is responsible for the groceries
- JES offers residents space, time and stability
- Social worker & peer worker facilitate individuals, group and project
- Primary goal: helping homeless towards a home

Research focus

How are former residents of JES doing and how did they experience the self management of JES?

Participatory design (co-creation)



- Former and current residents of JES were involved in:
 - the design of the research,
 - the development and finetuning of the structured qualitative questionnaires,
 - providing factual background information,
 - recruitment of respondents,
 - the interviews (together with social work students),
 - fine tuning the analysis & formulating the conclusion and recommendations.
- The questionnaire is based on literature, the 'selfsufficiency matrix' and input from (former) residents

Response

- total population ex-residents = 68
- 32 reached via phone, 22 participated
- 2 gave a short statement over the phone on their experiences and their reason for not cooperating (nothing good to say)
- 35 former residents were not reached via phone
- Mail (when possible), searching via internet and employing the snowball method did not result in more results

Gender, age & length of stay

- Mostly male residents, 27-70 years old
- Over time the average age is declining
- 25 former residents (1/3) stayed less than six months or not at all
- The other 43 former residents stayed on average for 12-14 months
- 1 resident came back for a second stay, three residents are long stayers (4-6 years)



Housing directly after JES

- 14 residents found housing on their own
- 24 residents moved on to housing via JES
- 14 residents were asked to leave because of unacceptable behavior
- 16 residents unknown



Non-responders



Description of non-responders

- 19 (of the 25) short stayers (<six months) did not participate
- Residents from the first period are overrepresented in the non-responders group, partly explained by lacking registration
- 11 (of the 14) residents who were asked to leave were not reached

Housing situation of non-responders

- Around half of the short stayers appears to have found stable housing, sometimes after another period of homelessness
- The majority of those who stayed longer have found stable housing

Outcomes

What did they hope to achieve?

“What I got now: my own house, hopefully soon a regular income, my debt repayment finally started”

- Mostly practical expectations: shelter, working on debts, getting a house
- Only a few chose self management on purpose



How are they doing?

“.... I’ve got a partner, a house and a job. The prospect of a better life, a purpose.”

- Most respondents report an increase in their quality of life, especially in their financial and housing situation
- Some report an increase in their social, functional and clinical recovery (less substance abuse, better mental & physical health)
- Questions on personal recovery were deflected



Social recovery

“The longer I stayed at JES, the more I got involved.”

- Participation in JES (meetings, projects)
- During & after JES many started work, paid or unpaid
- Not many social contacts remain from JES (no community)
- Respondents with a shorter history of homelessness have larger social networks



Life after JES

“I think that once we leave JES, we cut through the umbilical cord to quickly”

- Issues with independent living similar to regular housing after homelessness
- Several respondents report issues with:
 - Substance abuse
 - Social contacts
 - Management of small budget



How did they experience self management

*“That I had my own place, my own key.
That I could decide what I did with my
life....the personal freedom that you have.”*



- Most of the respondents were satisfied with their experiences at JES, but.....

Did JES contribute to recovery?

“ If I would have allowed it, JES could have contributed to my development.” “I can take care of myself and I have myself to thank for that”

- Difficult to explain for respondents, except for stability, space and time and for some the practical support
- Three groups: a place to figure your stuff out, enabling niche for recovery, a place to relax



Concluding remarks

- The primary goal of JES appears to be achieved
- Preparation for independent living is under-articulated
- Aftercare needs to be developed
- No sense of community (some don't want it, others miss it)



Limitations to this research

Methodology

- Under- and overrepresented groups
- Recent former residents are over-represented, is their housing sustainable?
- No comparison group (propensity matching might be a solution)
- Participatory design had many benefits, but contributed to uncertainties in analysis:
 - Influence selfmanagement -> recovery
 - Level of issues (substance abuse, mental health) and personal recovery

