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ABSTRACT

INTRODUCTION. Although the right to housing - which essentially equates to housing security - is recognized by the United Nations, there is no single measure of housing security status. In the U.S. various indices are currently require to robustly assess housing security issues of the homeless, of renters and of homeowners.

METHODOLOGY. A proposed Hierarchy of Rental Housing Needs was developed using Constant Comparative Analysis of the Hawai’i Renters Study 2013 dataset, and by comparison of themes across groups.

RESULTS. Themes differentiated two levels of housing security labeled as housing secure and insecure. The insecure classification included the themes of homelessness/at-risk of homelessness, and the tradeoffs between affordability and adequate space. The housing secure classification included themes related to location and landlord, or health and safety issues. Quantification of housing themes verified differences in housing security classification by whether they were happy or unhappy with housing, by Section 8 status and across counties, but not by Native Hawaiian household status.

IMPLICATIONS. Findings indicate that the fundamental experience of housing insecurity is similar across ethnic groups studied, although families due to their size, may prioritize space over affordability. Thus, a more robust measure single measure of housing security may be possible and warranted for policy evaluation. A proposed Hawai’i Housing Security Matrix Measure, is presented for consideration.
Data Collection:
See Part I. of Hawai‘i Renters Survey 2013

Qualitative Data Analysis:
• Constant Comparative Analysis of responses to “Why you were happy (or unhappy)” with your current rental unit?” was refined to 8 housing themes
• Cross tab analysis of themes was compared by Happy with Housing, Section 8, and Native Hawaiian Household status
• The Hierarchy of Rental Housing Needs was specifically aligned with quantitative and qualitative results from of those who they were “Unhappy while on a Section 8 Wait List” (Housing Insecure)

Responses ➔ 8 Housing ➔ 5 Hierarchy ➔ 2 Levels of Housing Security:
Themes ➔ Levels

Secure vs. Insecure
Finding #1. Section 8 Vouchers enhanced housing satisfaction ➔ “Housing Security”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Native Hawaiian</th>
<th>Non-Hawaiian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 8</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wait List</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Happiness with current housing (tantamount to housing security) was significantly associated with having a Section 8 voucher (*Pearson Chi Square* = 79, df = 1, *p* < 0.001) and did not vary with Native Hawaiian household status.

OHA, Hawai‘i Renters Study, 2013. Figure 22, p. 48.
Quantitative analysis of housing themes confirmed differences were linked to “happiness with housing” and household size, not ethnic background.
Happy/unhappy “responses” were basis of hierarchy
Using Constant Comparative Analysis: Quotes -> 8 Themes -> 5 Levels

Responses to “Are you happy with your current rental unit (Yes or No)? Explain why or why not?

“Own home”

“Safety, Pests, Stairs, Asthma”

“Convenient Location”
“Good (or Bad) Landlord”

“Too small. Not affordable. Struggling to pay.”

“Homeless”, “Live in Tent”
“Don’t have home of my home”

OHA, Hawai’i Rental Study, 2013: Methods: pp.23-28; Results, pp.51-59, Appendix F.
Difference explained by how happy (secure) a household was NOT by ethnic differences

84% Secure when Happy on Section 8

70% Insecure: Unhappy on Wait List

Housing Themes

- Multiple Happy
- Safety
- Health
- Location
- Landlord
- Affordability
- Space
- Need Home

Difference between Hawaiians vs. Non-Hawaiians attributable to household size (space vs. affordability)

OHA, Hawai‘i Renters Study, 2013, Figure 25.1-25.2, p. 57.
Differences in the frequency of housing themes reported exist between counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Unhappy with Housing</th>
<th>Happy with Housing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawai‘i</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Need Home - 32%</strong></td>
<td>Good Location – 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Enough Space - 20%</td>
<td>Affordable – 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Affordable - 19%</td>
<td><strong>Need Home – 13%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaua‘i</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Enough Space – 27%</td>
<td>Good Location – 37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Landlord/Old – 19%</strong></td>
<td>Landlord/Old – 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Affordable – 15% + Safety - 15%</strong></td>
<td>Multiple Reasons – 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maui</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Enough Space – 28%</td>
<td>Good Location – 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Need Home – 22%</strong></td>
<td>Affordable – 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Affordable – 19%</td>
<td>Enough Space – 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Enough Space – 26%</td>
<td>Good Location - 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Need Home - 23%</strong></td>
<td>Landlord/Old – 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Landlord/Old – 15%</td>
<td>Multiple Reasons – 19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion. Since housing security is multi-faceted (including aspects of homelessness, affordability, crowdedness, adequacy of the physical, etc.) it is difficult to assess the efficacy of policies designed to promote housing security. Findings suggest that because experience of housing security appears consisted across key ethnic groups a single more robust housing measure is possible. Yet, Hawai‘i - with its unique weather, ethnic diversity & high costs of living - is a unique housing market.

Bottom Line. Although housing security may be a universally similar experience, aspects of housing choices that affect housing security vary by region, leading to different trade-offs in obtaining housing security. Therefore, a region-specific housing security measure may be best to assess the efficacy of housing policies in Hawai‘i.

Possible Next Steps for Research (Based on interest, time and funding)

✓ “Proposed Hawai‘i Housing Security Measure” based on this study, national measures, and similar efforts across the United States
  ▪ Revise based on community feedback and develop a plan to validate.
  ▪ Validate with a diverse sample; finalize measure and classification system
  ▪ Utilize measure to standardize assessment of policy and programs designed to improve housing security.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In-Crisis</td>
<td>a. Homeless (i.e. living on street, car, beach, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Eviction or Foreclosure notice in process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At-Risk</td>
<td>a. Sheltered or institutionally housed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. Subsidized living with family &amp;/or friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter</td>
<td>a. With housing assistance (S-8, public housing, family)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. WithOUT housing assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner</td>
<td>a. Department of Hawaiian Homelands Leasee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. With mortgage (Not DHHL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. Fully paid off (No mortgage: Not DHHL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordability</strong> (Housing costs/Income)</td>
<td><strong>Homeless.</strong> A homeless person could be asked to complete the VP-SPDAT survey instead of these questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>People per room</strong></td>
<td>No choice (shelter, institutional housing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health &amp; Safety</strong></td>
<td>Very Risky: Life threatening (police or ambulance needed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adequacy</strong> (Plumbing, Electrical, Key appliances, Roof)</td>
<td>Severely Inadequate (2+ major unfixable problems)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commute</strong></td>
<td>&gt;60 Minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Levels are conceptually similar with findings of the Hawai‘i Renters Study 2013. Except for the Health and Safety category, categorical measures were based on constructs used nationally, with response categories redesigned for Hawai‘i unique housing challenges. Contact: Jodad@oha.org.
Categorization based on a sum of cumulative points from the Proposed Hawai‘i Housing Security Matrix.

**Current Hawai‘i Housing Security Status?**

**Thriving**
- 5% of residents (21-25 points*)

**Safe & Adequate**
- 20-30% of Residents (16-20 points)

**Insecure &/OR Inadequate**
- 25-40% (11-15 points)
- 15-25% (6-10 points)

**At-Risk of Homelessness**
- 5% (1-5 points)

**In-Crisis**

**Homeless**

**Housing SECURE**
- ~ 25-40% of Hawai‘i Residents

**Housing INSECURE**
- ~ 60-75% of Hawai‘i Residents

* Specification on current situation

* Categorization based on a sum of cumulative points from the Proposed Hawai‘i Housing Security Matrix.
Categorization based on a sum of cumulative points from the Proposed Hawai‘i Housing Security Matrix.

**REALISTIC Hawai‘i Housing Security TARGET?**

- **Thriving**
  - REALISTIC TARGET
  - Housing SECURE
  - ~ 50-70% of Hawai‘i Residents

- **Safe & Adequate**
  - Housing INSECURE
  - ~ 30-50% of Hawai‘i Residents

- **Insecure &/OR Inadequate**
  - Independently housed without assistance

  - **At-Risk**
    - (need $$)
    - 30-40% of residents (11-15 points)

  - **Evict/Foreclose**
  - 10-15% of residents (6-10 points)

  - **No Homelessness or only short-term homeless**
  - <1% of residents (1-5 points)

* Categorization based on a sum of cumulative points from the Proposed Hawai‘i Housing Security Matrix.
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The data presented has been vetted for accuracy; however, there is no warranty that it is error-free. The data itself does not represent or confer any legal rights of any kind. Please use suggested citation and report discrepancies to the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, Research Division (Contact jodad@oha.org).