

2 OVERCOUNTING AND UNDERCOUNTING

This chapter summarises how the national project enumerated the homeless population using the census and other data sets. It also contains a discussion of how there can be both overcounting and undercounting of homeless people. This is relevant to understanding why there can be anomalies when we examine the number of homeless people in particular communities.

2.1 IMPROVISED HOMES, TENTS AND SLEEPERS OUT

The operational category for primary homelessness is 'improvised homes, tents and sleepers out'. This category includes:

Sheds, tents, humpies, and other improvised dwellings, occupied on Census Night ... It also includes people sleeping on park benches or in other 'rough accommodation'. (ABS 2006b, p. 182)

First, we explain how the count was carried out. Then we estimate the number of persons in improvised dwellings (sheds, garages and cabins) and the number of persons sleeping rough (public places, derelict buildings, tents, cars etc). Finally, we point out that rough sleepers are a very mobile population and therefore the numbers identified on census night may not accord with what people 'know' on the ground.

The efficacy of the local count depends on census collectors having good local knowledge. They have to know, for example, whether there are people squatting in empty buildings in their local community, or whether there might be families living in their cars, or whether there could be people camping in the bush.

In 2006, there was a special effort to count the primary population in all states and territories. People without conventional accommodation are particularly difficult to count because they usually hide away at night to escape the cold. The 2006 Census was carried out in winter in the southern states, where night-time temperatures were generally cold. In addition, some homeless people were hostile to the idea of providing information to the government and did not want to fill out official forms. Other homeless people were hidden away in derelict buildings and census collectors were unaware of their presence. Counting the primary population is a major

practical challenge.

There were a number of components to the ABS strategy. Field staff were encouraged to work closely with local service providers who might know if people were squatting in derelict buildings or sleeping rough in their community. In all states, local services provided intelligence on where people might be found sleeping rough. In some cases, census forms were handed out at these agencies. It was also widely reported that mobile food vans were a good place to hand out census forms. This strategy was used in capital cities and in some regional centres, but implementation varied across the states.

The ABS also had short census forms that could be filled out by ABS staff where personal forms were judged inappropriate. The short forms were less intimidating than the longer personal forms.

In addition, there was a procedure for filling out a substitute form when a homeless person was observed by a census collector but was not able to be interviewed. Observation is an accepted method for counting people sleeping rough. Collectors were asked to record sex, estimated age and location.

The category 'improvised homes, tents and sleepers out' also included overseas visitors and Australian residents who were on camping holidays. International visitors can be identified because they report a usual address overseas, and Australian holidaymakers can be identified because they report a usual address 'elsewhere in Australia'. Once both groups were removed, this left 16 375 individuals nationally in 'improvised dwellings, tents and sleepers out', including 385 people in this category in Tasmania.

Next, we estimate the number of persons in improvised dwellings (sheds, garages and cabins) and the number of persons sleeping rough (public places, derelict buildings, tents, cars etc). In public discussions about homelessness, it is sometimes assumed that there are 16 375 rough sleepers. However, the category 'improvised homes, tents and sleepers out' includes a wide range of situations from someone sleeping in a park, to someone sheltering in a derelict building, to someone living in a shed of some kind. Sheds can vary from broken-down buildings to assembled colour-bond farm sheds and garages.

There were 16 375 people in the 'improvised homes, tents and sleepers out' category, made up of 9414 households. It is not possible to quantify with certainty the number of people in improvised dwellings (sheds, garages and cabins) and the number of rough sleepers, but if we make two assumptions we can make some estimates.

First, we examined the responses of people in the 'improvised homes' category to the census question about dwelling tenure. We found that that 10 per cent were in rented dwellings and 39 per cent of households were in dwellings that were owned or being purchased. After talking with building inspectors and town planners across the country, we made the judgment that the 'owner, purchaser, renter' reply indicated that these households were usually living in improvised dwellings such as sheds, garages and shacks. In the case of owners and purchasers, this was their own property. It is also probable that people living in cars would have reported 'owning' their dwellings and this is more likely to be the case in the cities.

Second, 51 per cent of households did not answer the question about dwelling tenure and we took this to indicate that they were sleeping rough, squatting in derelict buildings, or living in other forms of temporary shelter. This assumption was in accord with other information from service providers and council staff in local areas. If both assumptions are reasonable, then we can estimate the numbers in improvised dwellings and sleeping rough, but we cannot quantify this exactly.

In the capital cities, about 75 per cent of households in the primary homelessness category were sleeping rough or squatting in derelict buildings, but in Hobart it was about 40 per cent. In regional Australia, about 60 per cent of these households were living in sheds, garages and shacks and in regional Tasmania it was about 80 per cent. Most of these dwellings were on land that was 'owned or being purchased', but about one-quarter of the dwellings were rented. Both owners and renters were living in rural poverty.

Building inspectors and town planners across the country reported that most people living in sheds were not building houses. In many cases, the householder had laid a concrete slab and then erected a metal shed, assembled from a prefabricated kit. We were told that people in improvised dwellings had often moved into communities where it was possible to purchase cheap blocks of land and they had probably dreamed of building houses on their blocks. However, these were also communities where unemployment was high and the newcomers remained unemployed or marginally attached to the labour force. These families may have dreamed of building a house, but the dream had not been realised and they were living in rural poverty.

In the capital cities, people in the category ‘improvised homes, tents and sleepers out’ are usually transient and without conventional shelter. In regional and remote Australia, about 40 per cent of households in this category were transient but 60 per cent were living in improvised dwellings which they owned, rented or were purchasing. These dwellings were below the community standard, but these households were not ‘rough sleepers’ and they were not transient.

In the cities, people sleeping rough, squatting in derelict buildings or using vehicles for shelter are likely to move from place to place. Twenty people may show up in a particular subdivision on census night, but a week later they may be somewhere else. When we carry out a local analysis there is a risk that it will not accord with what people ‘know’ on the ground, because the population may have changed since the time of the census. However, in inland Australia, people in improvised dwellings are more stable.

2.2 SAAP SERVICES

The starting point for counting people in accommodation provided under the Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP) was the census category ‘hostels for the homeless, night shelters and refuges’. However, we knew that many of these dwellings were misclassified at previous censuses (Chamberlain and MacKenzie 2003, pp. 23–24). Youth refuges and women’s refuges often look like suburban houses and sometimes census collectors did not realise they were SAAP accommodation. These dwellings were mistakenly classified as ‘private dwellings’. The ABS convention is to replace census figures with information from the SAAP National Data Collection if the SAAP figures are higher.

In 2006, the ABS had two strategies to count people accommodated in refuges, hostels and other forms of emergency accommodation. The ‘list strategy’ required the Census Management Unit (CMU) in each state/territory to consult with the relevant government department to see if the department could supply a list of all their SAAP properties. The ABS guaranteed the confidentiality of these lists. The lists were passed on to specified ABS officers to assist with confidential data processing. The lists enabled ABS staff to identify SAAP properties that had been classified as private dwellings.

All states provided lists but they were of uneven quality. Some states provided a comprehensive list of their supported accommodation. Other states provided a list but excluded women’s refuges (for security reasons), while other states provided only partial lists of their SAAP properties.

The second component of the ABS approach was the 'green sticker' strategy which was first used in 2001. This involved the distribution of information to service providers offering them an alternative way to return their census forms. Service providers were advised that they could request a mail-back envelope from the census collector to ensure confidentiality. Service providers were asked to return the census forms directly to the Data Processing Centre and to attach a green sticker which facilitated the identification of SAAP accommodation.

Overall, the census strategy worked better than in 2001, but in all states (except Victoria) the census count was lower than the SAAP count. The Victorian Department provided the ABS with a full list of its SAAP addresses as well as a full list of its Transitional Housing Management (THM) properties. We followed the established convention and replaced the census data with National SAAP Data for all states and territories except Victoria. There were 19 849 people in SAAP across Australia and 622 in Tasmania.

2.3 FRIENDS AND RELATIVES

Homeless people staying temporarily with friends or relatives were identified at the question: 'What is the person's usual address?' There was an instruction on the census form that people with no usual address should write 'none' in the suburb/locality box. In 2006, the number of people staying temporarily with other households was 32 200.

The census underestimates the number of homeless young people aged 12 to 18 who are staying temporarily with friends or relatives, because people filling out the census forms often record that these teenagers have a usual address elsewhere (MacKenzie and Chamberlain 2008, Ch. 3). We corrected for undercounting in this age group using information from the third National Census of Homeless School Students.

The count of homeless school students was carried out in the same week that the ABS undertook the 2006 Census of Population and Housing. Welfare staff in secondary schools identified 7035 homeless students using the cultural definition of homelessness. This figure was used in conjunction with SAAP data on the proportion of school students accommodated in SAAP to estimate the overall homeless population aged 12 to 18. The final correction for undercounting was 14 656. The number of homeless people staying temporarily with friends and relatives was 46 856, including 1248 people in Tasmania.

There was no information on how the missing 14 656 young people were distributed geographically within each state and territory. An assumption was made that they were distributed in the same way as other persons staying temporarily with friends and relatives. This assumption cannot be corroborated independently, and it could mean that homeless people in this category were overestimated in some geographical areas and underestimated in others.

The method of estimating the number of persons staying temporarily with other households also depends on how people interpret the census question that asks for each person's usual address. For example, an Indigenous household may be unwilling to record that a relative escaping domestic violence has 'no usual address'. We have a method for estimating the undercount for those aged 12 to 18, but there is no method for estimating the undercount in other age groups or for Indigenous people.

Finally, it is important to remember that the number of people staying temporarily with friends and relatives also goes up and down, because most people stay temporarily with other households on a short-term basis.

2.4 BOARDING HOUSES

The final category is people living in boarding houses. This was the most complicated part of the count and it is explained fully in Chamberlain and MacKenzie (2008). Here the main points are summarised in three steps: a discussion of the 'basic rules', the '2001 conventions' and the '2006 conventions'.

Basic rules

The 2006 Census used 20 categories for coding non-private dwellings. The categories included 'hotel, motel, bed and breakfast' and 'boarding house, private hotel'. This distinction draws attention to the fact that there are major differences between conventional hotels that many travellers use and boarding houses (often called 'private hotels').

The 2006 Census identified 16 273 people in 'boarding houses and private hotels'. However, three groups had to be excluded: owners and staff members who were sleeping over on census night; guests who reported a usual address 'elsewhere in Australia'; and backpackers who reported a usual address overseas.

In addition, there are four ABS conventions to correct for the fact that census collectors sometimes misclassify 'boarding houses', 'hotels' and 'staff quarters'. After applying the 'basic rules', the number in boarding houses was 14 490 in 2006 compared with 17 972 in 2001.

2001 conventions

There was an important change in ABS procedures in 2001 which impacted on the boarding house count. Following the 1996 census, ABS staff telephoned those dwellings where there was insufficient information to identify dwelling type. Where additional information could be obtained a more accurate classification was entered. In 2001, these follow-up telephone calls were discontinued and the number of dwellings in the 'other' category increased from 536 to 2784. The number of persons in those dwellings jumped from 12 938 to 54 636 and it remained at 54 000 in 2006.

The '2001 conventions' involve the application of five rules to identify boarding houses in the 'other' category (Chamberlain and MacKenzie 2003, Ch. 3). When these rules were applied in 2006, they produced a correction of 3763.

2006 conventions

Boarding houses have been closing down in the inner suburbs of the capital cities, but new boarding houses have been opening up in some outer suburbs. These dwellings often look like suburban houses and rarely have a sign outside. Census collectors could have misclassified these boarding houses as 'private dwellings'.

In 2006, an investigation was undertaken to see whether it was possible to identify boarding houses in the 'private dwellings' category. The final stage of the investigation focused on 9000 private dwellings that had five or more unrelated adults. A small boarding house or a share household could have five or more unrelated tenants. Five criteria were devised to exclude working households, student households, housing for disabled people and dwellings that were too small to be boarding houses. After the rules were applied, there were 705 dwellings remaining with 3343 residents. These were boarding houses that had been misclassified as private dwellings.

In 2006, the total number of persons in boarding houses was 21 596 ($14\,490 + 3763 + 3343 = 21\,596$), compared with 22 877 in 2001. The number of boarding house residents in Tasmania was 252 in 2006, compared with 265 in 2001.

The ABS conventions for identifying boarding houses are complicated and it is possible that some dwellings could have been misclassified at all three stages of the analysis. Undercounting could have occurred in some communities and overcounting in others because of misclassification. This can lead to anomalies when we examine the number of people in boarding houses in particular subdivisions.

2.5 CONCLUSION

The census provides the best data that we have on the homeless population at a point in time, but as we have seen there can be ‘undercounting’ and ‘overcounting’ of homeless people on census night. Undercounting is most likely in the census category ‘improvised homes, tents and sleepers out’, and overcounting is more likely in the boarding house category because of misclassification.

The problem of establishing reliable census figures for policy purposes is compounded by the fact that the homeless population changes over time. New people become homeless and some homeless people return to secure accommodation, so the number of homeless people goes up and down.

It is also common for homeless people to move between different forms of temporary accommodation within the same city, and to move both within and between states. The census data was collected in August 2006, and it is unrealistic to expect the same number of homeless people in particular areas at the current time. The challenge is to identify patterns in the population data that might inform the policy process.