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Abstract: Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ people’s housing experiences are poorly understood in Aotearoa, New Zealand, including those of young people. We use data from an online survey to investigate experiences of homelessness, involuntary mobility, and housing-related discrimination amongst Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ youth (n = 334). Multiple linear regression analysis shows a significant relationship between homelessness scores and experience of state care, involuntary mobility, and housing discrimination. Furthermore, these young people had high rates of poverty (57% reporting an annual income below NZD 20,000), involuntary mobility (56%), housing-related discrimination (55%), and lifetime experiences of homelessness (31%). These findings highlight the difficulties that Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ young people face in the housing market, emphasising the need for targeted programs and policies to meet their needs and prevent homelessness from occurring.
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1. Introduction

This paper investigates the housing-related experiences of Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ youth (16–25) in the context of Aotearoa, New Zealand (henceforth referred to as Aotearoa, the te reo Māori name for New Zealand). The acronym LGBTIQ+ stands for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex, queer, and other minority gender and sexual orientation identities (such as pansexual, non-binary, and asexual). The inclusion of the + sign is intended to be inclusive of additional identities that are not included within the acronym. Since the 1870s, the word takatāpui has been translated to mean “intimate partner of the same sex”, and in the 1980s it was gifted to LGBTIQ+ identifying Māori by academic and activist, Ngahuia Te Awekotuku [1]. The word is now widely used among LGBTIQ+ identifying Māori as both an identity in and of itself, and as an umbrella term [1]. For this paper, we look at Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ youth’s experiences of homelessness, involuntary mobility, and housing-related discrimination. People who identify as LGBTIQ+, particularly youth, face higher levels of homelessness and poverty than their non-LGBTIQ+ counterparts [2–4]. International evidence suggests that 20–40% of people experiencing homelessness identify as LGBTIQ+, despite comprising 5–10% of the general population [4,5]. In addition to this, LGBTIQ+ people face an increased risk of other housing-related issues, such as discrimination in the housing market, housing instability, and family relationship breakdown—all of which can directly result in homelessness [6–9]. Furthermore, LGBTIQ+ youth are over-represented in foster care, and when they are placed into out-of-home care settings, they experience greater levels of victimisation and abuse by foster carers, social workers, and peers [10,11].

For this study we used the official Aotearoa definition of homelessness in which homelessness, or severe housing deprivation, is defined as “living situations where people with no other options to acquire safe and secure housing: are without shelter, in temporary accommodation, sharing accommodation with a household, or living in uninhabitable
housing” [12]. This definition, arising from the work of Kate Amore and colleagues [13–16], is a comprehensive one which includes situations such as rough sleeping, couch surfing, living in shelters and women’s refuges, living in government-funded emergency and transitional housing, and living in cars, caravans, tents, and garages. This captures a wide range of experiences, including traditionally “hidden” forms of homelessness. Additionally, we use the phrase “involuntary mobility” to refer to informal eviction-like situations—those where a person is forced to move before they are ready. This includes situations such as a landlord abruptly notifying to end the tenancy agreement and relationship breakdowns that resulted in a person either being asked to move, or feeling like they had no other choice but to move. We choose not to refer to this range of experiences as “eviction” due to the specific legal definition of eviction in Aotearoa, which requires going through the Tenancy Tribunal (a court which holds hearings to settle disputes between tenants and landlords), and is enforceable through District Courts and carried out by bailiffs [17].

In the context of Aotearoa, Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ youth of secondary school age have been found to report greater levels of housing deprivation than their non-Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ peers (37.7% compared to 28.4%) [18]. Additionally, Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ youth of secondary school age who have been involved with Oranga Tamariki (the government agency responsible for the wellbeing of children, particularly those in state care, youth offenders, and at-risk of experiencing violence and abuse) have high rates of housing deprivation and residential mobility, over and above what Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ youth who had not been involved with Oranga Tamariki had experienced [19]. A large-scale survey of transgender and gender-diverse New Zealanders found that 12% of youth respondents (14–24) had experienced homelessness, 15% of all respondents reported housing-related discrimination, and a median income of NZD 15,001–20,000 [20]. Although no whole-of-population data yet exists about Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ communities, emerging official statistics, such as that from Statistics New Zealand’s (SNZ) Household Economic Survey, suggest that Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ people are more likely to be younger, disabled, renting, earning lower incomes, and living in poor-quality housing [21]. Previous research on Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ homelessness identified commonality in experiences prior to homelessness, including: the pervasiveness of instability—especially regarding family relationships, finances, and housing; having to grow up fast due to social and material conditions; experiences of looking for housing in stressed markets; and systems failures that resulted in a lack of autonomy [22]. Emerging research on transgender and gender-diverse homelessness in Aotearoa by Vandenburg, Groot, and Nikora [23] utilised photovoice methods. Early findings highlight the importance of community engagement, insider research, and scholar-activism when conducting such research [23].

Literature on the health and wellbeing of Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ communities in Aotearoa has explored themes of youth suicide [24], psychological distress [25–28], drug and alcohol use [29], HIV prevalence and risk factors [30,31], and non-consensual sex among Māori men [32,33]. There is a general trend of Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ people facing poorer health and wellbeing outcomes than their non-LGBTIQ+ counterparts. Gloria Fraser [27] and Ker et al. [34] have highlighted the importance of culturally competent healthcare (including mental health) for the wellbeing of Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ patients. Specifically, providing gender-affirming care was particularly beneficial for the wellbeing of transgender and gender-diverse patients [34]. SNZ data shows that Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ communities report poorer mental wellbeing than the non-Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ population; in particular, these rates have worsened over time for 15–24-year-olds [35]. Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ communities also report slightly poorer rates of physical wellbeing, and higher rates of inadequate incomes, than the non-Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ population [35].

For non-Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ specific data on youth in Aotearoa, we know that 28.5% of the 41,644 people who were experiencing homelessness at the 2018 Census were aged 15–24 [18]. Other SNZ data reveals that young people are more likely to rent, and that renters move more frequently than owner-occupiers; those aged 20–24 experience particularly high levels of residential mobility [36]. The 2018 General Social Survey found
that renters are almost twice as likely to have moved five or more times in the past five years, and those aged 15–24 had the highest rate of residential mobility within the past five years [36]. The most common reason people moved between rentals was due to a landlord ending the tenancy [36]. Furthermore, Māori young people have lower rates of home ownership than Pākehā (New Zealand European) young people [37]. Māori are renters at disproportionate rates, and thus have higher levels of residential mobility than Pākehā [37]. Te Kūpenga, the Māori Social Survey, found that almost 20% of Māori renters had experienced discrimination when trying to get housing or a mortgage [37]. Finally, roughly 26% of young people aged 15–24 report poor mental wellbeing, and roughly 13% report fair-to-poor physical health [35].

2. Methods

We conducted an online survey aimed at Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ people over the age of 16 who were residing in Aotearoa. Our survey focused on housing experiences as part of BF’s postdoctoral fellowship, and HC’s summer studentship. Our survey comprised 45 questions covering demographics, housing quality, household composition, wellbeing, homelessness, involuntary mobility, and discrimination. Ethics approval was granted by the Department of Public Health on behalf of the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee (reference D21/356). The opening page of the survey provided the information sheet and consent form. Participants consented to take part by clicking a large button which read, “By clicking through to continue to the survey questions I am indicating that I give my consent and agree to take part in this project.” The opening and closing pages of the survey contained information on freely available mental health hotlines and resources (including Takatāpui/LGTIQ+ specific ones) should participants have needed them. As part of our ethics approval, participants were able to leave blank any questions they did not wish to answer.

The survey questions were primarily based on existing Statistics New Zealand surveys such as the New Zealand Census, the General Social Survey, the Household Economic Survey, and Te Kūpenga Māori Social Survey. We wrote several of our own questions where there were no SNZ questions that met our needs, using structures and wording that mirrored those used in SNZ surveys where appropriate. We also included several open-text boxes for participants to share more about specific experiences relating to issues such as discrimination, involuntary moves, and interacting with the Tenancy Tribunal. To measure lifetime experiences of homelessness, we provided a multiple choice question asking, “Have you ever experienced any of the following situations for a week or more?” with the following options: living rough (e.g., sleeping on the street); living in a night shelter; living in a women’s refuge; living in emergency and/or transitional housing; living in a camping ground or motor camp due to having nowhere else to live; living in other commercial accommodation due to having nowhere else to live (e.g., hotels, boarding houses, guest accommodation); and living as a temporary resident in a private dwelling due to having nowhere else to live (e.g., couch surfing, staying with friends). For involuntary mobility, we provided a multiple-choice question asking if participants had ever moved because the landlord ended the tenancy (e.g., the landlord sold the house of flat, expiry of lease agreement); had a poor relationship with the landlord (this can include moving out of your own choice, or being asked to leave); had a poor relationship with other people in the house (e.g., parents, flatmates. This can include moving out of your own choice, or being asked to move), and an open-text “other” option.

Our sexual orientation and gender identity questions were based on SNZ’s 2021 standards; we asked separate questions on gender (options included female, male, and another gender, which included an open-text box), whether participants considered themselves to be transgender, sexual orientation (we added asexual and Takatāpui to the standard SNZ options, which includes an open-text option), and if participants have a variation of sex characteristics (i.e., are intersex) [38]. These standards recommend that when deriving transgender status from gender and transgender questions, those who respond to gender
questions with “another gender” be placed into the output category “transgender and non-binary” [38]. We decided against this, as 39% of our non-binary respondents did not consider themselves to be transgender, so we wish to respect the ways they have identified and thus have not grouped them with transgender respondents. For ease of reporting, we present the results of the sexual orientation question, as well as the numbers of those who are transgender, non-binary, and intersex, together in Table 1.

For income, we report amounts in New Zealand Dollars (NZD); in Aotearoa, the adult minimum wage is NZD 21.20 an hour (roughly NZD 44,000 gross annually for full-time employment), and the starting-out and training minimum wages are NZD 16.96 an hour (roughly NZD 35,000 gross annually for full-time employment) [39]. The starting-out minimum wage is applied in different circumstances to those aged 16–19 dependent on their employment history, and the training minimum wage is applied to those 20 years old or above whose employment agreement state they must undertake an industry training program [40]. For our disability question, we used the six categories identified in the Washington Group Short Set, but chose not to have participants rate the extent to which they had difficulties with each due to the length of our survey and participant burden [41].

Survey data were collected and managed using REDCap electronic data capture tools hosted at the University of Otago. REDCap (Research Electronic Data Capture) is a secure, web-based software platform designed to support data capture for research studies. The survey ran from 17 December 2021 to 24 January 2022, with 1040 responses, 894 of which were usable (i.e., were not empty). Of those, 334 were youth aged 25 and under. Participants were recruited via the authors’ professional and private networks as well as their personal social media accounts (i.e., Facebook, Instagram, and Twitter), 62 separate Facebook groups (including housing, regional, cultural, and LGBTIQ+ specific groups), housing- and Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+- related organisations, and Instagram and TikTok accounts created specifically to advertise this project. Of this, the Instagram account we created (@rainbowhousingnz) was the most widely shared and engaged with. Participants were able to opt-in to enter a draw to win one of five NZD 50 supermarket vouchers as a thank-you for their participation.

The survey data were exported through REDCap and analysed through RStudio [42]. We report the demographic information, specifically the frequencies and percentage distributions of key variables for those aged 25 or under in Table 1. This reporting is the same for Table 2 on housing instability where the cohort is partitioned into Māori and non-Māori. Specifically, we report homelessness, involuntary mobility, and housing-related discrimination. Chi-squared and Fishers’ exact tests were used for examining the statistical differences between Māori and non-Māori youth. The frequency, mean, interquartile range, and range were calculated for the homelessness score, total number of moves in the past five years, and total number of lifetime moves. The Wilcoxon rank sum test was used to find the significant differences between Māori and non-Māori groups for the total number of moves in the past five years and total number of lifetime moves and homeless score. We considered p-values less than 0.05 as significant.

To measure relative levels of homelessness experienced, a ‘homelessness score’ was constructed for each participant by summing the different forms of homelessness they reported experiencing. For example, a participant reporting no forms of homelessness would have a score of zero and a participant reporting ‘living rough’ and ‘using a night shelter’ would have a score of two. A ‘housing discrimination score’ was also constructed for each participant by summing the different forms of housing discrimination they reported experiencing. Involuntary mobility was coded into a binary variable depending on whether participants reported any involuntary mobility or none. Care experiences were included as a factor with four levels: formal state care, informal care, unsure/don’t know/refuse, and no state care/no response. We structured our question about care experiences to ask about both formal and informal care as our previous research highlighted experiences of informal care arrangements [22]. The question asked: "When you were younger, did you ever experience foster care or state care (e.g., through Oranga Tamariki/CYFS)? This
can be either formally or informally (e.g., unsafe conditions at home meant you had an informal arrangement to live elsewhere for a time).” It was assumed that participants who did not respond to the care experiences question skipped it as it was not relevant to their circumstances (their completion rate for other questions was very high).

Multiple linear regression was used to determine and summarise the key variables involved in reported experiences of homelessness. It is not expected that the residuals from the linear regression would be normally distributed; however, very approximate normality will be sufficient for empirical analysis. The number of forms of homelessness reported by each participant was used as a crude measure of homelessness severity. Therefore, linear regression was used to preserve this information. The following variables were considered in the linear regression: experience of state care (formal, informal, unsure of care experience), involuntary mobility, housing discrimination score, location type (rural, suburban, urban), gender, sexual orientation, ethnicity, income, and education level. In the final model, only variables with \( p \)-values of less than 0.05 were included. This resulted in a final model using experiences of care, involuntary mobility, and housing discrimination.

### 3. Results

Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics for youth \( (n = 334) \) included in the dataset. The youth were distributed evenly (between 16–25) with 20 years old as the mode (17%). Most respondents were non-binary (40%) or female (39%), with males making up a sizeable minority (21%). Just over a third of all respondents (37%) identified as transgender, with 39% of males and 11% of females identifying as trans. Only 61% of non-binary respondents considered themselves to be transgender. When asked whether they were intersex, 1.2% of respondents said yes, 87% said no, 11% did not know, and 0.6% said they preferred not to answer. Regarding wellbeing, 30% of participants rated their physical health as good, 24% as fair, 14% as very good, 15% as poor, 6.9% as excellent, and 9.6% did not respond. For mental health, 34% rated theirs as being fair, 34% as poor, 16% as good, 6.6% as very good, 0.9% as excellent, and 9.6% did not respond. Of our cohort, 17% were flatting (shared housing which typically involves two or more people leasing a house and sharing a communal kitchen, living room, and bathroom, while maintaining private bedrooms) or living with friends, 40% were living with family, 18% were living with a partner, and 1.5% were living alone. Overall, 63% of our cohort were renters.

Table 1. Demographics.

| Characteristic       | \( n = 334 \) |
|----------------------|--------------|
| Gender               |              |
| Another gender/Non-binary | 132 (40%)  |
| Female               | 131 (39%)   |
| Male                 | 71 (21%)    |
| Age                  |              |
| 16                   | 19 (6%)     |
| 17                   | 23 (7%)     |
| 18                   | 40 (12%)    |
| 19                   | 28 (8%)     |
| 20                   | 56 (17%)    |
| 21                   | 44 (13%)    |
| 22                   | 46 (14%)    |
| 23                   | 27 (8%)     |
| 24                   | 25 (7%)     |
| 25                   | 26 (8%)     |
| Ethnicity            |              |
| Pākehā/New Zealand European | 281 (84%)  |
| Māori                | 56 (17%)    |
| Asian                | 23 (6.9%)   |
| Other European       | 14 (4.2%)   |
| Pacific              | 13 (3.9%)   |
| Other                | 8 (2.4%)    |
| Income (NZD)         |              |
| Under NZD 20,000     | 192 (57%)   |
| NZD 20,000–$50,000   | 58 (17%)    |
| Don’t know/refuse    | 43 (13%)    |
| NZD 50,000–$100,000  | 41 (12%)    |
Table 1. Cont.

| Characteristic                        | n = 334 |
|---------------------------------------|---------|
| **Takatapui/LGBTIQ+ identities**      |         |
| Bisexual/Pansexual                    | 132 (40%) |
| Non-binary                            | 132 (40%) |
| Transgender                           | 123 (37%) |
| Gay/Lesbian                           | 92 (28%)  |
| Queer                                 | 34 (10%)  |
| Asexual                                | 26 (7.8%) |
| Other                                  | 24 (7.2%) |
| Takatapui                             | 22 (6.6%) |
| Straight                               | 4 (1.2%)  |
| Intersex                               | 4 (1.2%)  |
| **Disability**                        |         |
| Difficulty remembering                | 157 (47%) |
| Difficulty communicating (generally understanding or being understood) | 87 (26%) |
| Difficulty with self-care (such as washing or dressing) | 69 (21%) |
| Difficulty seeing (even when wearing glasses) | 49 (15%) |
| Difficulty walking or climbing stairs  | 40 (12%)  |
| Difficulty hearing                     | 36 (11%)  |

Table 2 describes the housing instability that our cohort reported experiencing housing instability. Of these youth, 56% reported experiencing at least one form of involuntary mobility, 31% had experienced at least one form of homelessness, and 55% had experienced at least one form of housing-related discrimination. In regard to homelessness, the most common form was staying in temporary accommodation (24%). For Māori youth who had experienced homelessness, their three most frequently reported forms were temporary accommodation (32%), other commercial accommodation (12%), and living in a camping ground or motor camp (11%). For Pākehā who had experienced homelessness, their three most frequently reported forms were living in a camping ground or motor camp (64%), temporary accommodation (24%), and other commercial accommodation (11%). Furthermore, more Māori youth (5.4%) reported experiences staying in night shelters compared to non-Māori (0.7%) (p < 0.05).

Table 2. Housing instability.

| Form of Homelessness            | Full Sample | Non-Māori | Māori | p-Value |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------|-------|---------|
| Temporary accommodation         | 81 (24%)    | 63 (23%)  | 18 (32%) | 0.13    |
| Commercial accommodation        | 42 (13%)    | 35 (13%)  | 7 (12%)  | >0.9    |
| Camping                         | 19 (5.7%)   | 13 (4.7%) | 6 (11%)  | 0.11    |
| Living rough                    | 14 (4.2%)   | 9 (3.2%)  | 5 (8.9%) | 0.066   |
| Emergency/Transitional housing  | 8 (2.4%)    | 6 (2.2%)  | 2 (3.6%) | 0.6     |
| Women's refuges                 | 5 (1.5%)    | 3 (1.1%)  | 2 (3.6%) | 0.2     |
| Night shelters                  | 5 (1.5%)    | 2 (0.7%)  | 3 (5.4%) | 0.035   |

| Reason for involuntary mobility | Full Sample | Non-Māori | Māori | p-Value |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------|-------|---------|
| Household relationship          | 134 (40%)   | 111 (40%) | 23 (41%) | 0.9     |
| Tenancy reasons                 | 91 (27%)    | 74 (27%)  | 17 (30%) | 0.6     |
| Landlord relationships          | 48 (14%)    | 43 (15%)  | 5 (8.9%) | 0.2     |
| Other reasons                   | 10 (3.0%)   | 9 (3.2%)  | 1 (1.8%) | >0.9    |

| Source of Discrimination        | Full Sample | Non-Māori | Māori | p-Value |
|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------|-------|---------|
| Family member you live with     | 138 (41%)   | 116 (42%) | 22 (39%) | 0.7     |
| Flatmate you live with          | 56 (17%)    | 43 (15%)  | 13 (23%) | 0.2     |
| Landlord                        | 36 (11%)    | 26 (9.4%) | 10 (18%) | 0.061   |
| Neighbour                       | 33 (9.9%)   | 25 (9.0%) | 8 (14%)  | 0.2     |
| Property manager                | 31 (9.3%)   | 21 (7.6%) | 10 (18%) | 0.015   |
| At a flat viewing               | 29 (8.7%)   | 22 (7.9%) | 7 (12%)  | 0.3     |
| Real estate agent               | 14 (4.2%)   | 10 (3.6%) | 4 (7.1%) | 0.3     |
| Buying—from the broker or banker| 2 (0.6%)    | 1 (0.4%)  | 1 (1.8%) | 0.3     |
| Buying—from the owner           | 4 (1.2%)    | 2 (0.7%)  | 2 (3.6%) | 0.13    |
Table 2. Cont.

| State care                  | Full Sample | Non-M¯aori | M¯aori | \(p\)-Value |
|-----------------------------|-------------|------------|--------|-------------|
| Formal state care           | 8 (2.4%)    | 4 (1.4%)   | 4 (7.1%) | 0.030       |
| Informal state care         | 22 (6.6%)   | 18 (6.5%)  | 4 (7.1%) | 0.8         |
| Unsure                      | 13 (3.9%)   | 12 (4.3%)  | 1 (1.8%) | 0.7         |
| None                        | 242 (72%)   | 205 (74%)  | 37 (66%) | 0.2         |

| Homelessness score          | Full Sample | Non-M¯aori | M¯aori | \(p\)-Value |
|-----------------------------|-------------|------------|--------|-------------|
| Total score                 | 174         | 131        | 43     | 0.4         |
| Average (mean)              | 0.52        | 0.47       | 0.77   |             |
| Range                       | (0, 7)      | (0, 5)     | (0, 7) |             |
| Median (IQR)                | 0 (0, 1)    | 0 (0, 1)   | 0 (0, 1) |             |

| Total number of moves in the past five years | Full Sample | Non-M¯aori | M¯aori | \(p\)-Value |
|---------------------------------------------|-------------|------------|--------|-------------|
| Total moves                                 | 964         | 810        | 154    | >0.9        |
| Average (mean)                              | 3           | 3          | 3      |             |
| Range                                       | (0, 20)     | 0, 20      | 0, 11  |             |
| Median (IQR)                                | 3 (1, 5)    | 3 (1, 5)   | 3 (1, 5) |             |

| Total number of lifetime moves             | Full Sample | Non-M¯aori | M¯aori | \(p\)-Value |
|--------------------------------------------|-------------|------------|--------|-------------|
| Total moves                                | 2143        | 1788       | 355    | 0.5         |
| Average (mean)                             | 7           | 7          | 8      |             |
| Range                                      | (0, 30)     | 0, 30      | 0, 30  |             |
| Median (IQR)                               | 6 (3, 10)   | 6 (3, 10)  | 5 (3, 9) |             |

In terms of involuntary mobility, 40% of youth had experienced involuntary mobility due to household relationship breakdowns. This was followed closely by involuntary mobility due to tenancy reasons (30%). For housing-related discrimination, M¯aori had a larger reported number of discriminatory encounters with property managers (18%) compared to non-M¯aori (7.6%) \((p < 0.05)\). In addition, M¯aori also experienced more formal state care (7.1%) compared to non-M¯aori (1.4%) \((p < 0.05)\). On average, these youth moved seven times, with a median of six moves. In addition, over the last five years, youth moved an average of three times, with a median of three moves. Overall, the 334 youth moved a total of 2143 times throughout their lives, and 964 times over the last five years.

The multiple linear regression shows there is a significant relationship between homelessness scores and experience of state care, involuntary mobility, and housing discrimination (Table 3). Formal state care was by far the most significant predictor of a high homelessness score. Experiencing formal state care alone results in an expected homelessness score of two (a score of two corresponds to experiencing two forms of homelessness, Table 3). In contrast, someone who had not experienced any form of care would have needed to experience eight forms of housing discrimination to have a similar expected homelessness outcome \(0.25 \times 8 = 2\), Table 3.

Table 3. Multiple linear regression of homelessness score based on experience of state care, involuntary mobility, and housing discrimination.

| Variable                        | Beta (\(\beta\)) | 95% CI          | \(p\)-Value |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------|
| Adjusted R\([2]\) = 0.3679     |                 |                 |             |
| Formal state care experience    | 1.93            | 1.36, 2.51      | <0.001      |
| Informal care experience        | 0.66            | 0.30, 1.01      | <0.001      |
| Unsure of care experience       | 0.80            | 0.35, 1.25      | <0.001      |
| Involuntary mobility            | 0.26            | 0.07, 0.44      | 0.006       |
| Housing discrimination score    | 0.25            | 0.18, 0.32      | <0.001      |

Under our open-text questions, 36.5% of participants wrote about specific incidents of housing discrimination. Although some reported experiencing no discrimination or isolated incidents, others faced diverse forms of discrimination in housing. One participant described that they had been kicked out of their family home for “being trans”, their landlord “refused to refer to me using my chosen name or [use] my pronouns”, and
their flatmates would host parties without inviting them because a “trans person ‘isn’t the right fit’ for such a party”. Others described supportive flatmates struggling with discriminatory landlords. One response from a young person in an “entirely rainbow flat” said, “[We] had to take our landlord to the Tenancy Tribunal because our landlord was relentlessly homophobic and transphobic towards us”. Harassment by neighbours was also reported, with one respondent describing how their neighbour “spouted abuse at us, called us sexual deviants, and threatened to have someone come and physically harm us on several occasions”.

4. Discussion

The findings we have presented show a significant association between homelessness and experience of formal or informal state care, involuntary mobility, and housing-related discrimination. Furthermore, our findings show that our sample of Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ youth are low-income earners experiencing poverty, report having fair-to-poor mental health, fair-to-good physical health, difficulty remembering, and have moved an average of seven times throughout their lives. Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ youth are clearly experiencing significant struggles within the housing market and there needs to be meaningful improvements made to targeted policy, funding, and support for them and their needs.

Our homelessness data is broadly consistent with international literature on LGBTIQ+ youth homelessness; a study comparing the rates of homelessness amongst LGBTIQ+ and non-LGBTIQ+ high school aged youth reported that upwards of 25% of LGBTIQ+ youth were experiencing homelessness, compared to only 3% of non-LGBTIQ+ youth [43]. Other research has similarly shown that 28% of LGBTIQ+ youth had ever experienced homelessness [44]. Our findings show 31% of Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ youth had experienced homelessness at some point in their lives. This also aligns with Aotearoa-specific research which found over 37% of Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ high-school-aged youth had experienced housing deprivation [18]. Our findings also revealed that temporary accommodation (such as couch-surfing) was the most common form of homelessness amongst these youth. Existing literature has reported mixed results about the types of homelessness that LGBTIQ+ youth have experienced; Petry et al. [45] reported LGBTIQ+ youth to be more likely to experience couch-surfing than staying in shelters, whereas Shelton et al. [46] reported that LGBTIQ+ homeless youth were predominantly staying in shelters/hospitals/transitional housing, then rough sleeping, with couch-surfing being the third most prevalent form of homelessness they reported. International literature also highlights the links between foster care and experiences of homelessness amongst LGBTIQ+ communities [4,10,11,47,48]. Existing Aotearoa literature shows high levels of poor mental health, bullying, sexual violence, and drug use amongst youth in care [49,50]. Our findings show that care experiences, particularly formal state care, are linked to later experiences of homelessness. Further research is needed to explore this relationship in the Aotearoa context, particularly that which is attentive to the role of colonisation and structural racism in the over-representation of Māori within the care system.

Our cohort reported a large number of involuntary moves, especially due to household and landlord relationships. We use the phrase “involuntary mobility” to refer to informal eviction-like situations—those where a person is forced to move before they are ready. This includes situations such as a landlord abruptly ending the tenancy agreement and relationship breakdowns that resulted in a person either being asked to move, or feeling like they had no other choice but to move. Research from Desmond and Shollenberger [51] found that renters who had experienced involuntary displacement live in neighbourhoods with significantly higher rates of poverty. Furthermore, those who experience involuntary mobility are more likely to later experience voluntary mobility in order to move to better quality housing and more desirable neighbourhoods; those who experience involuntary mobility are more likely to live in poor-quality housing [52]. Those who experience involuntary moves are often forced to take any housing available to them out of desperation, and thus find themselves later moving again once they are able to find better quality
As a result of eviction and involuntary mobility, people are forced to find unsustainable living alternatives and, in some cases, they end up experiencing homelessness [54]. For many, a last resort can be living with family and friends. However, this causes overcrowding and broken relationships due to small living quarters and limited household relationships [54]. As a result, people experience significant personal stress when they are forced to move without planning. Negative outcomes such as homelessness emerge, as evidenced by our findings. More research is needed to investigate LGBTIQ+-specific experiences of involuntary mobility, particularly as it relates to relationships with landlords and property managers.

Young people are increasingly leaving home at a later age, generally associated with rising issues of housing affordability. In 2018, around 78% of 18-year-olds lived with their parent(s), compared to 65% in 2001 [36]. Furthermore, an increasing proportion of 20–24 year olds are living with their parent(s) [36]. This trend belies the vulnerability of those unable to rely on their parental home as a safety net in an unforgiving rental market, with just over 40% of our sample experiencing some form of discrimination from family members they live with. It has long been established that one of the key factors resulting in LGBTIQ+ youth experiencing homelessness is a breakdown in relationship with family members, often resulting in them being kicked out of home [2,3,9,55]. Our data indicates that this trend could likely be present in Aotearoa. As such, government policy and support are needed to ensure that Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ young people are having their housing needs met and that they do not end up experiencing homelessness. For instance, there needs to be housing policy and funding that is specific to Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ communities. At present, the government’s Homelessness Action Plan has a brief mention of Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ communities, but there has been a distinct lack of action in this area [56]. Alongside this, there is a need for increased protections for those who are renting and flatting, especially that which considers the distinct needs of Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ communities. For instance, there is a need for better resources provided for young people who are flatting and might be unsure of their rights, and how to resolve conflicts in group dynamics. Additionally, tenants need to be given more ability to negotiate and alter tenancy agreements (such as who is listed on an agreement) to reflect the fact that people’s circumstances and relationships might change throughout the period of a tenancy.

This paper provides important and novel data about the housing experiences of Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ youth in Aotearoa. There is limited research on both the housing experiences of Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ populations, and on homelessness, eviction, and involuntary mobility more broadly, in Aotearoa [22,54]. Our findings suggest that formal or informal state care, involuntary mobility, and housing-related discrimination are associated with Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ youth experiencing homelessness. This has important implications for policy and practice aimed at preventing and ending Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ homelessness. Specifically, it emphasises the need to create avenues through which Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ youth can be supported to find appropriate housing before they are forced to move suddenly, and to repair household or landlord/property manager relationships where it is appropriate to do so—noting that this is often not an option due to discrimination from family members and landlords/property managers. Furthermore, these findings also demonstrate a need for increased support post-eviction/involuntary move, and when leaving care situation, so that Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ are less likely to experience homelessness. Alongside this, a significant finding was the large number of our cohort (57%) whose annual income was under NZD 20,000 and were thus experiencing poverty. In comparison, the wider population of youth aged 15–19 see a median household equivalised income of NZD 40,133 annually, which increases to NZD 42,430 annually for 20–24-year-olds [57]. This suggests that age alone cannot account for the low incomes of our cohort. Poverty is a key driver of homelessness and other housing-related difficulties [58–61]. Countries with liberal welfare states (such as Aotearoa) have been shown to have higher levels of poverty, income inequalities, and homelessness when compared to countries with more robust welfare states [62,63]. This, alongside our findings, indicates a need to improve
the social welfare system in Aotearoa. We believe it is both necessary and urgent to fully implement the 42 recommendations made by the Welfare Expert Advisory Group on how to transform our welfare system for the better, particularly in regards to ensuring that benefits rates provide sufficient incomes for people to live healthy and dignified lives [64].

There are several limitations to note. The current study consisted of a small sample size which reduces the power of the study and increases the margin of error. Although 17% of our cohort were Māori, we were unable to reach representative proportions of other ethnic communities during recruitment, despite our best efforts. Separating sexual orientation and gender identity was not feasible due to the limited sample size. This means we are unable to tease out the difference in experiences between sexuality minorities and gender minorities [65]. It is our hope that in future studies we will be able to increase our sample size and investigate these differences. Other constraints include limited access to the population of concern and timing to carry out the survey due to the Christmas and New Year period. Due to the nature of our survey recruitment, the study is affected by self-selection bias, as evidenced by comments we received from individuals that they did not want to affect our results by participating when they had not personally experienced any discrimination. As we relied on self-reported measures, some questions such as the ‘number of moves’ would be heavily subjected to recall inaccuracies and are not comparable to existing administrative data on residential mobility in Aotearoa from the Integrated Data Infrastructure [66,67]. There is, currently, a limited capture of Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ community data in the Integrated Data Infrastructure. Future studies should address this once the 2023 Census includes questions regarding sexual orientation, gender identity, and intersex status.

5. Conclusions

This paper provides an important and necessary contribution to both housing and Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ literature in Aotearoa. Little is known about the intersection of the two, particularly in relation to youth. Our findings indicate that Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ youth in Aotearoa experience high levels of poverty and homelessness. Multiple linear regression analysis revealed a significant relationship between homelessness scores and experience of state care, involuntary mobility, and housing discrimination. These findings expand on existing LGBTIQ+ youth homelessness research in their exploration of experiences within the wider housing sphere. Understanding experiences of housing-related discrimination and involuntary mobility betters our understanding of the causes and precursors to homelessness, thus strengthening homelessness prevention and policy responses. There is thus an urgent need to provide targeted policies aimed at supporting and upholding the rights of Takatāpui/LGBTIQ+ communities as they navigate housing.
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