



[Addict Res Theory](#). Author manuscript; available in PMC 2014 Jan 27.

PMCID: PMC3902663

Published in final edited form as:

NIHMSID: NIHMS355872

Addict Res Theory. 2012 Dec 1; 20(6): 480–491.

PMID: [24478615](#)

Published online 2012 Dec 1. doi: [10.3109/16066359.2012.665967](#)

Community Context of Sober Living Houses

[Douglas L. Polcin](#), Ed.D., [Diane Henderson](#), B.A., [Karen Trocki](#), Ph.D., [Kristy Evans](#), B.A., and [Fried Wittman](#), Ph.D.

Alcohol Research Group, Public Health Institute, 6475 Christie Avenue, Suite 400, Emeryville, CA 94608-1010, Phone (510) 597-3440, Fax (510) 985-6459

[Corresponding author.](#)

Douglas L. Polcin: DPolcin@arg.org

[Copyright notice](#)

See other articles in PMC that [cite](#) the published article.

Abstract

[Go to:](#)

The success or failure of programs designed to address alcohol and drug problems can be profoundly influenced by the communities where they are located. Support from the community is vital for long term stability and conflict with the community can harm a program's reputation or even result in closure. This study examined the community context of sober living houses (SLHs) in one Northern California community by interviewing key stakeholder groups. SLHs are alcohol and drug free living environments for individuals attempting to abstain from substance use. Previous research on residents of SLHs showed they make long-term improvements on measures of substance use, psychiatric symptoms, arrests, and employment. Interviews were completed with house managers, neighbors, and key informants from local government and community organizations. Overall, stakeholders felt SLHs were necessary and had a positive impact on the community. It was emphasized that SLHs needed to practice a "good neighbor" policy that prohibited substance use and encouraged community service. Size and density of SLHs appeared to influence neighbor perceptions. For small (six residents or less), sparsely populated houses, a strategy of blending in with the neighborhood seemed to work. However, it was clear that larger, densely populated houses need to actively manage relationships with community stakeholders. Strategies for improving relationships with immediate neighbors, decreasing stigma, and broadening the leadership structure are discussed. Implications for a broad array of community based programs are discussed.

Keywords: Sober Living Houses, Residential Treatment, Environmental Influences, Neighborhood, NIMBY

The premise of this paper is that it is insufficient to study the effectiveness of community based services without examining characteristics of the community context in which those services are delivered. How services are perceived by key stakeholder groups will affect whether they are implemented, the level of support they receive, and the types of barriers they encounter ([Guydish, et al., 2007](#); [Jason, et al., 2005](#); [Polcin, 2006](#)). As an example, we describe a study of the community context of Sober Living Houses (SLHs), which are alcohol- and drug-free living environments for

individuals attempting to achieve sustained abstinence. The study compliments previous research showing that SLH residents make improvements in a variety of areas, including reductions in substance use, arrests, psychiatric severity and unemployment ([Polcin et al., 2010](#)). The community context of SLHs is assessed by conducting qualitative interviews with stakeholders, including managers of the houses, neighbors, and local key informants in one Northern California County. A typology of factors supporting and hindering operations and expansion of SLHs in the community is provided.

Alcohol-and drug-free housing

Few problems in the treatment of addictive disorders have been more challenging than helping clients find long-term, alcohol- and drug-free living environments that support sustained recovery. The progress that clients make in residential treatment programs is often jeopardized by the lack of appropriate housing options when they leave ([Braucht, et al., 1995](#)). For clients attending aftercare or outpatient treatment, progress is often jeopardized by their return to destructive living environments at the end of the treatment day ([Hitchcock, et al., 1995](#)). These are often the same environments that originally contributed to their addiction. Finding affordable housing has also become more difficult because of tight housing markets in urban areas and the rise in unemployment.

One approach to the need for alcohol- and drug-free living environments has been to refer individuals to residential treatment programs. However, as funding for residential services has decreased over the years it has become an option for very few. Even when clients are admitted to residential services, the length of treatment is typically short, often only a few weeks. Although some programs have developed “half-way” or “step-down” living facilities, these too have maximum lengths of time after which residents must leave regardless of their readiness. Cost is an additional issue for halfway houses because frequently public and private funders are unwilling to pay for services that are not medically oriented. In addition, halfway houses tend to be available only to individuals who have completed rigorous inpatient treatment, which diminishes the potential pool of individuals who might make use of them.

Sober living houses

[Polcin et al \(2010\)](#) suggested sober living houses (SLHs) were an underutilized housing option for a variety of individuals with addictive disorders, including those completing residential treatment, attending outpatient treatment, being released from criminal justice incarceration, and seeking non-treatment alternatives to recovery. SLHs offer an alternative alcohol- and drug-abstinent living environment for individuals attempting to establish or maintain sobriety ([Wittman, 1993, 2009](#)). Residents are free to come and go during the day and are not locked into a group schedule, as is typical in most treatment programs. This allows residents to pursue activities vital to recovery such as finding work or attending school. Residents in most SLHs are afforded social support through shared meals, socialization with recovering peers, house meetings, and access to a house manager. To help residents maintain abstinence, SLH's use a peer oriented, mutual-help model of recovery that emphasizes social model recovery principles ([Polcin & Borkman, 2008](#)). As such, they emphasize learning about addiction through personal recovery experience and drawing on one's own recovery as a way to help others.

Although management of SLHs varies, some include a residents' council as a way to empower residents in operation of the facility. While SLHs offer no formal counseling or case management, they do either mandate or strongly encourage attendance at self-help groups such as Alcoholics Anonymous or Narcotics Anonymous. Costs of living at the facility are primarily covered by resident fees. Although some residents are able to draw upon entitlement programs or financial help from their families, most must find work to meet house rent and fees. Because SLHs are typically not part of formal treatment systems, they are available to a broad range of individuals provided they follow basic

house rules, such as maintaining abstinence from substances, paying rent and fees, attending house meetings and participating in upkeep of the facility.

SLHs are similar to Oxford Houses for recovery, which are widely known in the U.S. and developing in other countries as well ([Jason, et al., 2005](#)). Similarities between the two housing models include prohibition of alcohol and drug use, social support for sobriety, encouragement or a requirement to attend 12-step meetings and work a program of recovery, and no limit on how long residents can live in the house. The main difference is that Oxford houses have more regulations for structure, size, density and management of the houses. Similar to our outcome studies of SLHs, which are described below, research on Oxford houses has documented significant improvement of resident functioning over time. For a more complete description of similarities and differences between the two housing models see [Polcin and Borkman \(2010\)](#).

[Jason and colleagues \(2005\)](#) studied neighbor perceptions of Oxford Houses and found very favorable views. However, they did not study other key stakeholders in the community, such as local government officials and criminal justice staff. They also did not aim to understand the impact of regulatory policies on the houses or what various stakeholders felt would improve relationships. Finally, the study was limited to Oxford houses and might not generalize to other types of recovery houses, including SLHs.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to provide data that depicted the community context where SLHs operate. We wished to understand views about SLHs among key stakeholder groups and ways they support and hinder SLHs. To achieve our aim, we conducted qualitative interviews with key stakeholders in the same geographic area where we conducted a quantitative program evaluation of SLHs, Sacramento County (i.e., [Polcin, et al., 2010](#)). We wanted to assess areas where stakeholder groups were in agreement about SLHs as well areas where they disagreed. The ultimate goal was to create a typology of factors supporting and hindering SLHs within as well as across stakeholder groups.

METHODS

[Go to:](#)

Sample

To assess the community context of SLHs we conducted 43 in-depth qualitative interviews with 1) neighbors of SLHs (N=20); 2) SLH managers (N=17), which included the owner of the houses and the coordinator, and 3) key informants (N=6). Key informants included representatives from the criminal justice system, local government, housing services, and drug and alcohol treatment. The overall sample consisted of 18 women (43%), 3 from the SLH manager group, 4 key informants and 11 neighbors. Eighty six percent of the sample was white and ages ranged from 19 to 70. See [Table 1](#) for a list of characteristics by stakeholder group.

Table 1

Sample characteristics by stakeholder group

STAKE-HOLDER GROUP	GENDER	RACE	MAR

STAKE-HOLDER	MALE	FEMALE	WHITE	BLACK	HISPNIC	MIXED RACE	SINGLE	MARRIED	DIVORCED
House	14	3 (18%)	15			2 (12%)	10 (59%)	1 (6%)	4 (23%)
Managers N = 17	(82%)		(88%)			MIXED RACE			
Neighbors N = 20	10 (50%)	10 (50%)	18 (90%)	1 (.05%)	1 (.05%)		3 (15%)	13 (65%)	1 (5%)
Key Informants N = 6	2 (33%)	4 (67%)	5 (83%)	1 (17%)			1 (17%)	5 (83%)	



[Open in a separate window](#)

Data collection site

Clean and Sober Transitional Living (CSTL) in Fair Oaks, California was one of our data collection sites for our earlier quantitative study ([Polcin et al., 2010](#)). Because the current study was designed to complement our previous work, we interviewed house managers at CSTL and neighbors who resided near one of the 16 CSTL houses. Key informants were recruited from Sacramento County, the county in California where CSTL is located.

CSTL is slightly more structured than some SLHs because the houses are divided into six phase I and ten phase II houses. Phase I houses are adjacent to each other and operate as one unit, which includes shared dining and meeting spaces. These houses are located on a frontage road next to a busy commercial street (i.e., not imbedded within a larger residential area). The close proximity provides residents a sense of community that facilitates their commitment to the program. Although much less restrictive than residential treatment programs, there is some degree of external control and structure. Phase I residents have a curfew, must sign in and out when they leave and must have five 12-step meetings per week signed by the meeting chairperson. A minimum of 30 days in a phase I house is required before transitioning to phase II. The stability developed in phase I helps residents to be more successful in phase II, which includes increased freedom and autonomy. Phase II houses are conventional single-family homes and are dispersed in residential neighborhoods rather than part of a single complex.

Although CSTL houses are owned by one individual, there are a number of ways that residents are involved in management and operations. There is a “resident congress” that develops rules for the community, a “judicial committee” committee comprised of residents who enforce rules, and senior peers who monitor the behaviors of residents and bring rule violations to the attention of the judicial committee. In addition, each house also has one designated house manager and residents have an opportunity for input into the operation of CSTL through this person.

CSTL tests for drugs and alcohol at random and may conduct a test at any time if substance use is suspected. A positive test is grounds for dismissal from the house. However, a resident with a positive urine screen may appeal to the judicial committee for reinstatement. Other dischargeable offenses include drug use on the property, acts of violence, and sexual misconduct with other residents. For a more complete description of CSTL see the [Polcin and Henderson \(2008\)](#).

Our quantitative research on 250 CSTL residents who were tracked over an 18-month period showed significant improvement in multiple areas of functioning, including alcohol and drug use, employment,

arrests, and psychiatric symptoms (Polcin et al., 2010). Importantly, residents were able to maintain improvements even after they left the SLHs. By 18 months nearly all had left, yet improvements were for the most part maintained. Although individuals with a wide variety of demographic characteristics showed improvement, those who benefited the most were those who were most involved in 12-step groups such as Alcoholics Anonymous and those who had social networks with few or no heavy substance users.

Procedures

All participants taking part in qualitative interviews were contacted by a research interviewer and asked if they were willing to participate. They were informed about the overall purpose of the study and if they agreed to participate they signed an informed consent document. Interviews lasted about one hour and participants were offered \$20 for their time. All study procedures were approved by the Public Health Institute Institutional Review Board in Oakland, California.

Content of the interviews

The overall goal of the qualitative interviews for all three stakeholder groups (i.e., house managers, neighbors and key informants) was to identify areas of strength and weakness for SLHs as well as barriers to expansion. Therefore, there was considerable overlap in the questions asked of the three groups. Examples of questions asked of all three groups included:

What are the strengths of SLHs? What are the weaknesses? What type of impact have SLHs had on the surrounding neighborhood/community? What are the key barriers to operating and expanding SLHs? How might SLHs be improved?

Because the three groups had different relationships with SLH facilities, there were also some differences in content of interviews. For example, house managers were asked:

What types of individual do well in SLHs? What types of individuals need a different environment? How often are residents asked to leave because they cannot pay rent and fees? How do you think management of the houses affects residents' experiences and outcomes? Are there specific local government policies that impact SLHs, such as housing, zoning or health policies? Describe some of the resistance, if any, that was encountered when this house first opened. How were the resistances overcome? What actions were not effective? Describe how complaints or concerns from neighbors are handled.

There were also questions that were specific to neighbors. Interviews with neighbors began by asking them whether they knew about SLHs in the neighborhood and when they first became aware of them. If they had no knowledge about SLHs the interview was terminated. If they were aware of SLHs in the neighborhood they were asked:

How would you describe them as neighbors? Have you or other neighbors had complaints? Describe any interactions that you have had with SLHs in your neighborhood. Describe any specific ways that you think SLHs impact alcohol and drug problems in your community. What do you think of SLHs compared with other approaches to addiction, such as formal treatment programs or criminal justice consequences?

In addition to general questions asked of all the participants, key informant interviews contained questions designed to elicit information about policies and local laws that might impact SLHs. We queried these officials about their own views about SLHs, the roles SLHs might play in the larger

addiction recovery system, and ways they think public policy could be modified to provide more support to SLHs. Examples of questions included:

What role does housing play for individuals attempting to establish sustained recovery? What is your sense of how well housing needs for individual with alcohol or drug problems are being addressed in your community? How would you describe your department's relationship with SLHs? Describe how SLHs support and hinder the mission of your department. How do local politics affect SLHs in your area?

Analytic plan

A triangulation design (Creswell & Plano-Clark, 2007) was created by drawing on data from the three different stakeholder groups (SLH managers, key informants and neighbors). A preliminary coding list was developed prior to the analysis of the interviews. These codes were based on key research interests, such as factors supporting and hindering SLHs. To analyze the qualitative interviews, we transcribed all sessions and entered text into a qualitative data management program, NVivo, for coding and analysis (Bazeley & Richards 2000; Richards 2002). Team members then coded transcripts independently and met to check coding accuracy and improve coding validity (Carey, Morgan, & Oxtoby, 1996).

RESULTS

[Go to:](#)

The final coding scheme reflecting themes across all three stakeholder groups included codes depicting drug and alcohol problems in the local community, strengths and weaknesses of SLHs, barriers to operation and expansion, perceived impact of SLHs on the surrounding community, views about SLHs in comparison to other approaches to alcohol and drug problems (e.g., more intensive treatment and incarceration), and suggestions for improving SLHs. Some additional codes were applicable to some stakeholder groups but not others. For example, codes for neighbors included knowledge about SLHs and interactions with SLHs near them. SLH manager interviews yielded codes depicting views about characteristics of good candidates for SLHs, the extent to which cost functioned as a barrier, the perceived impact of zoning laws and other local policies, SLH relationships with various professionals and local government, and past conflicts with neighbors and how those conflicts were resolved. Codes that were relevant to key informants included ways SLHs support goals of their departments and perceived impact of policies on SLHs.

Knowledge about SLHs

SLH managers provided extensive comments explaining how SLHs work to promote recovery. Typical was this description from a phase I manager.

...I believe that it [SLHs] definitely plays a substantial role in that it – I would say the biggest role it plays is it offers relief from isolation and that it can make people aware... That one doesn't have to worry about bills or that everything is inclusive is a very significant role as well.

However, managers were only vaguely aware of problems and challenges the houses faced in relation to the larger community. They noted these issues were handled by the owner of CSTL. Managers offered little information in response to questions addressing the larger context of SLHs, such as the types of relationships CSTL has with local and state government, the effects of regulatory mechanisms (e.g., zoning laws), and how issues such as NIMBY (not in my back yard) were addressed at the community level.

Key informants varied in their perceptions about how much they knew about SLH. Those who felt most familiar with SLHs in general and CSTL specifically were those who worked most closely addressing alcohol and drug problems. Surprisingly, the representative from housing services had very little information about SLHs. When asked how familiar she/he was with SLHs the reply was, “not very.” Although other key informants felt they had some general knowledge about SLHs, it was nonetheless limited. For example, one key informant stated, “I don’t know that we spend a lot of time hanging out at programs to see what’s going on.”

Many of the neighbors also had a limited understanding of SLHs. In some cases they had no idea a SLH existed in the neighborhood; it seemed to them like any other house. For those who were aware that there was a SLH in their neighborhood there was often a fairly vague notion of the population served and how the program operated. Without information, some neighbors expressed fears that the residents were mostly parolees or that they included sex offenders. They did not seem to be aware that a minority (about 25%) of CSTL residents was referred from the criminal justice system (i.e., jail or prison) and CSTL does not accept individuals convicted of sex offenses.

Who succeeds and who fails

Many of the respondents, and especially house managers, had very strong ideas about who would be a successful candidate within the sober living environment. Paradoxically, many house manager respondents said that a person had to ‘hit bottom’ to benefit, yet they also noted potentially successful candidates needed to have enough strength to check themselves into a recovery program and to have the motivation to “push through.” Success was viewed as more likely for residents of the SLH who had accepted substance abuse as a disease, one that isn’t going away on its own.

...[to be successful] they have had to accomplish what we refer to as the first step in the program of AA... that there’s no denying of their alcoholism, that they’re passed that point; that they’re willing to accept that they’re an alcoholic, that their lives are unmanageable and they need to do something about it. I think that anybody who comes in these places too soon it’s not going to work you.

It was suggested that people who were too young and unmotivated might fail. Such individuals were not as likely to have hit bottom, were often still supported (or ‘enabled’) by family members and just did not have the long history of failures to motivate them. Prospects for success or failure were also influenced by the right kind of financial support. Most respondents felt that people who paid for their housing themselves from their own earnings did the best as opposed to those who had a family member footing the bill.

... A lot of the kids around here, the parents just let ‘em run amuck and they did whatever they want and now they’re in trouble and they’re goin’ “Mommy help me” and when they screw it up they still get help from mommy. A lot of these kids around here have been through a lot of programs... They’re just not ready.

On the other hand, many of the managers, all of whom were in recovery, said that they would never have made it unless the first few months had been paid for by a social agency, the criminal justice system, a family member or some other external form of support. Some felt that more people would be successful if the funds for maintaining themselves at the SLH were more easily available, especially for beginning recovery.

House managers also felt residents who are dual diagnosed with psychiatric disorders were more likely to have a low probability of success. It was felt that such individuals needed many more services than

those provided for by the SLH and that some aspects of the housing situation might exacerbate these other problems (e.g. people with social phobia having to come in contact with many strangers on a daily basis or people with paranoia having to share space with other residents). In addition, it was felt that people with more severe mental disorders such as schizophrenia might need skilled personnel to monitor medications.

Well definitely those with dual diagnosis that we are not prepared to handle – and there are special cases I mean obviously if there is some illness that runs deeper than alcoholism there's no way they can get the help they need here, nor do they pretend that they can offer that sort of help. ... And it's not like people here don't go see psychiatrists or therapists or whatever because I know there are more than one that do but just if the problems are running much deeper.

People who had been coerced into coming to the SLH were also thought to be unlikely to succeed in the long-term. If an individual had chosen treatment instead of prison or parole, or were forced by the courts, it was thought that they would be less likely to be successful. Such individuals often end up as 'fake it to make it' individuals who try to get by with the bare minimum of effort.

... they just want to be clean enough just to satisfy the court; once they've got that done they're on their merry way.

Strengths and weaknesses

Virtually all of the house managers and a majority of neighbors and key informants as well mentioned that the strengths of sober living houses are that they provide structure and support for a recovering substance abuser. The role models provided by the longer term residents, the social support and encouragement of staff and residents, the house rules and regulations and the availability of AA meetings all help to keep a person from relapsing. One of the house managers described the importance of social support for abstinence:

... a lot of people in their usual neighborhoods are family. Like it's not [a good area] for them to get clean 'cause they know a lot of people who they did drugs with. So being like a place where you can live with other people trying to do the same thing and are all about the same thing is really supportive and it helps you stay positively influenced to stay clean and get your life together...

Another house manager emphasized the importance of a supportive community:

Community, everybody gettin' along, everybody helpin' each other. Everybody's always helpin' each other around here. If they see that you're down and out they'll ask you 'What's wrong?' or start the coffee or whatever and that's what it is people around here care about each other.

On the other hand, the factor of density was mentioned as an area of strength and as a weakness, sometimes by the same respondents. Density of the SLH was viewed as an area of strength for house residents because it allows a range of services to be on hand (including meals, meeting places, AA and other types of classes) as well as a wide range of role models and positive normative pressure. Yet, because there are separate houses, the residents do not have the feeling of being in an institution; with one exception, the houses are approximately family-sized and offer the opportunities to build skills, develop social relationships and offer a degree of privacy. However, there is one neighborhood where there are six adjacent houses together in one complex. Some neighbors experienced this high density arrangement as having a negative impact on the surrounding neighborhood.

Impact on SLH residents and the surrounding community

Participants across all three stakeholder groups generally felt SLHs had a positive impact on the residents who lived in them and the surrounding community. This was particularly evident when respondents considered the consequences of ignoring alcohol and drug problems or alternative approaches to dealing with them, such as criminal justice incarceration. House managers were particularly strong proponents of this view.

I think we've raised property value. There is no crime going on here. You've got seven houses here and the police don't get called. Cars aren't broken into, there's no burglary you know. I mean the level of integrity of the hundred people that live here is gonna be three times as high as the people living on the street...one over....

Key informants, especially those who worked closely with SLHs and drug treatment, also had positive views about the impact of SLHs. For example, one stated, "I would think that it's just more people that aren't out there drinking and using." Other key informant comments included:

if they work I think they have a great impact...They're good citizens, neighbors, don't create a nuisance within our community, and I think they have a great impact.

The more you can be in a home as opposed to an institution or shelter to me that is beneficial to not only the individual but it's actually probably beneficial to the community at large too...

...if there were a lot of calls for service out there I'd be hearing about it...then we know there are other things going on that we've gotta address but it's usually not been [the case] with CSTL.

A number of neighbors had family members or friends who had a history of addiction problems. Their concern about family and friends who had addiction problems appeared to influence their views about the impact of SLHs.

Well I don't think that incarcerating people rehabilitates them. You know it's like my daughter if she was in that situation where she could at least was trying to get herself cleaned up and can go to a home, I'd be all for that.

...my younger sister had a problem and so she's – so I know she's been in a couple in and out...It's rare you talk to anyone you know honestly that doesn't have a sister or brother, a parent, an uncle, you know what I mean..

...Yeah they need help you know we have a daughter that's a meth user and so I'm all for anything that will help...Yeah and we've been estranged from her for the last 20 years...

Although views about the impact of SLHs were generally favorable, concerns were raised about the potential for detrimental impact to residents and the surrounding community if the houses were not well managed. This was the view even among house managers. The owner of CSTL emphasized the importance of standards and integrity.

We have a class here called Sober Living Specialist and it's a 36-hour class that I put together.... What we're trying to do is create minimum standards and a high level of integrity. And it goes beyond just having a house, I mean you've got recovery integrity, you have fiscal integrity, you have community integrity you know. So we talk about ADA [Americans with Disabilities Act], we

talk about FHA [Fair Housing Act]; we talk about structure and management; we talk about how to keep your books and pay taxes and be financially in integrity. We talk about confidentiality and do no harm and a code of ethics.

Phase I and phase II houses Despite generally positive views about the impact of SLHs on surrounding communities, key informants and some phase I neighbors raised concerns about the impact when houses were too densely located in one neighborhood. One key informant commented:

Well, it changes the atmosphere; I think that when you walk through, you drive through and there's a group of adults sitting outside you often wonder what's that all about. Is it a halfway house, is it sober living? What's going on is it just about a big family and you know those sorts of things. So it makes you wonder about the neighborhood.

When we looked at the characteristics of the neighbors who had concerns it became clear that they lived in the vicinity of the six phase I houses that were densely located along a two block area in one complex. One neighbor stated, "I hate to say this, but I would say it's been negative. One would've been fine (laughs) but the whole block is too many for this small street." Some complaints of neighbors had to do with nuisance issues such as noise and parking.

...The only thing that gets people in the neighborhood kind of upset is if you have too many cars and sometimes if there's too many people there, if they have too many guests it'll get the neighbor across the street upset...

...I don't see them as strict enough...I mean they're lifting weights at all hours of the night, there is no – back there is no control of their language at all... every now and then obviously there are screaming and yelling matches and sometimes they are – they're just you know people have lost their cool.

... they [should] cut the size of it and not have so many people over there in so many houses and that they exercise control when they have these large groups and stuff over there. Because these groups have to be coming from more than just those houses because there's been times when I saw hundred or more people there and cars are parked not only up and down the entire street but over in the Safeway parking lot there's so many people there. And I just don't understand why they need that many people at one time.

A few phase I neighbors expressed fears about safety, the potential for an increase in crime, and declining values of houses in the neighborhood. However, when pressed by the interviewer, they had difficulty providing examples of these issues. A phase I neighbor stated she assumed housing values would fall as a result of the SLH in their neighborhood, but did not elaborate or provide examples of declining values. Another neighbor described concerns about crime:

...there were a couple of incidences where in the night...we had a couple of break-ins and you don't know if it was them or not.

Interviewer: So I'm wondering if the break-ins were close to each other and how long ago it was or how recently?

Well, one of them was 5 years ago, the other one was in '89.

The concerns raised by some neighbors of phase I houses were not unanimous. Different points of view from phase I neighbors included:

Well, for me like I say to me it's positive that there's been a positive impact...the crime situation has reduced. I mean we were broken into three times here before...madhouse came.

It seems to be a big success. They have on you know specific nights of the week and specific nights of the month they have a lot of people gathered there in support of the people that are graduating from the program or hopefully successfully moving on from that program. So I have a lot of support for that, I've known several people in my lifetime through friends or employees that have been working for us that had issues with drugs and needed to clean up. And so I think it's a huge benefit to helping people get back on track and finding that support system and other people that are going through the same situations that can be there for each other and be a good support structure for each other.

Another phase I neighbor succinctly summed up the pros and cons of having a large community of phase I houses:

...because you have it the way it is the level of support is incredible as opposed to having the phase 2 houses which are more isolated. But of course you have to work to get that and...having large phase I houses is probably a good thing but it you know it is in a residential neighborhood area and so you create a traffic issue and the streets line up, I mean that's what they have to do. And we were real worried 'cause we thought that whole frontage area was gonna be gone on this latest modification and it was like okay now what are they gonna do? But it isn't, and they are considerate, they do a good job, but it is a lot— they have a lot of people on Sunday night.

Reactions from neighbors of phase II houses were nearly all positive. Neighbors were either unaware that a SLH existed in their neighborhood and when they did know about one they were perceived as good neighbors. One neighbor of a phase II house reported a positive incident with a SLH resident who lived next door. During a violent late night altercation with his wife, he was forced to leave his home. He found refuge and counsel from his next-door neighbor. It was then he learned this was a SLH. In another neighborhood, a single mother reported feeling “safe” because of the SLH residents living across the street. They kept an eye on her house and reported to her when a group of teenagers climbed the fence to her property. She also commented that the SLH residents were good role models for her teenage son.

Residents of phase II houses were viewed as quiet and they maintained their properties well. A few reports suggested there was admiration among neighbors for the changes the residents were attempting to make in their lives:

...I would hope that people would be more observant and respectful to them because they chose to take a different road with their life...they're trying to make a difference for their lives and themselves and their families so I would hope people would respect that.

One phase II SLH manager told a story of a neighbor expressing appreciation for their work recovering from alcohol and drug problems.

...she likes to bake a lot so she brought me like cake, right and she's like 'hi, I'm so and so. I live next door and I just came down here to support you and tell you that I'm so proud of you and I like what you guys are doing here and keep doing the right thing' and I was like “who are

you?" ...they're like an awesome old couple next door and they have a couple grandchildren and like I said I walk out of the house, they ask me how I'm doing.

Improving the community context

All three stakeholder groups felt the reputation of CSTL in the local community benefited from a variety of volunteer activities in which residents participated. These included involvements in activities such as hosting a Christmas holiday party open to the local community and volunteering to support various events (e.g., parades, Veteran's Day activities and seasonal festivals). One house manager noted:

...so we do stuff like volunteer so that we don't get a [bad] name. Because you know a lot of us we stole a lot, we hurt a lot of people through our actions. So when we give back it shows the community that we're not like that now. We're trying to change. We're still people. We just had problem and we're fixing it now.

Phase I neighbors felt providing more information about SLHs and developing forums for more interaction would be good ways to improve relationships:

"Well maybe if they had more interaction with the community as far as letting the community know what's goin' on, what their goals are, what their success rate is.

Other suggestions from phase I neighbors included distributing brochures about CSTL to local neighbors, inviting them to attend a question and answer meeting at the main facility, and promoting a neighborhood barbeque. One man appeared to be frustrated not having the phone number for whom to call if there were concerns. Another felt intimidated by the residents and feared he would be misunderstood if he raised his concerns. One neighbor suggested CSTL residents get involved in volunteer work, apparently not aware that CSTL residents were already involved in a variety of volunteer activities.

It is important to note that like neighbors of CSTL, house managers also felt increased contact and communication would improve relationships. Managers felt many concerns that neighbors had were based on fear rather than information about the program:

I would challenge the skeptics to come spend a day or two around here and see how the people are; see how these places work; see what they promote, what kind of lifestyle they promote and you know see if their opinion hadn't changed in that period of time.

Another house manager felt similarly:

Like come on in and check it out. Bring a city council member, bring a newspaper reporter, you know bring whoever you'd like and come and see. It's not a cult....its people trying to better themselves.

Finally, like one of the neighbors, the coordinator of CSTL expressed a wish that residents could be involved in more volunteer activities, mentioning breast cancer awareness as an example.

Regulatory impact on SLHs

There is no state or local licensing of SLHs. Because anyone can set up a SLH and operate it as they wish, stakeholders felt there was a need for standards for SLHs. When asked about obstacles to

expanding SLHs, several house managers noted that standards were important for both the houses and the operators, “I think there should be more strict guidelines on who can operate these places.” One of the key informants noted, “...you know licenses or having somebody in the neighborhood that would involve you know the code of enforcement people.” There was a clear sense among all participants that poorly run houses were a threat to all SLHs and they therefore needed to be dealt with “swiftly because they are the ones that make it bad for everybody else.” None of the participants mentioned that CSTL was a member of the California Association of Addiction and Recovery Resources (CAARR), which does certify SLHs for compliance with basic safety, health, and operations standards.

There were differences of opinion among stakeholders about the need for a special use zoning permit. A few neighbors and key informants felt that any house containing more than six individuals required a special use permit or it would violate zoning laws. The owner challenged that contention citing the Americans with Disabilities Act and the Fair Housing Act:

...since we are considered disable Americans, which the total public and the whole government want to ignore... we're protected by the Fair Housing Act which says that people with addiction have to be treated like any other family. They can live together; they can have more than six people. Now if the county wants to limit it to six people and then anything over six people you get a use permit then that should apply to every family in Sacramento County as well.

When we asked house managers about the impact of regulatory laws and policies on SLH operations the nearly unanimous response was that these issues that were dealt with exclusively by the owner of CSTL. This individual is active in the local community and also has connections in state government. It is important to note that some of the earlier critics of CSTL now support the program. The owner attributes much of this shift to familiarity; the fact that critics were able to get to know him personally and observe what actually goes on in the houses.

Typology of factors supporting and hindering SLHs

[Table 2](#) shows a summary of factors that support and hinder SLHs from the vantage point of different stakeholders.

Table 2

Factors supporting and hindering sober living houses

	Supporting	Hindering
House Managers	Volunteering	Poorly run houses
	Characteristics of Owner	Stigma
	Familiarity with SLHs	Criminal Justice Mandated
	Addressing Complaints Promptly	Dual Diagnosis
	Scope of Addiction Problems	Finances
	Communication	

	Supporting	Hindering
Neighbors	Volunteering	Poorly run houses
	Familiarity with SLHs	Nuisance Problems
	Addiction in Family	Perceptions of Crime
	Good Neighbor Behaviors	Perceptions that housing values decline
	Addressing Complaints Promptly	Large houses
	Communication	Densely populated houses
Key Informants	Characteristics of Owner	Poorly run houses
	Addressing Complaints Promptly	Nuisance problems
	Scope of Addiction Problems	Zoning Laws
		Large houses
		Densely populated houses
		Finances

Note: Poorly run houses include factors such as poor appearance and lack of resident accountability.

Nuisance problems include factors such as noise level, parking, offensive language and cigarette butts.

Hindering factors for neighbors primarily refer to Phase I houses.

DISCUSSION

[Go to:](#)

Overall, there was significant support for SLHs across stakeholder groups. To some extent, our finding that phase II houses were either viewed favorably by neighbors or were not perceived as different from any other house in the neighborhood replicates the study by [Jason et al \(2005\)](#) of Oxford Houses. Even when neighbors or key informant had criticisms of phase I houses, they nevertheless supported the importance of this type of service in the community and viewed it as preferable to alternative responses to alcohol and drug problems (e.g., criminal justice).

Concerns about phase I houses appeared to center mostly on issues such as the larger size and higher density of these houses in one area, as well as related concerns about noise and traffic. Only a few mentioned issues related to resident behavior, such as offensive language and leaving cigarette butts in the area. It is worth noting that even the most critical phase I neighbors supported the importance of recovery programs and sober housing as a concept. They tended to want the program to have more control over resident behavior and find solutions to the high density of houses and corresponding problems such as limited parking.

CSTL faces a dilemma in that the larger, higher density phase I houses were viewed as helpful to recovery by house managers and even by one of the neighbors. The large complex of adjacent phase I houses creates a sense of independent living blended with extensive support and some degree of structure, both of which are felt to be essential to recovery. The design also allows the owner, coordinator, house managers, and senior peers to monitor the behavior of new residents and address problems promptly. One could argue that the increased oversight and sense of community in phase I prepares residents for success in phase II, and thus leads to stable phase II houses in the community. Given the current scenario, the program might consider collaborating with neighbor about ways to address issues such as parking and traffic congestion. Examples might include holding some meetings off-site or developing alternative places to park when large meetings are held at the facility. Efforts to maintain a “good neighbor” policy by enforcing rules that limit noise, offensive language, cigarette butts, etc. are clearly important.

In a number of areas there was significant agreement among stakeholder groups. Most of the factors supporting and hindering SLHs were identified by participants from at least two groups. For example, the importance of volunteering was mentioned by most of the house managers as well as some neighbors. Size and density were viewed as hindrances by neighbors, especially those who lived near phase I houses, as well as some of the key informants. Both house managers and key informants viewed characteristics and activities of the owner as important to the success of CSTL. Neighbors and managers both felt increased communication and familiarity with SLH operations could help improve relationships. Nuisance problems (e.g., parking) were viewed as a hindrance by neighbors and key informants and all three groups felt that even a limited number of poorly run houses could threaten the viability of all SLHs. Adopting “good neighbor” practices was viewed as essential by nearly all participants.

Communication with neighbors

One of the clearest findings was that both house managers and phase I neighbors felt the need for more communication and interaction. Phase II neighbors, in contrast, were fairly unanimous in their praise of SLHs in their neighborhood and thus felt little need to take action to improve relationships. Given the current stability and successes of phase II houses, the best approach might be to leave well enough alone.

Phase I neighbors and managers proposed specific suggestions for increasing communication that could be readily implemented. These included neighbors attending open houses at the program, the program distributing brochures about CSTL to local neighbors, neighbors spending a day at the program to experience what actually goes on, the program implementing a neighborhood barbeque and developing regular meetings with managers and neighbors to address questions and concerns that arise.

It should be mentioned that the owner of CSTL reported some previous efforts in this regard that were not very successful. One involved going door to door in the neighborhood to introduce the program, which yielded some negative comments and threats. The other involved some ice cream socials that were poorly attended. On at least two occasions letters were sent out to neighbors containing a brief description about CSTL and contact numbers. It is not clear why these efforts were not more successful. It could be that developing a meaningful and sustained impact on the surrounding neighbors will require regular and varied activities, such as regular social events, more substantive forums to address neighborhood issues and problems, and a monthly or quarterly brochure that is distributed to each neighbor.

Although CSTL residents are involved in extensive volunteer work in the local area, there may be a need for more of those activities in the immediate neighborhood. Several immediate neighbors did not appear to be aware of volunteer activities in which CSTL residents participate and they suggested volunteering would improve relationships with the community.

Addressing stigma

House managers believed that stigma plays a strong role in biasing some neighbors against SLHs and their residents. This view was shared by participants in our previous work (e.g., Polcin et al., in press), where addiction counselors and mental health therapists rated stigma as the main obstacle to expanding SLHs. Stigma was rated as a higher obstacle than practical issues such as not have sufficient financial resources to pay for residence in a SLH. In our interviews for this study we found negative assumptions about SLHs when neighbors expressed concerns about increasing crime and decreasing housing values but were not able to support their claims with specific examples.

A good way of addressing stigma was suggested by several house managers. They argued convincingly that the more the local community understood about the day to day operations of CSTL and the

residents who lived there the more they would support SLHs in this and other communities. Instead of relying on preconceived biases and notions, they would increasingly base their views on observations about what occurs and interactions with residents. Contact with stigmatized groups as a way to decrease stigma is a strategy supported by a variety of stigma researchers (e.g., [Corrigan et al., 2001](#)). It might be particularly helpful to create forums where successful residents could interact with neighbors and share the stories about addiction and recovery. In addition to decreasing negative assumptions about addicts and alcoholics, such interactions might offer hope to families who have a member suffering from a substance use disorder.

Managing community relations

A number of managers and key informants noted how the owner was well connected within the local community (e.g., president of the local chamber of commerce) and used those connections in service of CSTL. A notable limitation of this scenario is that mobilizing community influences in ways that support CSTL was the purview solely of the owner. There is considerable risk that if this individual were not around, the relationships with local and state officials would evaporate. It was striking how little house managers and residents knew about critical issues directly affecting the viability of CSTL, such as zoning laws, the Fair Housing Act, Americans with Disabilities Act, and initiatives at the state level to limit SLHs. Increasing their knowledge of and involvement in these issues would leave the program less vulnerable. This could be accomplished through delegating house managers to attend selected meetings and discussion with the owner about how to best represent the interests of CSTL.

Implications for community based programs

Study findings suggest important considerations, not only for SLHs, but for community based programs more generally. One area where there was nearly unanimous agreement across stakeholder groups was the importance of being good neighbors. Therefore, community based programs need to have policies and resources that ensure upkeep of the facilities to standards consistent with the local neighborhood. Further, there need to be policies in place to contain potentially destructive behaviors, such as drug use and other behaviors that would be experienced as unacceptable (e.g., destruction of property). For example, “Housing First” models for substance use disorders that tolerate alcohol and drug use would not do well in the neighborhoods we studied. To avoid open community resistance, it would seem that these types of harm reduction services would need to be located in areas where substance use is more tolerated. In addition, community based programs need to have mechanisms for handling complaints from neighbors. While CSTL was praised by key informants for responding to complaints promptly, a few phase I neighbors were unsure whom to contact and others felt intimidated and that left them feeling frustrated and more negative toward the program. Phase II neighbors did not express this uncertainty and seemed comfortable approaching residents of phase II houses.

Another consideration is how to handle the issue of anonymity. We found that small, sparsely populated phase II houses were viewed favorably or were unknown to neighbors. One workable option for community programs in such circumstances might be to maintain a relatively low profile and simply blend in with the local community. However, when programs are larger and their presence is obvious, it may be necessary to directly address the concerns of local neighbors, especially to counteract negative assumptions associated with stigma. Such a strategy requires forums for such interaction to occur. Both house managers and neighbors had suggestions in this regard, ranging from neighborhood barbeques to information meetings that describe the program and respond to neighbor questions and concerns.

All of our stakeholder groups emphasized the importance of volunteer work. The specific types of activities that community programs get involved in might be dependent in part on the types of clients served and their capabilities. However, it seems that some very public way of showing involvement in

and support for the community is important to garner support. In part, volunteer work might be viewed as important because volunteer work contradicts assumptions associated with the stigma of addiction, such as crime and exploitation of others.

It was clear from our interviews that the owner of CSTL had a long history of successfully managing challenges to CSTL and navigating through the political and regulatory environment. He appeared to persevere using a combination of knowledge about his rights and applicable laws, involvement in local and state politics, and personal relationships that he was able to develop with individuals who were once his adversaries. Such an individual can be invaluable to the development of successful organizations. However, there are serious questions about how the program could maintain its position in the community and its political strength if this individual were not around. CSTL and other community based programs might do well to consider shared models of leadership and responsibility (e.g., Polcin, 1990) for promoting the program's agenda within political and regulatory circles.

Limitations

There are some inherent limitations in our study that are important to note. First, all of the interviews took place in one Northern California County and the issues relative to SLHs there might not generalize to other geographic regions. Second, all of the house managers were part of CSTL and all of the neighbors resided near CSTL facilities. Although CSTL has implemented the sober living house principles promoted by the California Association of Addiction and Recovery Resources in California, there may be individual factors that are unique to CSTL that limit generalization of results. Other SLHs with different characteristics (e.g., size, management, cost and house rules) might have different issues. Finally, the results are specific to SLHs and might not generalize to other types of housing, such as halfway, step down and Oxford houses.

Acknowledgments

[Go to:](#)

Supported by NIDA Grant R21DA025208

The authors would like to thank Don Troutman, owner of Clean and Sober Transitional Living, for helpful comments on earlier drafts of the manuscript.

References

[Go to:](#)

1. Bazeley P, Richards L. *The NVivo Qualitative Project Book*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications; 2000.
2. Braucht BG, Reichardt CS, Geissler LJ, Bormann CA. Effective services for homeless substance abusers. *Journal of Addictive Disease*. 1995;14:87–109. [[PubMed](#)]
3. Carey J, Morgan M, Oxtoby MJ. Intercoder Agreement in Analysis of Responses to Open-Ended Interview Questions: Examples from Tuberculosis Research. *Cultural Anthropology Methods*. 1996;8(3):1–5.
4. Corrigan PW, River LP, Lundin RK, Penn DL, Uphoff-Wasowski K, Campion J, Mathisen J, Gagnon C, Bergman M, Goldstein H, Kubiak M. Three strategies for changing attributions about severe mental illness. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*. 2001;27:187–195. [[PubMed](#)]
5. Cresswell JW, Plano V. *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage; 2007.
6. Guydish J, Tajima B, Manser S, Jessup M. Strategies to encourage adoption in multisite clinical trials. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*. 2007;32:177–188. [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
7. Hitchcock HC, Stainback RD, Roque GM. Effects of halfway house placement on retention of patients in substance abuse aftercare. *American Journal of Alcohol and drug Abuse*. 1995;21:379–390. [[PubMed](#)]

8. Jason LA, Roberts K, Olson BD. Attitudes toward recovery homes and residents: Does proximity make a difference? *Journal of Community Psychology*. 2005;33:529–535.
9. Polcin DL. How Health Services Research Can Help Clinical Trials Become More Community Relevant. *International Journal of Drug Policy*. 2006;17:230–237.
10. Polcin DL, Borkman T. The impact of AA on non-professional substance abuse recovery programs and sober living houses. In: Galanter M, Kaskutas L, editors. *Recent Developments in Alcoholism, Volume 18: Alcoholics Anonymous and Spirituality in Addiction Recovery*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publisher; 2010. pp. 91–108. [[PubMed](#)]
11. Polcin DL, Henderson D. A clean and sober place to live: Philosophy, structure, and purported therapeutic factors in sober living houses. *Journal of Psychoactive Drugs*. 2008;40:153–159. [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
12. Polcin DL, Korcha R, Bond J, Galloway GP. Sober Living Houses for Alcohol and Drug Dependence: 18-Month Outcomes. *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment*. 2010;38:356–365. [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)]
13. Richards L. *Using NVivo in Qualitative Research*. Melbourne: QSR International; 2002.
14. Wittman FD. Affordable housing for people with alcohol and other drug problems. *Contemporary Drug Problems*. 1993;20(3):541–609.
15. Wittman FD. Alcohol and drug free housing. In: Korsmeyer P, Kranzler H, editors. *Encyclopedia of drugs, alcohol and addictive behavior*. 3. Farmington Hills, MI: Gale Group Publishing; 2009. <http://www.enotes.com/drugs-alcohol-encyclopedia/alcohol-drugfree-housing>.