Final Wave Survey Results:
A Preliminary Evaluation of Chicago's Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness

By

Michael R. Sosin
Christine George
Susan F. Grossman
Julie Hilvers
Koonal Patel

Loyola University
The University of Chicago
August, 2011

We gratefully acknowledge the financial support received for this project from the following: Chicago Community Trust, Michael Reese Health Foundation, Polk Bros. Foundation, City of Chicago, Field Foundation, McCormick Foundation, and the Boeing Company. We also appreciate the support and help provided by our partner and sponsoring agency, the Chicago Alliance to End Homelessness, and that agency's CEO, Nancy Radner. The authors take full responsibility for the opinions expressed in this document.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This is the second of two planned documents reporting the results of the client longitudinal survey component of the Evaluation of Chicago's Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness. The longitudinal survey interviews adult clients who, when first interviewed, resided in three types of programs central to the Ten-Year Plan: emergency shelters, interim housing programs, and permanent supportive housing programs. The survey follows the progress of the interviewed clients over the course of a year.

Emergency shelters generally provide beds to clients, but require nightly re-enrollment. Interim housing programs, established under the Plan, generally provide clients with accommodations for a 120 day period. That period can be extended. The programs aimed to locate a permanent dwelling for clients. The programs serve a higher proportion of families than other types of programs. Permanent supportive housing programs provide what can be permanent, and normally subsidized, housing for clients who previously were homeless. Following regulations of federal funding, the programs generally service chronically homeless, disabled adults.

For this survey, between October 20, 2009 and March 29, 2010, first or baseline interviews were conducted with 185 clients in emergency shelter programs, 192 clients in interim housing programs, and 177 clients in what for short will be called permanent housing programs (permanent supportive housing programs). About six months later, the researchers located and interviewed for what will be called wave 2 about 65.4 percent of the clients in emergency shelters, 72.9 percent of clients in interim housing programs, and a robust 89.2 percent of clients in permanent housing programs. In another six months, another round of interviews, called wave 3 interviews, was completed with 58.4 percent of the clients originally interviewed in emergency shelters, 69.8 percent of clients originally interviewed in interim housing programs, and 88.1 percent of clients originally interviewed in what here are called permanent housing programs. Overall, the response or re-interview rate is 75.6 percent at wave 2 and 71.8 percent at wave 3. Some follow-up data exist on somewhat more than 75.6 percent of clients because 19 clients who were interviewed at wave 3 were not interviewed at wave 2. Comparisons of traits of clients interviewed once with those repeatedly interviewed shows very limited biases in the follow-up data on key variables, such as length of experience with homelessness, gender, family status, ethnicity, education, or alcohol, drug, or mental health problems.

The current report uses data from all interview waves to consider questions related to changes in client outcomes, and other aspects of client trajectories, over time. It generally compares the progress over the course of a year of clients in each of the three types of programs. It also in a preliminary way considers the relation between progress in housing stability and traits and circumstances of the clients.

Permanent Housing Programs

Permanent housing programs seem to meet the goals of the Ten-Year Plan by helping clients avoid homelessness. The central finding is that most of the clients who resided in

permanent housing at the time of the baseline interview, 81 percent, still lived in the permanent housing programs one year later. Indeed, these clients on average lived in the programs for many years.

Another positive finding is that, of the few (19 percent) clients who exited permanent housing programs, virtually none had more than a small exposure to homelessness. All were in a domicile at the final interview point. In short, clients who first were interviewed in permanent housing programs seemed to almost completely avoid homelessness.

Those same results also suggest that a very large proportion of clients remains in the permanent housing programs. Another important finding is that relatively low numbers of clients from shelters (12.1 percent) and interim housing programs (18.8 percent) move to permanent housing programs during the period of interest. It is possible, that, since few clients leave permanent housing programs, few clients from shelters and interim housing programs can enter. That is, perhaps the residential stability of permanent housing clients essentially limits the potential availability of the programs for clients who are placed elsewhere. Moreover, permanent housing programs generally are limited by their mandate to serve homeless adults with disabilities. To be sure, our research design does not let us determine whether relatively large numbers of new clients quickly enter and leave permanent housing programs.

Another attribute of the permanent housing programs is that they seem to collect clients with serious problems. As our data analyses suggest, clients who remain in the programs over the course of the year tend to be those with high levels of mental health problems, alcohol problems, felonies, and other disabilities. This is laudable but still leaves in question the extent to which the clients will in the future find opportunities to leave the programs.

Interim Housing Clients

The central research finding concerning interim housing programs is that the clients originally interviewed in these programs are more likely to find a domicile than are clients originally placed in shelters. These Plan-based programs thus seem to help to advance the goal of helping clients escape homelessness. In general, the research suggests that about 66 percent of the clients placed in the interim programs found a domicile by the final interview point. The vast majority are found to move to market housing, that is, in apartments and homes. Of course, these findings also imply that a lower proportion of clients from interim housing than from permanent housing end up in a permanent dwelling by the final interview point. (As mentioned above, 18.8 percent of the clients move to permanent housing programs.)

Results also suggest that only 17.1 percent of those living in market housing at the final interview point report obtaining a housing subsidy. Further, as has been mentioned, results suggest that few clients manage to move from interim housing programs to permanent housing programs. Policies that might help strengthen these Plan-related paths of escape might be considered.

The results also suggest that a moderately large 27.4 percent of clients who originally were in interim housing programs still lived in that or another interim housing program at the

final interview point (that is, on average about one year later). In short, these findings can be taken to suggest that, even if clients in these programs make significant housing stability gains, the programs do not seem to quickly fully eliminate homelessness for clients placed in interim housing.

Shelters

Of the three types of programs, shelters seem least successful in helping clients escape homelessness or remain domiciled (permanent housing programs provide domiciles). Indeed, our analyses suggest that half of clients residing in shelters when first interviewed – many of whom already were in the shelters for lengthy periods of time – remain there a year later. All in all, only 12.1 percent of clients originally interviewed in shelters were in permanent housing programs at the last interview point, and 21.6 percent were in market housing. In other words, only 33.7 percent of those clients originally interviewed in emergency shelters found a permanent dwelling by the time of the final interview point. Further, only small proportions of shelter clients move to interim housing programs.

On the other hand, results suggest that few clients leave the shelters for the street and that clients in the programs do not suffer unusually from declining health or mental health problems. Shelters seem successful in providing basic care. Their clients to a degree find a way out of homelessness, if only at a limited rate.

Our evidence suggests that the lack of programming may contribute to the lack of progress away from homelessness among clients originally interviewed in emergency shelter programs. But it always is possible that results also reflect unmeasured traits of the clients.

Multivariate Analyses

Multivariate analyses comparing the progress on homelessness of clients in interim housing and in shelters continues to suggest that interim housing programs have more success at helping individuals escape homelessness (over the period of the research). In other words, our findings hold up when we take into account client traits that range from demographic characteristics to the existence of substance abuse and mental health problems to the length of experience with homelessness and length of time living in programs. Results also hold up when separately considering the individuals (not family heads) in the two sets of programs, thus compensating for the relatively high proportion of families in the interim programs.

The analyses also suggest several reasons for that differential in improvement. While evidence is not perfect, it suggests that the receipt of the three types of services taken together – professional services, advocacy services, and employment-related services – contributes to the decline in homelessness; that employment-related services are particularly efficacious in helping clients exit from homelessness; and that interim housing programs are particularly successful when their clients first move to permanent housing or to market housing (that is, the clients who so move do not eventually return to homelessness). The clients leaving interim housing for market housing also are found to be usually likely to have some resources, including either jobs or some sort of welfare benefit.

Family Heads

The major finding concerning group differences is that family heads, and thus families, seem to exit homelessness at a greater rate than single individuals. The heads are particularly likely to enter market housing. To be specific, at the baseline interview, 5.5 percent of the clients we interviewed at shelters were heads of families, as were 42.8 percent of clients interviewed at interim housing programs and 22.4 percent of clients we interviewed at permanent housing programs. The clearest pattern of change over time is that heads of families leave interim housing programs in great numbers; they only represent 10.1 percent of those interviewed at interim housing programs at the last interview point. Another clear finding is that a large proportion of those found in market housing at the final interview point (45.1 percent) are family heads. Multivariate analyses confirm that, at the final interview point, family heads experience less homelessness than single individuals when taking into account such personal traits as other demographic characteristics, mental health and substance abuse problems, and the like.

Statistically, the difference in rates of exiting homelessness across family types is fully explained by obvious variables – whether the clients who leave their program first move to either market housing or permanent housing. However, the research fails to demonstrate why the rates of first moves to market housing and permanent housing differ by family status: variables such as the use of social services or the other personal traits of clients are found to be relatively unpredictive, while access to welfare benefits only explains a little of the difference in rates of exit from homelessness between families and individuals. Our suspicion is that families are provided greater resources in ways that are not measured here, for example, because families are preferred by landlords or by programs that offer market housing. It also is possible, and beyond the scope of the study to determine, that services offered by the interim housing programs at which families resided are more helpful than those offered by interim housing programs at which single individuals reside.

Client Needs and Outcomes

There is little or perhaps no evidence that programs force out clients with disabilities, mental health problems, alcohol problems or the like. Indeed, it seems that problem-prone clients aggregate over time at many programs.

Results also suggest that certain disabilities, like physical disabilities, make it difficult for clients to leave the programs at which they first were interviewed. But findings suggest that other problems, like alcohol use and mental health problems, relate to outcomes in complex ways, sometimes seeming to increase the likelihood that clients from shelters obtain market housing, for example. Again, we suspect that the last pattern occurs due to special regulations or opportunities made available in the environment. For example, there are treatment programs for clients with alcohol problems, some of which offer market-like housing.

Housing and Other Outcomes

There is very little evidence to suggest that improvements in housing lead to improvement in health, mental health, drug use, and alcohol use. Accordingly, the aspect of the Housing First model suggesting that stability (or even the offered services) leads to various personal improvements cannot be confirmed with the data at hand.

INTRODUCTION

Chicago's "point in time" studies suggest that about five thousand single individuals and members of families in the city are homeless each night. In 2000, in order to address the homelessness problem, representatives from local government, service providers, advocacy agencies, universities, foundations and consumers of homeless services joined together to release a comprehensive plan. This plan, *Getting Housed, Staying Housed: Chicago's Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness* (Chicago Continuum of Care, 2000) was subsequently published and became the blueprint for radically changing Chicago's service system.

The Plan outlines a bold, ambitious strategy for ending homelessness within ten years (i.e. The Ten Year Plan or the Plan). It argues for doing away with the traditional approach for addressing homelessness. Under that approach, individuals and families who were homeless were provided beds in shelters. Homeless people otherwise were expected to find services they needed to help them solve the problems (such as mental health or employment problems) that might make it difficult for them to find a permanent dwelling. Clients only were provided permanent housing or other treatment options when deemed ready, and they often had to search for such options on their own.

New policy undertaken by the Plan is based on what is called a Housing First approach. As recommended by several contemporary scientific studies, Housing First calls for providing affordable housing to clients as soon as possible and then working with the clients to confront other life challenges. If not yet in permanent housing, clients are expected to be referred to such housing as soon as possible. While services are recommended or provided, the availability of housing does not depend on the use of the services.

In Chicago, there are many different types of programs for homeless clients under the new plan. In general, though, the sleeping accommodations relevant to the Plan (and to this report) can be classified into three types.

There are **emergency shelter programs**. Ideally, clients from shelter programs will be quickly referred to longer-term options. Shelters tend to enroll clients daily; clients usually have to leave the programs each morning and re-enter each night. As it turns out, many clients reside for long periods of time in shelters.

There are **interim housing programs**. Ideally, these programs provide short-term housing options. Their staff members are expected to help clients obtain permanent housing and the tangible resources that are needed to sustain placements in permanent housing. The staff can refer clients either to permanent supportive housing programs, described below, or to "market" housing, like regular apartments. Subsidies are sometimes available for placements into market housing. In most interim housing programs, the targeted maximum length of stay is one hundred and twenty days. However, extensions are possible.

Finally, there are **permanent supportive housing programs**. These programs usually subsidize clients' rents. They also can have their own social services or can attach people to community services. Clients stay in permanent supportive housing for as long as they wish.

In 2009, as part of an effort to better determine how well clients are doing under the Plan to End Homelessness, the City of Chicago and private foundations provided support to researchers from Loyola University and University of Chicago to conduct an evaluation. The evaluation is designed to help guide policy and management of Chicago's system for homeless clients. On the basis of this information, those responsible for implementing the Plan can think through whether the Plan in general, or parts of the plan, can be improved.

As funded, the research addresses several specific goals:

o To detail the program models that actually have been implemented;

o To determine if there are gaps or other issues in the implemented programs;

o To trace client outcomes under service programs provided under the Plan;

o To determine if resources and programs are appropriately targeted to improve those outcomes; and

o To detail client needs.

The research is specifically linked to targeted recommendations for efficiently and effectively improving Chicago's homeless system, allowing policy makers to make a "mid-course correction" to the Plan if needed.

To accomplish these goals, the evaluation undertakes several research tasks, including focus group interviews with consumers, participant observation of homeless individuals at points of entry into the service system (i.e., police stations and hospital emergency rooms), and an assessment of the city of Chicago 311 City Services. Reports on those topics have already been completed. The evaluation also includes a survey of program administrators and interviews with youth in the service system. Reports are forthcoming on these aspects of the evaluation.

Another major part of the evaluation, that part discussed in this document, involves a longitudinal survey of individuals who are in the 3 different types of housing programs supported by the Plan (i.e., emergency programs, interim housing programs, and permanent supportive housing programs.) Individuals agreeing to take part in the survey are studied for a year and are asked to take part in 3 interviews over that period. The survey is designed to answer questions such as:

o What are the characteristics of the clients who are served in each type of program?

o How long do clients stay at the programs?

o What types of needs do clients have and how, if at all, do these differ by type of program?

o What sort of services do clients receive at the programs?

o Do clients improve over time?

o What types of clients do not improve?

A previously released report, *First Wave Survey Results: A Preliminary Evaluation of Chicago's Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness*, focuses on some of the findings from the baseline survey, that is, from the first wave of interviews of the longitudinal client survey. That report highlights findings concerning such questions as who is served by each program type, for how long, what are the varying client needs, what sorts of services clients receive from the different programs, and how services compare to expressed needs.

The current report further reports on results from the longitudinal survey. It uses data from all interview waves to consider questions related to changes in client outcomes and client trajectories over time. It generally compares the progress over the course of a year of clients in each of the three types of programs. It also in a preliminary way considers the manner in which progress relates to the traits and circumstances of the clients.

METHODOLOGY

The report described above (*First Wave Survey Results***)** explains the sampling plan for the study. In brief, the data for the first or baseline interviews were collected between October 20, 2009 and March 29, 2010 using a stratified, random sample design. The intent was to obtain roughly equal numbers of clients in each of the three types of programs (emergency, interim, and permanent supportive housing programs). That is, the sampling design oversamples clients in emergency and interim housing programs, in that way compensating for the fact that most clients housed by the system are in permanent supportive housing programs. The purpose of sampling in this manner is to assure that conclusions can be reached about clients who, when interviewed, were in all three types of programs. The study samples single adults and families proportionally to their actual representation in each of the three types of programs.

Follow-Up Interviews

To obtain the data for the current report, clients surveyed at the baseline ideally were interviewed two more times. Since interviews occurred about six months apart, the study has up to one year of data on each of the sampled clients. Here the original interviews are referred to as providing baseline data (the interview conducted along with sampling), described extensively in *First Wave Survey Results***.** The follow up data are referred to as wave 2 data (collected six months later) and wave 3 data (collected a year from the start of data collection).

Various strategies were used to find clients for the follow-up interviews, that is for the wave 2 and wave 3 interviews. First, clients were told when first interviewed that they would be paid for future interviews. They were provided a $25 gift card to a local grocery store and a

one-day CTA (Chicago Transit Authority) pass for the second interview and a $40 grocery store gift card at one-Day CTA pass for the third interview.

Second, clients were invited to telephone the project before each of the follow-up survey waves to update their contact information and to set up the interviews. They were paid an additional $5 grocery store gift card, when interviewed, if they called. To encourage telephone calls, clients also were told that, using a lottery, two clients who called would be provided a bonus $100 grocery gift card (one client was selected prior to the second wave survey and one was selected prior to the third wave survey.)

Third, staff searched for clients. The clients were asked to provide names, addresses, and telephone numbers of friends, professionals, or others who may be aware of their movement. Searches made use of these contacts (without revealing the purpose of finding clients again). Staff also searched for clients through readily available lists, including the list of clients in jails, and the list of clients reported at programs according to HMIS (Homeless Management Information System). Other lists included one from IDHS (Illinois Department of Human Services). Interviewers also searched for clients at the location where they first were interviewed.

Interviews usually were conducted at the agencies at which clients received services, at the client's private homes, and at the downtown research office that houses the study. Other locations for interviews included library branches, the Cook County Jail, hospitals, treatment facilities, and local restaurants and coffee shops (when no other location was available). About 25 follow-up interviews were administered over the telephone to clients who moved out of the local metropolitan area.

Interview Completion Rates

The data in Table 1 report on the project's success in locating clients for follow-up interviews. This table examines the number of clients interviewed at each wave by program type.

Table 1 - Response Rates at Each Interview Wave by the Three Program Types

Group	Unweighted N Time 1 (% of Total)	Unweighted N Time 2 (% of Total)	Response Rate	Unweighted N Time 3 (% of Total)	Response Rate
Emergency	185 (34.0%)	121 (28.9%)	65.4%	108 (27.1%)	58.4%
Interim	192 (34.7%)	140 (33.4%)	72.9%	134 (33.7%)	69.8%
Permanent Housing	177 (31.9%)	158 (37.7%)	89.2%	156 (39.2%)	88.1%
Total	554	419	75.6%	398	71.8%

As the table suggests, baseline interviews were conducted with 185 clients in emergency programs, 192 clients in interim housing programs, and 177 clients in what for short will be called permanent housing programs (permanent supportive housing programs). About six

months later, the researchers located and interviewed for wave 2 about 65.4 percent of the clients in emergency shelters, 72.9 percent of clients in interim housing programs, and a robust 89.2 percent of clients in permanent housing programs.

Generally, it proved possible to locate and interview and locate again for wave 3 interviews the vast majority of clients located at wave 2. Thus, for wave 3, the response rates for the three programs, respectively, are 58.4 percent, 69.8 percent, and 88.1 percent of clients having baseline interviews. Overall, the response or re-interview rate is 75.6 percent at wave 2 and 71.8 percent at wave 3. Some follow-up data exist on somewhat more than 75.6 percent of clients because 19 clients interviewed at wave 3 were not interviewed at wave 2.

Interview Schedule

As noted in the report on the first wave of client data, information was collected from individuals using a structured questionnaire incorporating questions that were utilized in the research team's previous work (Sosin et al; 1988; 1994), other standardized instruments, and a small number of original items (see *First Wave Survey Results***)**. The research team worked in conjunction with members of the Chicago Alliance to End Homelessness as well as other experts in the field to insure the survey included questions in all pertinent areas and that wording was relevant to the population.

The final survey includes questions about client demographic characteristics, homeless experience prior to the baseline interview, services received and experiences with service providers, client difficulties including health and mental health challenges and substance abuse problems, exposure to violence, housing quality, and social support resources. Questions in the follow-up interviews ask about current homeless status and changes in housing, service needs and use, and status related to areas of client difficulty and support systems. Follow-up interview questions also ask about the quality of the neighborhood and housing for those in permanent or market housing at the time of the interview.

Specific measures incorporated into the survey and utilized in the present analysis include:

1. *Addiction Severity Index.* (McLellan et al., 1985). The Addiction Severity Index (ASI) is a highly structured, 45 minute clinical research interview which is designed to assess problem severity in seven areas that are commonly affected by alcohol and drug abuse (McLellan et al., 1985). These areas include alcohol and drug consumption, legal problems, employment problems, psychological problems, health problems and relationship problems. Data about previous and current status are collected. In the current analysis, we use information about reported problems in some of the identified problem areas in the 30 days prior to the baseline interview. Some analyses compare that to the number of days in which problems in the same area reported by clients during the final interview.

The ASI has excellent reliability and validity. For example, the inter-rater reliability score for all subscales (that is, all domains) is .89; test-retest reliability coefficients for severity ratings on subscales are .92 or higher (McLellan et al., 1985). The ASI has been used by this team (Sosin et al., 1994) and others to study homeless individuals with substance abuse

problems (see works in Stahler & Stimmel, 1995; also Wenzel et al., 1995; Rosenheck et al., 1997). A convincing test-retest reliability study indicates kappa reliabilities for this population of .70 or more for most scales (Drake et al., 1995).

2**.** *The Brief Post Traumatic Stress Disorder-6 Scale* (Fullerton et al., 2000). The Brief Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (BPTSD-6) Scale is a 6 item scale structured to meet PTSD diagnostic criteria consistent with the *Diagnostic Statistical Manual IV* (Fullerton et al., 2000). The scale asks about whether, in the week prior to the interview, respondents report experiencing symptoms reflecting post-traumatic stress. The scale has good internal consistency and predictive validity (Fullerton et al., 2000). The measure of internal consistency for the present data was quite high at .91. Below we assess how the baseline measure relates to other conditions, and also consider how this measure of stress changes over time.

3. *Personal History Form***.** Current and previous homelessness are measured by a revised version of the Personal History Form (PHF) (Barrow et al., 1985). This instrument was used in previous studies of the homeless (see works in Stahler & Stimmel, 1995) and in this team's work involving homeless individuals with substance abuse problems (Sosin et al., 1994). It has good reliability and validity, with kappas in a test-retest study tending to be over .70 (Barrow et al., 1985; Drake et al., 1995). In the present analyses, we use information about the rate of homelessness as reported in the baseline interview to understand subsequent patterns of movement. We also report the number of days spent in situations constituting homelessness (on the street, alleys, etc., in shelter, in interim housing programs, doubled up and paying no rent for over a month) during the 60 days before the last interview to assess days homeless at the time of the final interview and compare that to days spent homeless at about the time of the baseline interview.

4. *Services Received***.** A series of questions used in previous work by the research team (Sosin et al., 1994) measures receipt of various key services in 30 days prior to each interview. For the current report, some of these measures were grouped into 3 scales. The scales thus represent professional services, comprised of counseling or family services, detoxification services, outpatient drug or alcohol treatment, 12 step programs, outpatient mental health services, medical care and help with money management; advocacy-related services, which include help finding housing, cash assistance from a program such as TANF, workfare, SSI or Social Security and food stamps or SNAP; and employment-related services, consisting of job/employment- related services, education, community voicemail (a voicemail account allows a client to receive messages from perspective employers), and child care or daycare. Again, the measures are used to understand patterns of movement. Change in the measures over time also is assessed.

Complex Design Statistics

The basic statistics and group characteristics reported below take into account the complex sample design used at baseline. This design includes such features as sampling from only some (randomly selected) programs of each type and allowing clients to have differential probabilities of being randomly selected, depending on their program. The reported results thus include statistical corrections for differential weights (weights are greater if the probability of being selected is lower), for the fact that multiple clients are sampled from the same program, for the fact that the sampling ratio varies across housing types, and for the fact that single adults and families are separately sampled. Use of "complex survey design" statistics generally means that tests of statistical significance are more conservative than tests that assume simple random sampling.

Please note that, when reporting results stemming from any one type of program – shelters, interim housing programs, and permanent housing programs – the weights generally add up to something close to the actual number of people interviewed (less non-respondents). However, when reporting results that combine clients from the different types of programs, the clients in permanent housing programs on average are weighted higher than clients in other programs; this reflects the reality that there are more clients in permanent housing programs than in the other types of housing programs (see *First Wave Survey Results***)**. Accordingly, the reported sample sizes for tables that combine responses across program types may appear unintuitive.

Sampling Bias

Ideally, we would like the follow-up samples to be fully unbiased. In other words, we would like clients interviewed in follow-up surveys to be exactly like clients interviewed in the first, baseline survey. In practice, the lack of bias cannot be proven.

One possible bias is that clients who remained in their program may be more likely to be interviewed repeatedly than clients who moved; the latter may be more difficult to find. Indeed, the high re-interview rate for clients originally residing in permanent housing programs suggests this possibility. On the other hand, not all facts fit this speculation: while a larger percentage of clients remain in shelters than in interim housing programs, the re-interview rate was higher for the latter programs.

It also is possible that, since we used lists from jails and from the homeless system, we were more likely to interview clients in these locations than other clients, such as those who found housing in the community. At least in theory, then, the results may underreport exits from the programs and thus, for clients in emergency shelters and interim programs, may underreport levels of escape from homelessness.

But it is not certain that all biases are in the direction suggested above. Some clients who we located still did not agree to be interviewed. Only 17 clients interviewed at the baseline refused to allow us to search for them at all, but 15.5 percent of those we asked did not provide the permissions we needed to locate them through HMIS, which tracks their continued

use of homeless services. Further, 16 percent did not provide permissions needed to locate them through IDHS, which provides the address they reported to programs like food stamps (almost all clients received food samples). Moreover, due to a time delay in obtaining an agreement to use the data, the first 9.4 percent of clients were not asked about providing access to HMIS. The clients who we could not contact because they did not grant us these permissions may have similar living arrangements to those we located. That is, they could reside in their original programs or at other locations where we searched. Because of that possibility, sampling bias may be more limited than it appears at first. Such clients constitute a substantial proportion of those we were not able to interview a second and third time.

In any case, it is not possible to simply use theory concerning the search strategy to estimate whether or not the clients we located, and those we did not, differ in the types of residences they finally obtained. However, it is possible to use empirical data to gain some sense of sampling bias at the level of client traits.

Table 2a, 2b, and 2c descriptively compare some traits of clients interviewed at each of the three points in time. The table distinguishes those who, at the baseline, were in each of the three program types. The comparisons are designed to determine if the clients interviewed at follow-up interviews have similar traits to those interviewed at the baseline interview. Weighting is applied to these statistics. Formal statistical significance tests of the differences in traits are not applied.

Our attempt here and elsewhere in the descriptive part of this report is to compare sample members on traits that are likely to be important for homelessness. For example, we compare clients interviewed at each wave on such basic demographic traits as age, gender, race, and education. We also compare them on homeless experience and on length of time spent in the program. Finally, we compare clients on personal characteristics known to be associated with homelessness, including health status, work, psychiatric hospitalization experience, and alcohol and drug use. Similarity in traits across waves suggests that bias is limited, that is, that the clients we interviewed are similar to those who we could not interview (on the traits that we measure).

Table 2a compares the traits of clients interviewed in shelters at the baseline with the traits of the subset of these clients (who may or may not be still living in the shelters) interviewed at waves 2 and 3. Results seem to suggest that clients interviewed at each wave vary to a considerable degree in the mean number of days spent in the program; the reported average length of stay is greater for the baseline than for wave 2 and 3 interviews. However, this variable has an unusual distribution, since the median time in the program is 90 days but the means are over 300 days (at wave 1). It thus is possible that these large differences are random, even if large. Indeed, the reported *average time spent homeless in general* is similar across clients interviewed at each wave.

Otherwise, clients interviewed at the baseline and in the other waves seem be similar to each other on measured traits. The largest differences are that 21.9 percent of those interviewed at the baseline admitted to a felony conviction compared to 25.5 percent of those interviewed at wave 2 and 24.9 percent of those interviewed at wave 3, and that 54.4 of those interviewed at

the baseline report drinking at all compared to 54.0 percent at wave 2 and 58.7 percent at wave 3.

Table 2a – Sample Characteristics at Each Interview Wave for Respondents Originally Sampled in Emergency Shelter Program Group

	Time 1 Sample (N=185)	Time 2 Sample (N=121)	Time 3 Sample (N= 109)
Mean Age	48.18	48.26	48.23
% Male	80.6	79.0	77.9
% African American	86.5	88.4	88.7
% White	10.6	9.0	10.0
% Hispanic	5.6	6.9	5.1
% Family Heads (versus singles)	5.5	6.8	7.5
% <High School for Education	35.5	31.4	33.0
Mean Total Time Homeless (in months)	64.02	61.40	62.16
Mean Days In Program	347.49	264.03	280.81
% Diagnosed Disability	28.9	24.2	26.1
% Working Regularly	21.9	25.5	24.9
% Been in Any Psych Hospital	21.2	21.0	21.5
% Any Alcohol	54.4	54.0	58.7
% Any Alcohol to the Point of Feeling the Effects	35.8	38.0	37.1
% Any Drugs	23.6	24.1	25.8
% Had Felony	48.5	43.5	45.2

Table 2b compares the traits of clients interviewed in interim housing programs at the baseline with the traits of the subset of these clients (who may or may not be still living in the same programs) interviewed at waves 2 and 3. Here measured biases appear to be quite limited. Across waves, the reported average days spent in the program only varies from 191.5 to 222.1. Perhaps the largest other reported difference involve the measure of felony convictions, since 37.8 percent of those interviewed at the baseline, but 41.3 percent of those interviewed at wave 3, report these convictions. Results also suggest that the percent of Hispanic respondents declines from 15.3 percent at the baseline to 12.6 percent at wave 3.

Table 2b – Sample Characteristics at Each Interview Wave for Respondents Originally Sampled in Interim Housing Program Group

	Time 1 Sample (N=192)	Time 2 Sample (N=143)	Time 3 Sample (N=137)
Mean Age	39.73	40.71	40.67
% Male	44.3	43.9	43.6
% African American	76.5	79.2	79.2
% White	14.8	13.5	13.2
% Hispanic	15.3	11.4	12.6
% Family Heads (versus singles)	42.8	37.9	39.5
% <High School for Education	35.9	34.3	32.8
Mean Total Time Homeless (in months)	39.55	44.94	45.12
Mean Days In Program	191.51	217.27	222.05
% Diagnosed Disability	27.0	29.3	28.1
% Working Regularly	27.9	27.7	30.4
% Been in Any Psych Hospital	28.0	31.0	29.6
% Any Alcohol	19.8	19.7	20.6
% Any Alcohol to the Point of Feeling the Effects	8.9	7.7	7.4
% Any Drugs	15.2	15.5	14.5
% Had Felony	37.8	41.1	41.3

Table 2c compares the traits of clients interviewed in permanent housing programs at the baseline with the traits of the subset of these clients (who may or may not be still living in the same programs) interviewed at waves 2 and 3. The reported mean days in the program varies across waves from 756.4 to 814.4. Otherwise, differences in reported traits at each wave seem small. This similarity of traits across waves should be expected in light of the high response rates for clients in this type of program.

Again, it is not possible to definitively demonstrate the lack of bias in the follow-up samples; clients interviewed at each wave may differ in ways we cannot or do not measure. Nevertheless, the figures reported above suggest that clients interviewed at each wave tend to be similar to each other on a variety of demographic traits and other characteristics that seem highly relevant to homelessness. This suggests that the sample is viable.

Table 2c – Sample Characteristics at Each Interview Wave for Respondents Originally Sampled in Permanent Housing Program Group

	Time 1 Sample (N=177)	Time 2 Sample (N=157)	Time 3 Sample (N=154)
Mean Age	45.03	45.18	45.6
% Male	49.1	48.7	48.7
% African American	84.3	84.5	82.8
% White	14.3	12.6	14.3
% Hispanic	3.2	3.6	3.7
% Family Heads (versus singles)	22.4	21.3	21.6
% <High School for Education	30.4	29.5	30.5
Mean Total Time Homeless (in months)	63.50	66.56	65.98
Mean Days In Program	776.96	756.42	814.38
% Diagnosed Disability	61.2	62.2	61.6
% Working Regularly	25.4	25.5	25.2
% Been in Any Psych Hospital	48.4	49.5	47.4
% Any Alcohol	29.7	28.9	27.9
% Any Alcohol to the Point of Feeling the Effects	17.7	18.8	19.1
% Any Drugs	18.2	19.3	18.1
% Had Felony	36.3	37.9	39.0

PATTERNS OF MOVEMENT

The next few tables are used to describe the residential history of clients who first were interviewed in each of the three types of programs. Certain tables also report on the resources clients have at their disposal.

Of course, ideally, clients in shelters and interim housing programs would all exit and would end up in a permanent dwelling. Clients in permanent housing programs would either stay in those programs or move to other permanent dwellings, like apartments or homes. The descriptive tables help determine the degree to which these ideals are achieved.

These tables generally compare the housing arrangements of clients at the first interview to their arrangements at the last interview for which we have information. In other words, we examine client progress in finding a home from the starting point of the survey to the endpoint. We partly are interested in determining if one or another type of program seems to help clients the most.

In looking at change, the information used to represent the last living arrangement often stems from the wave 3 interviews, that is, from the interviews completed a year after the baseline data were collected. However, if clients provided a wave 2 but not a wave 3 interview, the information used in the tables stems from the wave 2 interviews. Forty clients provided only a wave 2 and not a wave 3 interview. Clients providing only one interview are not included in any analyses. Certain tables provide some idea of the time-frame covered by the survey. These tables report the average number of days between the baseline and final interviews.

Please keep in mind that the descriptive tables do not fully take into account differences in the traits of clients. That is, descriptive tables do not prove causal relations. For example, results may show that many clients remain in permanent housing programs, but that descriptive finding does not make it clear whether retention occurs because the programs are set up well or because they serve the "types" of clients who would be unlikely to leave any programs in which they were placed. Analyses reported near the end of this report make an attempt to take into account a range of other variables.

Table 3 reports on the proportion of clients who left their original program during the period under investigation. The table suggests that there are vast differences across the three types of programs in rates of exit.

Table 3 – Percent Leaving and Staying in Original Housing Program Between First and Last Interview By Original Program Type*

		N	%
Emergency (N=129)			
	Remained in the Baseline Interview Location Over All Interviews Completed	57	43.9
	Average Number of Days between First and Last Interview	299.4	
	Left & Returned to Baseline Program as of Last Interview Completed *	7	5.6
	Average Number of Days between First and Last Interview	327.9	
	Exited the Baseline Program and Remained at Another Location as of Last Interview Completed *	65	50.5
	Average Number of Days between First and Last Interview	349.6	

Interim (N=149)			
	Remained in the Baseline Interview Location Over All Interviews Completed	22	14.5
	Average Number of Days between First and Last Interview	313.5	
	Left & Returned to Baseline Program as of Last Interview Completed *	4	2.9
	Average Number of Days between First and Last Interview	366.5	
	Exited the Baseline Program and Remained at Another Location as of Last Interview Completed *	123	82.7
	Average Number of Days between First and Last Interview	345.6	
Permanent (N=160)			
	Remained in the Baseline Interview Location Over All Interviews Completed	130	81.0
	Average Number of Days between First and Last Interview	303.1	
	Left & Returned to Baseline Program as of Last Interview Completed *	1	0.5
	Average Number of Days between First and Last Interview	435	
	Exited the Baseline Program and Remained at Another Location as of Last Interview Completed *	30	18.5
	Average Number of Days between First and Last Interview	332.2	

* Includes individuals interviewed only 2 as well as all 3 times.

Emergency Shelters. With respect to shelters, the results reported in the table suggest that a large, 43.9 percent of the clients found in shelters at the baseline interview remained in the same location at the last interview point. Another 5.6 percent left the shelter but returned to the same shelter by the last interview point. This means that only slightly more than half—50.5 percent of those interviewed – exited the program and remained at another location. The table

also suggests that clients were interviewed for the last follow-up from about 299 to 350 days after the baseline interview.

In other words, these results suggest that interviewed clients originally located in shelters frequently were unable to exit, even though they were followed over a relatively lengthy period. These findings occur despite the fact that, in theory, shelters are temporary programs. Further, as table 2a suggests, many of these clients resided in the shelter for a long period when first interviewed (that is, at the baseline interview). In sum, many clients seem to reside in shelters for very lengthy periods.

Interim Housing Programs. As the middle section of the Table suggests, only 14.5 percent of clients originally in interim housing programs remained in their baseline or original placement for the entire period of study, while 2.9 percent left but returned to that program. Altogether, then, the table suggests that 82.7 percent of the interviewed clients left their original interim housing placement and did not return during the course of the research. On average, the final interview point was 340.5 days after the original interview.

The proportions remaining in the interim housing programs are lower than those reported for clients in shelters, suggesting that the new, housing-first oriented programs are superior in helping clients exit from programs. Of course, differences in client characteristics can explain this, since such differences can affect the ability or willingness of clients to exit a program. Differences in programming also may explain the results.

Since interim housing programs ideally keep clients for up to 120 days, and since the original sample included a cross-section of clients who already were in the program for about 192 days on average (see table 2b), it is notable that even a moderate percent of clients remains in the programs by the last interview. This can occur because housing placements are scarce, so that programs feel obliged to retain clients for longer periods than expected. If the system still operated using pre-housing first ideas, then the lack of movement might occur because the staff of some programs believe that certain clients are not "ready" for housing (despite the principle of the housing first philosophy that housing should be provided, first). Programs may be reluctant to release such clients. There is no proof that programs still operate in this manner, however.

Permanent Housing Programs. Permanent housing programs can retain clients indefinitely. According to the findings reported in Table 3, clients indeed stay for a considerable period at these programs. Eighty-one percent of the interviewed clients remained in their original program throughout the period of investigation, and another half of one percent left and returned. It follows that 18.5 percent of the clients left the program. The low turnover is in some ways laudable. However, it also may be a problem for staff in shelters and interim housing programs who wish to place clients: it seems that few openings develop in the permanent housing programs. In other words, the findings suggest that few new clients can be successfully referred to permanent housing programs. The length of the stay in permanent housing is far longer than one year, of course, because many interviewed clients were in the programs for a lengthy period when they provided information for the baseline interview (see Table 2c). Nevertheless, please keep in mind that our original sample including a cross-section

of all previously homeless clients in permanent housing. It also is possible that large numbers of clients enter and quickly leave the programs, thus creating more openings than our data suggest. Our methods cannot uncover that type of turnover.

First Living Arrangements

Table 4 reports the first living arrangements of interviewed clients who left each of the three types of programs. The reporting categories distinguish three types of homelessness: residing in a shelter, living on the "street," and living in an interim housing program. They also differentiate two types of permanent residential options: permanent housing and market housing. The latter indicates living in conventional apartments and houses. Market housing covers circumstances where an individual or family pays for all of the rent, shares the rent, receives a subsidy, or lives with others for free. Finally, the last category includes residing in an institution: a hospital, treatment center, or (rarely) jail or prison. Technically, clients residing in an institution remain homeless unless they already have a dwelling to which they can return after their institutional stay.

Table 4 – First Living Arrangements for Clients who Left Baseline Program By Program Type

		N	%
Emergency (N=73)			
	On Street	4	5.0
	Shelter	11	15.7
	Interim Housing	7	9.5
	Permanent Housing	11	15.3
	Market Housing	31	42.6
	Institution	9	11.8
Interim (N=127)			
	On Street	6	4.8
	Shelter	4	3.1
	Interim Housing	22	17.1
	Permanent Housing	21	16.2
	Market Housing	69	54.6
	Institution	5	4.3
Permanent (N=29*)			
	On Street	0	0
	Shelter	0	0
	Interim Housing	0	0
	Permanent Housing	5	18.6
	Market Housing	21	71.1
	Institution	3	10.4

*Data are missing for one individual who moved.

Exits from Emergency Shelters. As the Table suggests, movements "down" or to other shelters do not seem common. Only 5 percent of the reporting clients who left shelters immediately moved to the streets, while 15.7 percent moved to another shelter. Further, clients do not readily move from shelters to interim housing programs; only 9.5 percent of clients reporting that the exited the shelters were able to move "up" to an interim housing program. In other words, the emergency shelter and interim housing system seem to be more like alternatives to each other than linked options in a unified system.

Results suggest that only a moderate, 15.3 percent of clients exiting shelters reported that they directly moved to permanent housing. This again shows the limited links between placements in types of programs within the system. Approximately 11.8 percent of exiting individuals reportedly moved to an institution. In contrast, 42.6 percent reported moving to market housing.

In general, then, results suggest that almost half of those exiting the shelters managed to find market housing. The results also suggest that a majority of those who left the shelters reportedly found either market housing or a placement in a permanent housing program. This level of success seems modest when taking into account those who did not move at all. That is, given that 50.5 percent of the clients reported remaining in the shelter (or exited and returned, as reported in Table 3), and 58.4 percent reporting moving to a permanent housing program or to market housing, over a period of almost a year only 29.5 percent of the originally interviewed cross-section of residents of shelters (multiplying 50.5 percent by 58.4 percent) found a permanent dwelling immediately upon leaving the shelter. That seems to be a relatively disappointing rate of locating a permanent dwelling.

Exits from Interim Housing Programs. The results reported in Table 4 also suggests that, of clients originally in interim housing who moved elsewhere (and were interviewed), only 7.9 percent moved down the ladder of permanence in the sense that they left the program to immediately enter a shelter or to live on the street. Only 17.1 percent moved to another interim housing program. Only a moderate 16.2 percent moved to a permanent housing program, again demonstrating the limited links between residential options offered under the plan.

In contrast, 54.6 percent of those leaving their interim housing program immediately moved into market housing. Further, adding together the percentage of interviewed clients reportedly entering market housing or a permanent housing program, the table suggests that 70.8 percent of interviewed clients who left the program located a permanent dwelling. Since 82.7 percent of all surveyed clients interviewed at interim housing at the baseline left the interim housing programs over the interview period, it follows that a reasonably robust, but not ideal, 58.6 percent of clients interviewed in interim housing found a permanent dwelling immediately upon exiting the interim housing program within the period under investigation. Clearly, interim housing programs are more successful than shelters in helping clients find a permanent residence. As previously mentioned, the difference across types of programs can occur for reasons involving the programs or the desires and abilities of the clients.

The results reported in Table 4 suggest that very few clients left their permanent housing programs. It also suggests that clients who did leave those programs fared relatively

well. None of the clients located for a follow-up interview left the programs and then ended up homeless. Approximately 18.6 percent of the few who left their program moved to another permanent housing program, while 71.1 percent moved to market housing. Of course, that last figure includes only 21 individuals out of 161 interviewees. These statistics again suggest that permanent housing programs are highly successful at helping people avoid homelessness, but that people live in them for long periods on average and do not frequently move to other residential options.

In sum, there are large differences in the degree to which the clients who left each type of program escaped homelessness. There also are large differences in the degree to which clients remained in the programs. Permanent housing programs seem to retain many clients and generally to help clients avoid becoming homeless; interim housing programs retain relatively few clients and help the majority of clients find a permanent housing. Emergency shelters seem relatively unsuccessful in helping clients find a permanent dwelling. As will be noted, the major patterns here and below are confirmed in multivariate analyses.

Subsequent Moves

How stable were the first living arrangements? According to Table 5, patterns of stability again vary by the program type. Of those who left the emergency shelters, 47.0 percent moved at least one more time in the period under study. In contrast, 38.7 percent of those who left an interim program moved at least once more, while only 15.6 percent of those who left the permanent housing program moved again.

Subsequent moves may be planned. For example, individuals may accept a temporary accommodation while waiting for a permanent one and then may move to that permanent location. Subsequent moves also may occur because the original placement did not work out. Assuming that unplanned moves dominate, these figures again show that emergency programs, interim housing programs, and permanent housing programs are successively more successful in providing a stable placement. This makes sense since the latter two, but not the former, engage in detailed planning. The first report (*First Wave Survey Results*) describes that planning.

Table 5 – Percent of Clients Who Stayed In and Left Their First Living Arrangement By Program Type

		N	%
Emergency (N=73)			
	Moved From Where They First Went	34	47.0
	In Same Location at the Time of the Last Interview	38	53.0
Interim (N=127)			
	Moved From Where They First Went	49	38.7
	In Same Location at the Time of the Last Interview	78	61.3
Permanent (N=30)			
	Moved From Where They First Went	5	15.6
	In Same Location at the Time of the Last Interview	26	84.4

Table 6a –Living Arrangement at the Time of the Final Interview for Clients Who Left Baseline Program Only – By Program Type *

		N	%
Emergency (N=73)			
	On Street	3	4.0
	Shelter	12	17.1
	Interim Housing	4	4.9
	Permanent Housing	16	21.5
	Market Housing	28	38.5
	Institution	10	14.0
Interim (N=127)			
	On Street	2	1.3
	Shelter	4	3.1
	Interim Housing	21	16.1
	Permanent Housing	28	21.9
	Market Housing	70	55.1
	Institution	3	2.5

Permanent (N=30)			
	On Street	0	0
	Shelter	0	0
	Interim Housing	0	0
	Permanent Housing	8	26.0
	Market Housing	23	74.0
	Institution	0	0

* Includes people who were interviewed last at both 6 and 12 months.

Final Location of Clients Exiting Shelters. Table 6a and 6b provide two ways of summarizing the final living arrangements of clients. According to the top portion of Table 6a, clients interviewed in shelters at the baseline interview generally moved between their first and their subsequent arrangements away from street locations and interim housing programs. Clients instead tended to increasingly move back to shelters (compare results to those reported in Table 4). Increasingly large percentages of those who left the program also found their ways to permanent housing programs or institutions. Yet, the rate of residence in market housing programs declined from the first to their last move (from 42.6 percent according to Table 4 to 38.5 percent according to Table 6a). In short, the data suggest that clients who were able to leave shelters often worked their way off the streets but occasionally seemed to lose the market-based housing they had obtained. These clients also occasionally left interim housing programs to which they had gained entry.

Final Location of Clients Exiting Interim Housing Programs. In contrast, results in the middle portion of Table 6a suggest that, between the first and subsequent moves, clients originally interviewed at interim housing programs increasingly vacated street, shelter, and institutional locations. The proportion landing in other interim housing programs and in market housing programs remained about stable. But a growing percentage, 21.9 compared to 16.2 at the first location, made their way into permanent housing programs. Thus, there is a slight trend away from homelessness for those clients leaving interim housing programs and moving at least once more.

Final Location of Clients Exiting Permanent Housing Programs. Finally, the bottom section of Table 6a shows that, clients originally in permanent housing programs who exited usually ended up in market housing and occasionally ended up in other permanent housing programs.

Perhaps the major pattern of interest, then, is the slight increase over time in movement from shelters and interim housing programs into permanent housing programs. Presumably, clients were on waiting lists for these programs and eventually entered them after temporarily living elsewhere. Another finding of note is that clients originally moving from shelters into market housing had a moderate tendency to lose their placement. This may occur because there was little planning for the clients at the shelters or because of the characteristics of the individuals.

Final Location of all Clients Originally in Shelters. Table 6b provides perhaps the best summary of client living arrangements at the last interview point. It reports on the location of all clients, whether they moved or stayed in the program where they resided at the baseline. In other words, this table helps to determine how successful clients in each type of program were in obtaining permanent dwellings.

As the Table suggests, clients in emergency shelters were only moderately successful in finding permanent housing over the interview period (whether this reflects the shelters or the people who used the shelters). Perhaps the most positive finding is that only 2.3 percent of those interviewed in shelters at the baseline survey ended up living on the street. On the other hand, the majority (53.5 percent) remained in a shelter, and only 2.8 percent moved to and stayed in interim housing. A relatively low 7.8 percent were housed in an institution at the final interview point. All in all, only 12.1 percent of clients interviewed at the baseline were in permanent housing programs at the last interview point, while 21.6 percent were in market housing. In other words, over the interview period, only 33.7 percent of those clients originally interviewed in emergency shelters found a permanent dwelling by the time of the final interview point.

Table 6b – Living Situation at the Time of the Final Interview for All Clients – By Program Type

		N	%
Emergency (N=129)			
	On Street	3	2.3
	Shelter	69	53.5
	Permanent Housing	16	12.1
	Interim Housing	4	2.8
	Market Housing	28	21.6
	Institution	10	7.8
Interim (N=149)			
	On Street	2	1.1
	Shelter	4	2.6
	Permanent Housing	28	18.8
	Interim Housing	41	27.4
	Market Housing	70	47.1
	Institution	5	3.0
Permanent (N=160)			
	On Street	0	0
	Shelter	0	0
	Permanent Housing	138	86.0
	Interim Housing	0	0
	Market Housing	23	14.0
	Institution	0	0

Final Location of all Clients Originally in Interim Housing Programs. The table suggests the clients in interim housing programs were somewhat more successful than those in shelters in finding permanent housing. Only 1.1 percent of clients interviewed in these programs at the baseline were living on the streets at the last interview point, only 2.6 resided in shelters, and only 3.0 percent resided in institutions. A moderately large 27.4 percent still lived in an interim housing program. About sixty-six percent achieved permanence of some kind: 18.8 percent resided in permanent housing programs and 47.1 percent resided in market housing.

Final Location of all Clients Originally in Permanent Housing Programs. Finally, the table suggests that almost all clients originally placed in permanent housing programs managed to avoid homelessness (as their final location). Only 14.0 percent moved to market housing, while 86.0 percent remained in a permanent housing program. Again, however, one problem uncovered by these statistics is that not many permanent housing slots for homeless adults seem to open up over the course of the year. This probably is one reason why few clients are found to move from emergency or interim housing into permanent housing programs.

Another finding is that, surprisingly, clients in interim housing programs seem to only be moderately more successful in accessing permanent housing programs than clients in emergency shelters. To be sure, the latter finding is consistent with statistics in our earlier report suggesting that few clients housed in permanent housing programs reported that they were referred by emergency and interim housing programs. One reason is likely to be that the permanent housing programs tend to admit clients with disabilities. Still, the finding reinforces the point made in *First Wave Survey Results* that, for whatever reason, referrals between types of programs are limited.

PRELIMINARY DESCRIPTION OF CLIENT CHARACTERIISTICS, EXPERIENCES AND LIVING ARRANGEMENTS

Table 7 reports on some of the characteristics and experiences of clients found at each living arrangements as measured at the final interview point. This table thus helps to suggest whether clients with certain specific *traits* were more successful in finding a permanent place to stay than others. The table also helps to compare the traits of clients who reside in various other living arrangements.

Table 7 –Living Arrangement at Most Recent Interview in Relation to Select Client Characteristics and Experiences– Whole Sample ##

	Homeless (N=30)	Interim (N=25)	Permanent (N=296)	Market (N=90)
Mean Age at Baseline Interview (in years) *	48.99	44.86	45.91	41.64
% Male **	85.3	58.5	53.6	31.8
% in Family at Baseline Interview ***	2.6	10.1	18.7	45.1
% Black	88.8	83.9	82.1	83.9
% White	9.5	10.4	14.9	11.2
% Hispanic Origin	8.7	8.7	3.2	9.1

% < HS Education at Baseline Interview	29.1	33.5	32.6	26.5
% Any Alcohol to the Point of Feeling the Effects at Baseline **	33.0	9.2	22.1	10.5
% Any Alcohol Use at Baseline Interview **	60.8	31.5	29.4	24.9
%Any Drug Use at Baseline Interview	27.5	12.5	18.0	18.9
% Felony Conviction Reported at Baseline Interview *	41.2	58.4	42.3	27.5
% Diagnosed with a Disability at time of Baseline Interview ***	22.5	24.3	65.9	25.1
% In Any Psych. Hospital in Lifetime at Baseline Interview ***	18.4	27.9	50.2	24.6
% Regularly Employed at Time of Baseline Interview **	26.2	18.5	21.7	41.7
% Not Employed at Baseline Interview ***	54.0	51.4	72.0	50.5
% Receiving SSI at Time of Last Interview ***	16.6	9.5	33.4	13.1
% Receipt of TANF at Time of Last Interview *	1.4	1.7	5.5	13.4
Had Subsidized Housing at Time of Last Interview +	0	100.0	94.5	17.1
% Receipt of Professional Services at Baseline Interview ***	15.3	59.8	60.3	34.3
% Receipt of Employment Services at Baseline Interview***	10.3	23.6	29.6	57.5
% Receipt of Advocacy Services at Baseline Interview	85.1	95.3	90.5	92.1
% Spoke to Someone about Housing at Baseline Interview ***	29.9	62.4	43.7	64.7
Average Time (in days) between first and last interview ***	346.56	365.26	310.15	358.08

* $p < .05$

** $p \leq .01$

*** $p \leq .001$

\+ Statistical significance cannot be calculated using complex sample statistics

Includes people interviewed at 12 months only.

For this table, the measure of final living arrangements is a four-way categorization: clients are classified as homeless (this includes clients residing in shelters or on the street), living in interim housing programs (this includes clients temporarily residing in such

institutional settings as treatment programs and hospitals, as well as those living in interim housing programs in which clients still are homeless but have their own bed for a moderate length of time), living in permanent housing programs, and living in market housing programs. As the first column of the table suggests, we examine the relation between living arrangements and a range of factors: demographic traits, personal problems and situations that may affect housing location, and resources. These resources include services provided at programs as well as financial resources.

Many issues must be kept in mind in reading this very preliminary table. First, the living arrangements that clients achieve reflect not only where clients moved to but also where clients resided at baseline: many clients are still at the location where they were interviewed at the baseline. Thus, reasons why any particular client resides in a given living situation is likely to be a mix of the factors driving them to enter a type of program (emergency shelter, interim housing program, permanent housing program) as well as the factors helping them to stay in or leave that program. Clearly, then, the table cannot be used to definitively determine, in a simple way, the causes leading clients to be in one living arrangement rather than another.

Second, since it combines responses from clients originally housed at all three types of programs, the table reports the number of clients in each arrangement in a way that takes into account the sample weights used to combine the samples. These weights heavily represent clients who originally were in permanent housing programs and least heavily represent clients who originally lived in shelters (for reasons discussed above in the subsection on complex design statistics). Despite these issues, Table 7 provides an introduction to an understanding whether some clients fare better in living arrangements than others, and what resources may account for the differences.

Demographic Traits

The results reported in the first six rows consider the demographic traits of clients. There are several statistically significant relations between these and living arrangements (statistical tests are based on simple 4-way comparisons). In general, one of these suggests that the oldest clients tend to be homeless and the youngest tend to be found in market housing. Statistically significant differences also suggest that, at the final interview point, male clients are most heavily represented among the homeless population and least heavily represented among the clients residing in market housing. The statistical results also suggest that, at that same interview point, families are least heavily represented among homeless clients, are relatively rarely represented among clients in interim and permanent housing programs, and comprise almost half (45.1 percent) of those making use of market housing. Please recall that, for this table, the "homeless" clients primarily are clients residing in emergency shelters.

Some ideas concerning patterns of movement may be gained by comparing some of these results to demographic traits of clients originally residing in each of the three types of programs. Essentially, patterns with respect to age seem unremarkable in the sense that the ages reported for clients who, at baseline, were in emergency programs, interim housing programs, and permanent housing programs (see tables 2a, 2b, and 2c), are similar to those reported in Table 10 for clients who are at the final interview point homeless, in interim

housing, and in permanent housing, respectively. Perhaps the most notable finding with respect to age at the final living arrangements, then, is that clients in market housing are somewhat younger than clients in other living arrangements. But family heads tend to be much younger than single individuals (see *First Wave Survey Results***)**, and these results are likely to reflect that difference.

With respect to the percent male, one notable finding seems to be that, while 58.5 percent of clients in interim housing as their final arrangement are male, only 49.1 percent of those found in the same programs at the baseline were male. To a small degree, males over time are increasingly represented in interim housing programs.

In this sample, the vast majority of family heads are women, and family heads tend to be younger than single individuals. The results concerning the living arrangements of family heads suggests that the trend in gender noted above may reflect the movement among the families. At the baseline interview, 5.5 percent of the clients we interviewed at shelters were heads of families, as were 42.8 percent of clients we interviewed at interim housing programs, and 22.4 percent of clients we interviewed at permanent housing programs (see tables 2a, 2b, 2c). The clearest pattern of change over time is that heads of families leave interim housing programs in great numbers; they only represent 10.1 percent of those interviewed at interim housing programs at the last interview point (the results may also occur because single individuals enter the programs disproportionately). Another clear result, suggested above, is that almost half of those found in market housing at the final interview point are family heads. In other words, the data suggest, in a preliminary way, that family heads have a greater probability of leaving interim programs and entering market housing than single adults. (That is, family heads represent a relatively limited proportion of interviewed clients but almost half of those reporting that they lived in market housing at the time of the final interview.) Other data not included in the table suggest that very few clients (10.3 percent of those who live in market housing) are provided rent for free. That and the results reported above suggest that families are more able to mobilize resources to pay for housing than are single individuals. Another possibility is that families may be highly represented in market housing because landlords are relatively partial to families over single individuals.

In contrast, the results do not suggest great divergences in final living arrangements by race or ethnicity. Nevertheless, it may bear watching that very few residents in permanent housing (3.2 percent) report that they are of Hispanic origin. This was the exact same percentage of permanent housing residents who, at the baseline interview, reported that they were of Hispanic origin. The figure makes one wonder whether it would be helpful to increase client access in permanent housing programs to staff who speak Spanish or perhaps to programs that generally focus on Hispanic clients.

Background Traits

The table also reports on background traits that may affect the living arrangements of clients. These traits include education, alcohol and drug use, disability status, and a measure of criminal history.

In general, there are many statistically significant differences in the background traits of clients residing at the four living arrangements. The proportion of clients who (as measured at the baseline) reported using alcohol to the point of feeling its effects at the last interview point ranges from 33.0 percent among those who are homeless to 9.2 percent among those in interim housing. The percent reporting felony convictions ranges from 58.4 percent among those in interim housing to 27.5 percent of those in market housing. Reported disabilities, and reported rates of psychiatric hospitalization experience (lifetime history of psychiatric hospitalization), are highest in permanent housing and lowest among those who are homeless. Reported "regular" employment is highest among those in market housing and relatively similar for clients in the other locations.

However, these differences do not seem to indicate causes of moving between programs. Often, they seem to reflect differences in the characteristics of clients who enter each type of program, or changes that are unrelated to program aims. With respect to alcohol use, for example, the reported statistics vary only moderately from reported statistics at the baseline survey. In other words, clients who end up homeless, in interim housing programs, or in permanent housing programs seem to be very similar in alcohol use to clients who originally used shelters, interim housing programs, and permanent housing programs. Perhaps the one "new" finding is that clients who rely on market housing demonstrate low levels of use of alcohol, particularly low use to the point of feeling the effects. Nevertheless, as noted below, the multivariate analyses suggest that alcohol use is not a cause of failing to obtain market housing. Patterns with respect to disabilities also appear to mirror those reported at the baseline.

It also is interesting that reported drug use seems to be unrelated to living arrangements at the final interview point. To be sure, the table suggests a slight tendency for drug use to be lower among those in shelters at the baseline (as Table 2a suggests, 23.6 percent of those in shelters at the baseline interview reporting using any drugs other than alcohol) than among those who are homeless at their final living arrangement.

With respect to felonies, the most notable change over time is that, at the baseline (see table 2b) only 37.8 percent of the population in interim housing programs reported felonies, but the percentage rose to 58.4 percent by the final interview point. It also is notable that felony convictions are unusually low among those in market housing at the final interview point. But it is likely, if not clear from these figures, that the patterns are accounted for because the proportion of families in interim housing programs declined between the baseline and final interview points. (Perhaps it may be argued that differences in rates of felonies are one cause for the tendency of family heads to leave interim housing programs and find permanent housing programs.) Below, when we utilize multivariate analyses to predict homelessness at the final interview point (we do not try to predict remaining in interim housing programs), felony convictions generally are not strong predictors (major factors in homelessness) when taking other variables into account.

The findings concerning regular employment offer a few new but not surprising insights. Since 27.9 percent of residents in interim housing at the baseline reported being regularly employed (see table 2b), the results from table 7 may suggest that those who tend to work leave interim housing programs; only 18.5 percent of those in these programs at the final

interview point regularly worked. Results also suggest that 41.7 percent of clients in market housing reported being regularly employed at the baseline. This suggests that work history, and presumably, a tendency to continue to work (which we consider below), helps clients obtain housing.

A few other insights develop when examining these results separately for clients who began in each of the three types of housing (this information is not reported in a table). For those originally in shelters, statistically significant results suggest that previous psychiatric hospital experience may positively predict the probability of obtaining market housing: 35.0 percent of those in market housing have this experience, compared to now more than 20.4 percent of those residing elsewhere. This suggests that those with mental health problems, ironically, have an easier time than others in finding market housing. It may be that some housing formally labeled as "market" caters to adults with mental health problems. For those clients originally in permanent housing programs, residing in market housing rather than permanent housing programs at the final interview point is negatively related to using alcohol to the point of feeling the effects (3.3 percent of those in market housing report such behavior as opposed to 21.7 percent of those in permanent housing), to reporting a felony conviction (15.6 percent vs. 42.8 percent), and to reporting previous experience in a psychiatric hospital (16.0 percent vs. 52.6 percent). All in all, these findings provide some tentative evidence that disabilities, alcohol use, and the like are related in complex ways to rates of entering market housing (client activities or program patterns of placement may explain the patterns) but otherwise do not drive the movement of clients out of the programs they used at baseline. There also is some evidence that permanent housing programs gradually accumulate clients with above average levels of mental health problems, alcohol problems, felonies, and other disabilities. This pattern makes one wonder whether many clients will in the future have the opportunity to leave the programs.

Resources and Living Arrangements

The next rows in Table 7 consider resources that might help clients sustain an independent dwelling. Here we specifically focus on results in the last column and thus on the issue of the resources that may help people reside in market housing.

As noted above, 40.2 percent of those people in market housing report current, regular work. Further, 13.1 percent report receiving SSI benefits, and 13.4 percent report receiving TANF benefits. Receipt of TANF varies to a statistically significant degree with the living arrangement.

Unfortunately, the results on resources overall imply that at least a third of the population (the maximum percent receiving at least one of the three forms of benefits is 40.2 + 13.1 + 13.4=66.7 percent) is managing to live in market housing bereft of a known, regular source of income. As noted earlier, only about 10 percent of those in market housing report living for free. Perhaps many clients attempt to retain housing utilizing a combination of savings, loans or gifts from others, food stamps, occasional work, unconventional income sources, and the like. Accordingly, some market housing living arrangements may not be very stable. Note that the findings discount the possibility that access to TANF is the sole reason

that families are overrepresented among those living in market housing: TANF is not that widely distributed.

Examining evidence not provided in tables concerning the financial situation of clients who moved into market housing from each housing type, it appears that clients originally residing in interim housing programs seem better financed than those originally residing in shelters or permanent housing programs. Of clients found in market housing at the final interview point who originally resided in shelters, 34.3 percent report working regularly, none reports receiving SSI, and 22.2 percent reports receiving TANF (a few families are in shelters, and perhaps a few other individuals move into families). Of clients found in market housing at the final interview point who originally resided in permanent housing programs, 43.6 percent report working regularly, 14.1 percent report receiving SSI, and none reports receiving TANF. Of clients found in market housing at that same point who originally resided in interim housing programs, 37.2 percent report working regularly, 17.6 percent report receiving SSI, and 28.0 percent report receiving TANF.

Findings also suggest that only 17.1 percent of those living in market housing at the final interview point report obtaining a housing subsidy. This is a bit disappointing; results provide only scant evidence that programs are able to obtain housing subsidies for clients who move to market housing. When examining results divided by original housing type, results suggest that clients first interviewed in interim housing programs are the most likely to receive subsidies for their market housing units (20.5 percent). But this is a low percentage. Note that the results cannot be explained away by suggesting that clients do not understand the meaning of the term, subsidy, since just about all of the clients who remain in permanent housing programs report obtaining subsidies.

Service Receipt

Is it possible that receipt of services helps individuals and families escape homelessness? The simple percentages reported in Table 7 provide very preliminary evidence about this issue. These frequencies provide client reports of services they received when in their original program at the baseline interview. It may be that, if clients receive more of a given type of service and then fare well, that services are a cause for client success.

However, simple frequencies can be misleading. It also must be considered that clients and programs select services: they gravitate toward those services that the clients seem to need or believe that they can use. For example, if clients who work receive employment services, this may mean that receipt of services actually predicts obtaining employment. But it also may mean that those who would have obtained a job in any case are referred to employment services or seek them out as they search for a job.

Nevertheless, Table 7 shows that there are relations between living arrangements at the final interview point and several services: receipt of professional services at the baseline, receipt of employment-related services at the baseline, and speaking to someone about housing at the baseline. In general, those who obtain market housing are found to also be likely to have received employment-related services, while those who remain in interim or permanent housing

programs are more likely to have obtained professional services. It is at least possible to use the results to argue that dedication to a housing first philosophy, where professional services are subsidiary to provision of housing, helps to increase movement out of programs.

A large proportion of those clients whose final living arrangements consist of a placement in interim housing or in market housing report speaking to someone about housing when they were in their baseline program. The finding that those clients in interim housing are likely to discuss housing matters, seems to follow from the regulations for interim housing programs – these programs are expected to help clients seek housing. But this finding also implies that talking about housing does not guarantee leaving an interim program – as further noted in the multivariate analyses.

PRELIMINARY DESCRIPTION OF CHANGES IN CLIENT OUTCOMES OVER TIME

The three types of programs are all aimed at eventually improving the circumstances and well-being of clients over time, that is, the client "outcomes." To determine the extent to which they accomplish that goal, analyses reported below estimate change on a variety of what here are called outcome measures between the baseline interview and the last interview.

The measures analyzed here may be divided into three sets. The first set considers the circumstances and functioning of clients. The items described in this report specifically examine changes in the level of homelessness, health problems, mental health, and substance abuse. The housing programs directly operate to attempt to reduce homelessness, and to the extent to which they succeed, one might hope to also find improvements in the other circumstances. For example, domiciled rather than homeless clients may experience less stress and thus may improve in mental health and find the personal resources needed to avoid substance abuse. Of course, the housing first options – interim housing and permanent housing programs – are explicitly designed on models suggesting that residential stability may lead to other improvements. On the other hand, clients who leave the programs may lose access to important resources, such as free health care, which may reduce their service use and related progress. Further, to the extent to which they rely on a traditional service model, shelters may be organized under the assumption that improvements in functioning lead to reductions in homelessness but do not cause it.

In general, for this part of the study, outcomes are measured as of the final interview point. Client scores on variable measures at the final interview are compared to their scores at the baseline interview. In that way, the data consider the degree to which outcomes improve. The difference between baseline and final scores are subject to tests of statistical significance.

With respect to the scores at the final interview point, the measure of homelessness is the number of days in the sixty day period before the (final) interview that the client reports being homeless. It is constructed using questions from the Personal History Form, which asks clients about their nightly living arrangements. Homelessness is derived from adding up the number of days clients report living at an arrangement the researchers define as suggesting homelessness: living on the street, in shelters, in interim housing programs, in such other

unconventional locations as abandoned buildings or automobiles, or living rent free with others for a short period of time (under 30 days) and having no other place to which to go.

Health problems at the final interview point are measured by two scales. One is a five point scale on which clients rate their health from excellent to poor. Higher scores indicate poorer health. The second is client reports of the number of days in the thirty day period before the interview that the client reports having medical problems.

The main measure of mental health problems at the (final) interview point used here is client reports of the number of days in the thirty day period before the final interview that they reportedly experienced any of several mental health problems, including depression, anxiety, and hallucinations. A second measure considers client reports of trauma. The scale used is the BPTSD-6 (Brief Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder Scale), a six item scale. Higher scores on this scale indicate greater seriousness of symptoms as of the "last week." Substance abuse problems are measured by the number of days in the thirty day period before the interview that clients report drinking to the point of feeling the effects, and the number of days in the same period clients report using any drugs other than alcohol.

The second set of client outcome measures considers levels of victimization. All three programs obviously are organized to reduce client victimization as much as possible. Further, to the extent to which homelessness is reduced over time, it is possible that clients are less vulnerable to victimization. Here relevant outcome measures are reported rates of being a victim of an assault or robbery, and being subject to domestic violence or rape. Each is measured as client reports of the number of days experiencing the victimization in the sixty day period before the interview. However, statistical significance levels are similar to those reported below when analyzing variables measuring only whether or not clients were subject to any victimization in the period of interest. On the other hand, the rates of reported victimization are sufficiently low that there is not much room for a decline over time (that is, there are so called floor effects).

The third set of client outcome measures considers resources. Here the focus is on whether there is improvement in the ability of clients to obtain employment, and also, whether clients sustain or increase their use of social services. All three types of programs encourage clients to work, even if *First Wave Survey Results* revealed that exposure to work services often was limited. Access to services may decline for those clients who leave programs that provided services – largely interim housing and permanent housing programs – but clients may become more comfortable in seeking out services on their own if their living arrangements improve.

The measure of employment is the number of days in the thirty day period before the (final) interview that clients report working. Service use is measured as the number of types of services clients use in the thirty day period before the final interview. As previously mentioned, use of professional services includes the number of the following services used: counseling or family services, detoxification services, outpatient drug or alcohol treatment, 12 step programs, outpatient mental health services, medical care, and help with money management. Use of employment-related services includes the number of the following services used: job or employment services, education, community voicemail (used to collect

messages from possible employers) and child care or day care. Use of advocacy services includes the number of the following services used: services to help find housing, cash assistance from TANF, workfare, SSI or Social Security, and Food stamps (SNAP).

Shelter Clients

Table 8 reports on changes over time in the circumstances of clients originally housed in emergency shelters. That is, the table reports whether there are differences between baseline and final scores on the variables described above. As the results suggest, clients from shelters reduced their level of homelessness over time to a statistically significant degree, from 56 out of 60 days at the baseline to 34 days out of 60 at the last assessment point. This decline seems roughly in keeping with the data provided above concerning the proportion of clients who left the shelters.

The results provide only limited evidence of improvement on the measures of circumstances and functioning. The number of days clients report having emotional problems remains relatively stable (standing at 3.8 out of 30 days at the baseline interview and 3.4 days at the final interview point). The BPTSD-6 (trauma) score actually slightly increases (from 11.3 to 11.8), but the difference is negligible and is not statistically significant. The overall rating of health remains roughly stable (at about 3 on the five point scale). One positive development is that the reported days with a health problem declines by a statistically significant degree (from 8.3 to 5.8 days). Reported days drinking (in a 30 day period) to the point of feeling the effects remains virtually stable (2.9 days). Drug use *increases* to a statistically significant degree (from 3.4 to 11.0 days out of 30 days). Some clients leave the shelters, and it may be that those who become stably housed return to previous forms of recreation.

The two measures of victimization also remain roughly stable over time. The reported days in a 60 day period that the client experienced assault or robbery increases (but not to a statistically significant degree) from 0.14 to 0.20. The reported days experiencing domestic violence or rape slightly declines from 0.02 to 0.01. As mentioned above, the reported level of victimization is low, so that statistically significant reductions are unlikely to occur.

While the trend over time in reported days working does not quite reach statistical significance at the .05 level, there is mild evidence of increased work effort (from 3.4 to 5.1 days out of 30, $p<.10$). Still, this increase is rather modest.

Table 8 - Outcomes of Clients Originally in Emergency Housing at the Baseline Interview and at the Final Interview[#] (N=129)

	Baseline Interview	Final Interview
Circumstances & Functioning of Clients		
Mean Number of Days Homeless in 60 days prior to Interview[1]**	55.7	33.9
Mean Overall Health Rating by Client[2]	3.0	3.0
Mean Number of Days Clients Report Having Health Problems	8.3	5.8
Mean Number of Days Clients Experienced Emotional Problems in Last 30 Days Prior to the Interview	3.8	3.4
Mean Rating on Trauma Scale[3]	11.3	11.8
Mean Number of Days Clients Used Alcohol to the Point of Feeling the Effects in 30 Days Prior to the Interview	2.9	2.9
Mean Number of Days Clients Used Any Drugs Other than Alcohol in 30 Days Prior to the Interview*	3.4	11.0
Changes in Levels of Victimization		
Mean Total Times Clients Were Victimized by Assault/Robbery in 60 days Prior to the Interview	0.1	0.2
Mean Total Times Clients Were Victimized by Domestic Violence or Rape in 60 Days Prior to the Interview	0.0	0.0
Changes in Resources		
Mean Number of Days Clients Were Paid for Working in the Last 30 Days Prior to the Interview	3.4	5.1
Mean Number of Total Professional Services Received by Client	0.7	0.7
Mean Number of Total Employment Related Services Received by Client	0.2	0.3
Mean Number of Total Advocacy Services Received by Client	1.2	1.3

Includes spending nights at all-night theater, subway station, or other indoor public place; subway or bus; abandoned building; car or other private vehicle; on the street or other outdoor space; emergency shelter; clients doubled up for less than 30 days; and for clients in Interim housing.

1. Based on a 5 point rating scale where 1 equals "excellent," 2 equals "very good," 3 equals "good," 4 equals "fair," and 5 equals "poor."
2. The Trauma scale is a 6 item measure with a 5 point scale where higher scores represent greater feelings of trauma.

#. Final Interview Could be at either at 6 months from Baseline Interview or 12 months from Baseline Interview

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

As might plausibly occur if potential revenue sources have been tapped, there is a small, but not statistically significant decline in the number of advocacy services reportedly used (from 1.7 to 1.3). The number of professional services reportedly used remains roughly constant (.72), as does the number of employment-related services reportedly used (.23 to .28). On average, then, for clients originally interviewed in shelters, changes in living arrangements are not linked to many other changes in circumstances and conditions.

Interim Housing

Table 9 reports data bearing on trends in outcomes between the baseline and final interview point for clients originally located in interim housing programs. The results noted above suggest that the vast majority of interim housing clients escaped homelessness between the time of the baseline and final interview. In keeping with this pattern, the reported days of homelessness in the sixty day period before each interview declined from about 56 to about 19. The decline is statistically significant and illustrates the superior progress of clients originally in interim housing as compared to clients originally in emergency shelter programs.

But again, other results suggest disappointingly limited improvements over time. The days reporting emotional problems declines only slightly (from 6.1 to 5.2); the change is not statistically significant. The BPTSD-6 scale score remains about constant (12.4 to 12.2). Overall ratings of health remain roughly constant (changing from 2.9 to 2.8 on the five point scale), as does the number of days in a thirty day period reporting a health problem (7.2 to 6.5). While the change is not statistically significant, the trend suggest an increase over time in days drinking until feeling the effects (from 0.6 to 1.5, $p<.10$). There is a small, not statistically significant, *increase* in drug use (from 3.4 to 4.9 days). In short, while there is an overall pattern of clients from interim housing moving to stable housing, there is little evidence that this aggregate level of improved residential stability has a pay off in improvements in other problems.

Similarly, whatever improvements in residential stability occurred during the period seems to have no general effect on victimization. Clients originally in interim housing report a minimal drop in days experiencing assault or robbery (.09 to .05) and days experiencing domestic violence or rape (.08 to .05 in a sixty day period).

Trends in resources also are relatively neutral or sometimes unfavorable. The trend in days of work is not statistically significant (from 3.4 to 4.9 days in a thirty day period), and work effort among clients originally in interim housing seems no greater than for clients originally in shelter. While there is no discernable trend in use of employment-related services (.60 to .63 services), there actually are declines in use of types of professional (2.1 to 1.4) and advocacy (1.7 to 1.4) services. It is likely that the declines occur because clients who exit interim housing programs lose access to services provided by those programs. *First Wave Survey Results* reveals that clients served when in interim housing typically were served at the programs. Nevertheless, the declines suggest that a simple model linking stability to use of services does not fully capture reality.

Table 9 - Outcomes of Clients Originally in Interim Housing at the Baseline Interview and at the Final Interview[#] (N=149)

	Baseline Interview	Final Interview
Circumstances & Functioning of Clients		
Mean Number of Days Homeless in 60 days prior to Interview[1]***	55.5	19.4
Mean Overall Health Rating by Client[2]	2.9	2.8
Mean Number of Days Clients Report Having Health Problems	7.2	6.5
Mean Number of Days Clients Experienced Emotional Problems in Last 30 Days Prior to the Interview	6.1	5.2
Mean Rating on Trauma Scale[3]	12.4	12.2
Mean Number of Days Clients Used Alcohol to the Point of Feeling the Effects in 30 Days Prior to the Interview	0.6	1.5
Mean Number of Days Clients Used Any Drugs Other than Alcohol in 30 Days Prior to the Interview	3.4	4.9
Changes in Levels of Victimization		
Mean Total Times Clients Were Victimized by Assault/Robbery in 60 days Prior to the Interview	0.1	0.1
Mean Total Times Clients Were Victimized by Domestic Violence or Rape in 60 Days Prior to the Interview	0.1	0.0
Changes in Resources		
Mean Number of Days Clients Were Paid for Working in the Last 30 Days Prior to the Interview	3.4	4.9
Mean Number of Total Professional Services Received by Client***	2.1	1.4
Mean Number of Total Employment Related Services Received by Client	0.6	0.6
Mean Number of Total Advocacy Services Received by Client**	1.7	1.4

1. Includes spending nights at all-night theater, subway station, or other indoor public place; subway or bus; abandoned building; car or other private vehicle; on the street or other outdoor space; emergency shelter; clients doubled up for less than 30 days; and for clients in Interim housing.
2. Based on a 5 point rating scale where 1 equals “excellent,” 2 equals “very good,” 3 equals “good,” 4 equals “fair,” and 5 equals “poor.”
3. The Trauma scale is a 6 item measure with a 5 point scale where higher scores represent greater feelings of trauma.

#. Final Interview Could be at either at 6 months from Baseline Interview or 12 months from Baseline Interview

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

Permanent Housing

Table 10 reports trends between the baseline and final interview for the clients originally interviewed in permanent housing programs. The data summarized earlier suggest that clients normally stay in these programs for the entire period of investigation. Perhaps as a result, there are few notable trends. The reported days of homelessness in a 60 day period declined slightly, but not to a statistically significant degree (from 4.2 to 2.2 days). The mean number of reported emotional problems also declined only slightly (from 8.6 to 7.8 days in a thirty day period), and the scores on the BPTSD-6 trauma scale remained about constant (13.0 to 13.3). The overall rating of health improved slightly (from 3.3 to 3.1, $p<.05$), although there is no discernable trend in days reporting a health problem (9.4 to 9.0). Note that health and mental health problems seem to be somewhat more common among permanent housing clients than clients starting in the other two housing types. This is consistent with the criteria used to select clients into permanent housing.

Table 10 - Outcomes of Clients Originally in Permanent Housing at the Baseline Interview and at the Final Interview[#] (N=160)

	Baseline Interview	Final Interview
Circumstances & Functioning of Clients		
Mean Number of Days Homeless in 60 days prior to Interview[1]	4.7	2.2
Mean Overall Health Rating by Client*[2]	3.3	3.1
Mean Number of Days Clients Report Having Health Problems	9.4	9.0
Mean Number of Days Clients Experienced Emotional Problems in Last 30 Days Prior to the Interview	8.6	7.8
Mean Rating on Trauma Scale[3]	13.0	13.3
Mean Number of Days Clients Used Alcohol to the Point of Feeling the Effects in 30 Days Prior to the Interview	1.9	2.2
Mean Number of Days Clients Used Any Drugs Other than Alcohol in 30 Days Prior to the Interview***	3.7	14.2
Changes in Levels of Victimization		
Mean Total Times Clients Were Victimized by Assault/Robbery in 60 days Prior to the Interview	0.1	0.1
Mean Total Times Clients Were Victimized by Domestic Violence or Rape in 60 Days Prior to the Interview	0.2	0.0
Changes in Resources		
Mean Number of Days Clients Were Paid for Working in the Last 30 Days Prior to the Interview*	3.9	5.0
Mean Number of Total Professional Services Received by Client	2.2	1.8
Mean Number of Total Employment Related Services Received by Client	0.4	0.4
Mean Number of Total Advocacy Services Received by Client	1.5	1.4

1. Includes spending nights at all-night theater, subway station, or other indoor public place; subway or bus; abandoned building; car or other private vehicle; on the street or other

outdoor space; emergency shelter; clients doubled up for less than 30 days; and for clients in Interim housing.

2. Based on a 5 point rating scale where 1 equals "excellent," 2 equals "very good," 3 equals "good," 4 equals "fair," and 5 equals "poor."
3. Based on a 6 item scale with a 5 point rating scale where 5 equals "extremely" and 1 equals "not at all."

#. Final Interview could be at either at 6 months from Baseline Interview or 12 months from Baseline Interview

* $p < .05$
** $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

Reported days drinking alcohol to the point of feeling the effects increased slightly over time, but not to a statistically significant degree (18.3 to 21.5), while there actually was a statistically significant, and large, increase in reported days of drug use (3.7 to 14.2 in a 30 day period). Overall, however, clients in permanent housing program apparently drink more and use more drugs than clients who had resided in either of the other two housing options.

Levels of victimization, limited to begin with, remained relatively unchanged. The mean times victimized in the 60 day period before the interview is 0.1 at both the baseline and final interview points; reported victimization by domestic violence or rape declines slightly (from 0.2 to 0.0 days).

On the other hand, there is a small, statistically significant increase in reported days working in a thirty day period (3.9 to 5.0 days). Use of services remains virtually unchanged and in fact slightly declines (from 2.2 to 1.8 professional services, from 1.5 to 1.4 advocacy services, and 0.4 employment-related services at each of the two assessment points).

All in all, there is very little evidence supporting the suggestion that housing first services give clients the room needed to improve on outcomes other than homelessness. In general, the improvements in relative housing security are not, at the aggregate level, translated into improvements in health or mental health. Work effort seems to mildly increase, but the increase seems independent of the type of program at which the client was first interviewed. Service use generally does not increase over time, and if anything, decreases for those in programs that previously provided many services. Service use at the final interview point thus appears similar for clients who were treated through the emergency shelters, interim housing programs, and permanent housing programs.

Results from other tests generally suggest that families are able to exit homelessness, and find market housing, much more readily than single adults. There also is some evidence that drinking is linked to a limited ability to obtain market housing. But results from the last few tables fail to suggest that there are any other problems or conditions that make it difficult for clients to use some program or housing options rather than others.

MULTIVARIATE ANALYSES OF CLIENT OUTCOMES

Compared to the descriptive analyses reported above, multivariate analyses can help provide a somewhat more accurate representation of the effects of living in different types of programs on the outcomes clients achieve by time of the final interview. The analyses reported below thus use multivariate analyses to consider whether clients who were in different programs at the time of the baseline interview fare better or worse over time. These analyses take into account (controlling for) a variety of circumstances. Analyses also attempt to assess the extent to which any uncovered differences in outcomes across clients originally residing in different types of programs occur because of exposure to services, or because of the living arrangements that clients obtained upon leaving their program.

To be sure, these analyses are highly preliminary. It is unlikely that analyses control for all differences among the clients originally found in each of the three types of programs. In other words, despite all of our efforts, differences in outcomes we uncover may be the result of client characteristics that we fail to measure. It even is possible that differences in outcomes reflect differences on traits that are inherently beyond any measurement. It also is possible that our analyses do not accurately capture causal direction. These and other common issues in basic multivariate analyses are limits to the analyses. Nevertheless, the multivariate analyses increase confidence in the portrait provided above linking clients, outcomes, and programs.

Homelessness for Single Individuals

We devote detailed attention to the multivariate analyses that predict homelessness. Here the outcome, homelessness, is measured as of the final interview point. The measure is the number of days in the sixty day period before the final interview that the client reported sleeping in a location that suggests homelessness.

Our first, perhaps most accurate analysis limits the sample only some clients and types of programs. This analysis compares the outcomes of clients who originally resided in emergency shelters and in interim housing programs. For this comparison, clients who resided in a shelter are provided a score of 1 on a variable representing the program type. Clients who resided in an interim housing program are provided a score of zero. In other words, one variable implicitly compares the outcomes of clients who were in shelters at the baseline to the outcomes of clients who were in interim housing programs at the baseline. This is a reasonable comparison, since clients residing in both types of programs are considered homeless at the time of the baseline interview. Moreover, both types of programs should help the clients locate a permanent dwelling.

In this first analysis, we only compare individuals. That is, we exclude family heads. This is accomplished because family heads are rarely served at emergency shelters; a comparison that includes families may not clearly distinguish the effects of the programs from the effects of being a family head and therefore residing in interim housing programs. Later analyses, reported below, add families. It will not be possible to analyze families, alone, because there are too few in emergency shelters to compare to those in interim housing.

We also control for traits and characteristics that may have some effect on homelessness independent from the effects of the efforts undertaken by programs. The key trait we consider is the number of days in the sixty day period before the baseline interview that the client reported being homeless. In other words, we predict homelessness at the final interview point when taking into account the propensity of the client to be homeless as measured by past behavior. The following variables, all captured at the time of the baseline interview, also are controlled: gender, whether the client reports being white or black, age, whether the client reports having less than a high school education, previously being convicted of a felony, reporting having a diagnosed disability, days in the previous thirty reporting drinking to the point of feeling the effects, days in the previous thirty reporting drug use, having previous psychiatric hospitalization experience, months of homelessness over the lifetime, days in the program, and time between the baseline and final interview.

Additional analyses add to the equation described above the clients' report of the receipt at the time of the baseline interview of three types of services that might help them exit homelessness: professional services, advocacy services, and employment-related services. Finally, still more analyses add variables measuring the location to which the client first moved. We only include the measures representing an exit from homelessness: moving to a permanent housing program, or moving to market housing.

Table 11 reports on the three equations estimated as described above. The key finding from the first of these equations (reported in the first column) is that, other factors controlled, days of homelessness are found to be considerably greater for clients originally in shelters than for clients originally in interim housing programs. The coefficient, which is ten, suggests that the difference is ten days homelessness out of the sixty day period. In short, this analysis provides evidence that the new, interim housing model is superior to the traditional model in ameliorating homelessness.

The results reported in the first column also suggest that very few control variables are predictive of homelessness. To be sure, as expected, the number of days of homelessness in the sixty day period before the baseline interview predicts homelessness at the final interview point. Alcohol use to the point of feeling the effects around the time of the baseline interview bears a negative relationship to homelessness at the final interview point. That relation suggests that programs are more successful in helping clients with alcohol problems than those without them.

The equation reported in the second column fails to suggest that use of any of the three measured types of services (professional, advocacy, and employment-related), taken alone, predicts homelessness. Nevertheless, the combination of the three reduces the level of statistical significance of the variable measuring residing in a shelter to the point at which it is not quite statistically significant. In other words, there is some, if modest, evidence that receipt of more of the three types of services, taken together, is at least part of the reason why clients in interim housing fare better in escaping homelessness than clients in shelters.

Table 11 - Regression Analysis Predicting Days of Homelessness at Final Interview for Individuals who Originally Were in Emergency Shelter or Interim Housing Programs (N=203)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Variable	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T
Respondent was in an Emergency or Overnight Shelter (1) versus Interim Housing (0) at Baseline interview	10.4341 (3.8598)	0.0157*	8.9756 (5.1135)	0.0983	0.9804 (4.5882)	0.8335
Respondent is White (1) versus not White (0)	-1.9352 (7.2572)	0.7931	-1.8843 (7.4812)	0.8043	4.9659 (4.9234)	0.3282
Respondent is African American (1) versus not African American (0)	4.1221 (6.0475)	0.5052	6.6056 (5.5805)	0.2538	9.5740 (4.4702)	0.0479*
Age of Respondent at Baseline Interview	0.0380 (0.1958)	0.8486	0.0086 (0.1694)	0.9602	0.0909 (0.1464)	0.5437
Respondent has less than a high school education (1) versus more than this (0)	-8.8111 (4.2381)	0.0541	-9.6583 (4.2891)	0.0387*	-6.8392 (4.1415)	0.1181
Respondent was convicted of a felony offense prior to the baseline interview (1) versus not convicted (0)	-1.8086 (4.2306)	0.6747	-1.7989 (4.3993)	0.6880	-3.0769 (2.4975)	0.2357
Respondent had a diagnosed disability at the time of the baseline interview (1) versus no disability (0)	-5.3499 (4.9140)	0.2924	-5.7511 (5.3927)	0.3020	-4.3145 (3.3227)	0.2125
Number of days in 30 before baseline interview respondent drank to the point of feeling the effects	-0.5697 (0.2103)	0.0155*	-0.4958 (0.2107)	0.0317*	-0.2243 (0.2064)	0.2933
Number of days in the 30 before the baseline interview respondent	-0.1091 (0.1436)	0.4582	-0.1035 (0.1388)	0.4668	-0.1421 (0.1333)	0.3023

used drugs other than alcohol						
Respondent was treated in a hospital at least once for a psychological or emotional problem prior to baseline interview	-2.4959 (4.7021)	0.6028	-2.6139 (4.1553)	0.5382	-2.4919 (3.5321)	0.4906
Total months experienced homelessness in lifetime prior to baseline interview	-0.0034 (0.0300)	0.9103	-0.0041 (0.0277)	0.8832	0.0156 (0.0119)	0.2092
Number of days between entry into program and baseline interview	0.0005 (0.0010)	0.6683	0.0003 (0.0012)	0.7657	0.0002 (0.0005)	0.6621
Number of days between baseline and final interview	-0.0533 (0.0377)	0.1773	-0.0565 (0.0393)	0.1705	-0.0499 (0.0244)	0.0577
Total number of advocacy services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	-2.4075 (3.2445)	0.4688	1.2643 (2.8748)	0.6660
Total number of employment related services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	-5.7075 (3.3345)	0.1063	-4.0377 1.7962	0.0390*
First Place Moved to was Market Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	-33.3878 (2.9055)	<.0001***
Intercept	5.9371 (22.6053)	0.7962	12.4114 (22.9665)	0.5964	34.551 (18.3065)	0.0774
RSquare **F (df)** **Pr < F**	0.1662 77.03 (15,16) < .0001		0.1837 46.20 (16,16) < .0001		0.5132 258.46 (16,16) < .0001	

* p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

As might be expected, results also suggest that clients who first move from their program either to permanent housing or to market housing have very few reported days of homelessness at the time of the final interview. Further, results suggest that, when variables representing those dwelling options are included in the equation, the variable measuring residing in a shelter (as opposed to in interim housing) at baseline no longer bears a statistically significant relation to homelessness. Another emerging relation suggests that receipt of employment-related services (at the baseline) negatively predicts homelessness. In sum, results suggest that interim housing programs are relatively successful (compared to shelters) in helping clients escape homelessness because they help clients obtain employment-related services, and also because they help clients move to permanent housing programs or to market housing.

The final equation also suggests that identifying as black is positively related to homelessness, all other factors controlled. While no ready explanation for the finding emerges, it does bear consideration.

Predicting Homelessness for All Clients in Shelters and Interim Housing Programs, and for Residents of Permanent Housing

Tables 12 and 13 present similar models predicting homelessness at the final interview point for different populations than those described above. Table 12 includes models predicting homelessness among both families and individuals originally (at baseline) in shelters and interim housing programs; Table 13 predicts homelessness for those originally in permanent housing programs. All models add a variable indicating whether the interviewed client was the head of a family or not.

Table 12 - Regression Analysis Predicting Days of Homelessness at Final Interview for Families and Individuals who Originally were in Emergency Shelter or Interim Housing Programs (N=263)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Variable	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T
Respondent was in an Emergency or Overnight Shelter (1) versus Interim Housing (0) at Baseline interview	7.3516 (3.5150)	0.0472*	6.1919 (4.3648)	0.1689	1.6068 (3.6801)	0.6663
Respondent was homeless with family (1) versus single at the time of the baseline interview (0)	-24.4168 (8.3123)	0.0072**	-21.0980 (8.6875)	0.0230*	-7.1360 (5.5513)	0.2109

Respondent is African American (1) versus not African American (0)	5.6636 (4.8259)	0.2521	7.6919 (4.5396)	0.1031	8.2912 (3.8244)	0.0403*
Age of Respondent at Baseline Interview	0.0721 (0.1572)	0.6506	-0.0500 (0.1356)	0.7156	0.1126 (0.1066)	0.3012
Respondent has less than a high school education (1) versus more than this (0).	-5.9231 (3.4568)	0.0995	-7.6064 (3.5176)	0.0408*	-6.9731 (2.9943)	0.0269*
Respondent was convicted of a felony offense prior to the baseline interview (1) versus not convicted (0)	-1.8126 (3.6090)	0.6201	-1.4202 (3.6201)	0.6983	-1.2347 (2.4548)	0.6196
Respondent had a diagnosed disability at the time of the baseline interview (1) versus no disability (0)	-3.2992 (4.1465)	0.4340	-3.7183 (4.5691)	0.4238	-2.5404 (2.9815)	0.4026
Number of days in 30 before baseline interview respondent drank to the point of feeling the effects	-0.4728 (0.1985)	0.0255*	-0.4169 (0.1854)	0.0340*	-0.2689 (0.1954)	0.1815
Number of days in the 30 before the baseline interview respondent used drugs other than alcohol	-0.0818 (0.1302)	0.5358	-0.0960 (0.1143)	0.4096	-0.1735 (0.1194)	0.1591
Respondent was treated in a hospital at least once for a psychological or emotional problem prior to	-1.7210 (4.1945)	0.6852	-2.3045 (3.8277)	0.5528	-2.0088 (3.2378)	0.5408

baseline interview						
Total months experienced homelessness in lifetime prior to baseline interview	0.0011 (0.0269)	0.9679	0.0003 (0.0260)	0.9904	0.0099 (0.0133)	0.4669
Number of days between entry into program and baseline interview	0.0008 (0.0012)	0.5268	0.0006 (0.0014)	0.6433	0.0005 (0.0008)	0.5760
Number of days between baseline and final interview	-0.0521 (0.0290)	0.0851	-0.0611 (0.0300)	0.0528	-0.0558 (0.0204)	0.0116*
Total number of advocacy services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	-1.5020 (2.4309)	0.5425	0.0160 (1.9809)	0.9936
Total number of employment related services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	-7.8509 (2.2279)	0.0017**	-4.2899 (1.2993)	0.0030**
First Place Moved to was Market Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	-30.2694 (3.0968)	<0.0001***
Intercept	8.7803 (18.1985)	0.6338	21.9629 (18.9109)	0.2569	37.1957 (15.0136)	0.0207*
RSquare **F (df)** **Pr < F**	0.2292 18.88(16,24) <.0001		0.2671 43.90(19,24) <.0001		0.5365 661.11(21,24) <.0001	

* p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

In brief, the results reported in the first column of Table 12 again suggest that clients originally residing in shelters experience more days of homelessness at the final interview point than clients originally residing in interim housing programs. The results reported in the second column suggest that the relation between housing type and homelessness is eliminated when adding variables measuring the use of services at the time of the baseline interview. The results reported in the second column also suggest that use of employment-related services at the baseline interview negatively predicts homelessness. The results in the third column again suggest that there is a negative relationship between days of homelessness at the final interview point and first moving to either permanent housing programs or to market housing. In short,

these results again suggest that interim housing programs are relatively successful (compared to shelters) in helping clients escape homelessness because they help clients obtain employment-related services, and because they also help clients move to permanent housing programs or to market housing.

Results in the first two columns also suggest that there is a strongly negative relationship between living in a family and days of homelessness at the final interview point. The relation disappears in the results reported in column 3. This suggests that the lower level of homelessness among families is explained by the variables added in column 3: a first move to permanent or market housing. In other words, results suggest that family heads probably escape homelessness more fully than single individuals because the families are more likely to first move to permanent housing or market housing. This bears saying because it suggests that the first moves are reasonably stable. That is, results suggest that homelessness at the final interview point is closely related to whether clients in programs were referred to, or obtained on their own, permanent housing or market housing.

Relations reported in Table 12 mirror those reported in Table 11 in again suggesting that clients who evince higher scores on the measures of alcohol use experience less homelessness at the time of the final interview than others. In general, results from all of the models, so far, fail to suggest that the individuals and family heads who are unusually problem prone on any measure are more likely to be homeless at the time of the final interview than those without those problems. That finding is welcome. On the other hand, results reported in Table 12 continue to suggest that being black is positively related to homelessness with all other factors controlled.

Table 13 presents the model predicting homelessness for clients originally in permanent housing programs. Here the major questions concern who among clients originally in permanent housing programs may become homeless, and why. Of course, as noted previously, the overall level of homelessness is low.

Statistically significant findings in the first column again suggest that families experience fewer days of homelessness at the final interview point than individuals. They also suggest that there are negative relations between being white or black and days of homelessness as measured at the final interview point. Given these last two relations, it seems to follow that those of Hispanic origin experience more days of homelessness (as is necessary in multivariate analyses, one racial or ethnic group must serve as the comparison for the groups put in the equation; Hispanics comprise the majority of clients in the comparison group). Seemingly oddly, months of experience with homelessness over the lifetime is negatively related to days of homelessness at the time of the final interview. Neither use of social services or moves to other permanent housing programs or to market housing is predictive. While the coefficient does not quite reach statistical significance, there is some indication that those with a previous felony conviction experience more days of homelessness at the final interview point than others, even if the difference is only about one day out of sixty. Perhaps the major finding here, then, is that families seem to fare better than single individuals. A second is that we cannot be certain that activities of the programs accounts for the small differences in reported homelessness by family status at the final interview point (since we cannot reduce the coefficient for family status by

adding other variables measuring those activities).

Table 13 - Regression Analysis Predicting Days of Homelessness at Final Interview for Clients Originally in a Permanent Program (N=152).

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Variable	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T
Respondent was homeless with family (1) versus single at the time of the baseline interview (0)	-3.2193 (1.3510)	0.0299*	-3.0583 (1.3963)	0.0437*	-2.9972 (1.3445)	0.0405*
Respondent is White (1) versus not White (0)	-2.3062 (0.9867)	0.0328*	-2.1319 (0.9614)	0.0414*	-2.0046 (1.0974)	0.0865
Respondent is African American (1) versus not African American (0)	-2.3002 (0.9783)	0.0319*	-2.1894 (1.0223)	0.0480*	-2.0174 (1.2516)	0.1265
Age of Respondent at Baseline Interview	-0.1033 (0.0641)	0.1262	-0.0932 (0.0595)	0.1369	-0.0916 (0.0615)	0.1559
Respondent has less than a high school education (1) versus more than this (0)	0.3672 (1.0488)	0.7308	0.4011 (1.0809)	0.7154	0.3747 (1.0911)	0.7358
Respondent was convicted of a felony offense prior to the baseline interview (1) versus not convicted (0)	1.3207 (0.6261)	0.0510	1.3604 (0.6035)	0.0385*	1.2526 (0.6377)	0.0671
Respondent had a diagnosed disability at the time of the baseline interview (1) versus no disability (0)	0.1092 (0.9773)	0.9124	0.3475 (1.0154)	0.7366	0.2827 (1.0180)	0.7848
Number of days in 30 before baseline interview respondent drank to the point of feeling the effects	0.0175 (0.0601)	0.7744	0.0272 (0.0631)	0.6722	0.0305 (0.0667)	0.6538
Number of days in the 30 before the baseline interview respondent used drugs other than alcohol	0.0058 (0.0418)	0.8910	0.0084 (0.0406)	0.8388	0.0110 (0.0363)	0.7657
Respondent was treated in a hospital at least once for a	-1.0940 (0.8604)	0.2217	-0.8728 (0.9925)	0.3922	-0.8899 (0.9803)	0.3775

psychological or emotional problem prior to baseline interview						
Total months experienced homelessness in lifetime prior to baseline interview	-0.0117 (0.0043)	0.0145*	-0.0106 (0.0045)	0.0327*	-0.0102 (0.0043)	0.0293*
Number of days between entry into program and baseline interview	-0.0002 (0.0003)	0.4858	0.000 (0.0004)	0.9983	0.0000 (0.0004)	0.9945
Number of days between baseline and final interview	0.0099 (0.0083)	0.2480	0.0093 (0.0090)	0.3181	0.0097 (0.0091)	0.3039
Total number of advocacy services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	0.0105 (0.5507)	0.9850	0.0307 (0.5782)	0.9582
Total number of employment related services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	0.5284 (0.8088)	0.5228	0.5586 (0.8078)	0.4991
First Place Moved to was Market Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	-0.4516 (1.2927)	0.7314
Intercept	8.0021 (3.9768)	0.0614	7.4180 (4.3014)	0.1039	7.0243 (4.8696)	0.1685
RSquare **F (df)** **Pr < F**	0.1434 44.63(15,15) <.0001		0.1493 11.54(16,16) <.0001		0.1515 72.19 (16,16) <.0001	

* $p < .05$

Market Housing for Single Individuals in Shelters and Interim Housing Programs

Table 14 presents two equations predicting whether clients live in market housing at the last interview point. The first equation is the basic model that considers whether single individuals who at baseline were in shelters and interim housing programs differ in the propensity to live in market housing, background factors controlled.

The second equation adds the variables that may explain why some clients but not others are in market housing. These variables measure the three types of social services used in the equations summarized above; whether clients believe that staff at the baseline program talked to them about housing options; and whether clients at the last interview point report having resources that may help them sustain housing: regular employment and income from SSI (TANF is unavailable to individuals, but the variable is added to the equation, below,

predicting receipt of market housing for individuals and families, combined). We do not report results from intermediate equations that include only some of these variables because we found the results to be relatively uninformative.

Since the dependent variable is dichotomous, the equations rely on logistic regression. These equations predict the log odds of living in market housing. For simplicity, here we report the results as predicting the probability of living in market housing (that probability varies with the log odds).

As the results reported in the first column of Table 14 suggest, single clients who at the baseline interview resided in shelters are found to have a lower probability of living in market housing than single clients who originally resided in interim housing programs. While the relation is not quite statistically significant, blacks also are found to be slightly less likely to reside in market housing at that point. The measure of alcohol problems (days drinking to the point of feeling the effects) is *positively* related to the probability of living in market housing at the final interview point.

Table 14 – Logistic Regression: The Likelihood of Being in Market Housing for Individuals Who Originally Were in Emergency Shelter or Interim Housing Programs (N=201)

	Model 1		**Model 2**	
Variable	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr>Chi-Square	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr>Chi-Square
Respondent was in an Emergency or Overnight Shelter (1) versus Interim Housing (0) at Baseline interview	-0.6960 (0.2885)	0.0158*	-1.0241 (0.5528)	0.0639
Respondent is White (1) versus not White (0)	-0.9035 (0.6789)	0.1833	-1.0415 (0.8189)	0.2034
Respondent is African American (1) versus not African	-0.8376 (0.5055)	0.0975	-1.0985 (0.5912)	0.0631
Age of Respondent at Baseline Interview	0.0013 (0.0243)	0.9583	0.0085 (0.0290)	0.7704
Respondent has less than a high school education (1) versus more than this (0).	-0.4637 (0.3321)	0.1627	-0.3126 (0.3421)	0.3608
Respondent was convicted of a felony offense prior to the baseline interview (1) versus not convicted (0)	-0.2419 (0.3428)	0.4804	-0.3316 (0.3346)	0.3217
Respondent had a diagnosed disability at the time of the baseline interview (1) versus no disability (0)	0.2069 (0.4599)	0.6527	0.7286 (0.6146)	0.2358
Respondent was regularly employed either full or part time (1) at the baseline interview versus not regularly employed (0)	0.1647 (0.5407)	0.7607	-0.2265 (0.5064)	0.6547

Number of days in 30 before baseline interview respondent drank to the point of feeling the effects	0.0286 (0.0140)	0.0410*	0.0146 (0.0224)	0.5157
Number of days in the 30 before the baseline interview respondent used drugs other than alcohol	-0.0310 (0.0209)	0.1369	-0.0314 (0.0248)	0.2050
Respondent was treated in a hospital at least once for a psychological or emotional problem prior to baseline interview	0.5981 (0.3950)	0.1300	0.9728 (0.3420)	0.0045**
Number of days between entry into program and baseline interview	-0.0002 (0.0003)	0.6351	-0.0001 (0.0003)	0.8282
Number of days between baseline and final interview	0.0045 (0.0023)	0.0483*	0.0037 (0.0025)	0.1349
Total number of advocacy services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	———	———	0.4496 (0.3901)	0.2491
Total number of employment related services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	———	———	0.4132 (0.4030)	0.3052
Respondent reports someone in the baseline program spoke to him or her about housing prior to the baseline interview (1) versus did not talk about this (0)	———	———	-1.0073 (0.5197)	0.0526
Respondent reports receiving SSI benefits in the 30 days before the last interview (1) versus not receiving SSI (0)	———	———	-0.9590 (0.8224)	0.2435
Intercept	-0.3089 (1.7104)	0.8567	-0.3796 (1.8088)	0.8338
-2 Log Likelihood Intercept Only **-2 Log Likelihood Intercept and Covariates** **Chi-Square** **DF** **Pr > Chisq**	215.664 194.139 21.5246 15 0.1209		215.664 175.242 40.4217 21 .0066**	

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

The results reported in the second column demonstrate that the relation between living in a shelter (as opposed to an interim housing program) and living in market housing is just barely outside of the range traditionally considered indicative of statistical significance. This finding thus could be taken to suggest that the added variables, that is, the measures of services and resources, explain differences in the rate of living in market housing between those originally residing in shelters and interim housing programs. But in reality, the technical change in levels of statistical significance is not enough to make a strong case; it is more likely that added variables do not truly explain all of the differences by housing type in the probability of living in market housing at the final interview point.

Results also suggest that those with psychiatric hospital experience are found to have a higher probability of living in market housing. Perhaps this reflects the availability of market housing available for adults with mental health problems.

Results further suggest that clients who talk to program staff may be less likely to move to market housing than those who do not (the relation is just at the level suggesting statistical significance). This anomalous relation makes one wonder whether clients obtain market housing on their own, or whether programs tend to discuss with them the availability of permanent housing. The other statistically significant relations suggest the seemingly obvious finding that the probability of living in market housing is greater for clients who have regular employment at the final interview point than for those who do not.

However, as noted above, the analyses should not be taken to fully explain why clients who at the baseline resided in shelters, and clients who at the baseline resided in interim housing programs, vary in their probability of obtaining market housing. Perhaps the variation reflects some combination of unmeasured client characteristics, special behaviors or traits that enable some clients to more successfully locate market housing, or some subtle differences in policies of specific interim housing programs that are not captured by our data.

Predicting Market Housing for Clients Originally in Shelters and Interim Housing Programs

Similarly, Table 15 reports results predicting the probability of being in market housing at the final interview point for the entire sample of clients who originally was in shelters and interim housing. The results reported in the first column again suggest that clients originally located in shelters have a lower probability of residing in market housing at the final interview point than clients originally located in interim housing programs. Results also confirm that family heads have a higher probability of living in market housing at the final interview point than clients who are single (when, insofar as possible, taking into account whether the clients originally were in shelters or interim housing programs). Other results suggest that the probability of living in market housing at the final interview point is lower for blacks; higher for those reporting greater alcohol problems; and higher for those reporting previous psychiatric hospital experience. In other words, there is little evidence of discrimination against those with alcohol or mental health problems. Instead, it appears that there may be some specialized programs that give priority for market housing to individuals with these problems. This was noted earlier in the report.

Again, the equation reported in the second column suggests that the measures of service use and client resources fail to eliminate the central findings: the probability of living in market housing at the final interview point remains higher for clients originally in interim housing than for clients originally in shelters. Similarly, results suggest that the probability of residing in market housing at the final interview point is higher for heads of families than for single adults. There again is a relation between having psychiatric hospital experience and the probability of living in market housing at the final interview point. Access to employment-related services, and being regularly employed, also positively predict the probability of living in market housing at the final interview point. That is, there is some evidence that programs that help

clients obtain employment services and help them obtain employment contribute to client movement to market housing.

Table 15 – Logistic Regression: The Likelihood of Being in Market Housing for Family Heads and Individuals Originally in Emergency Shelter or Interim Housing Programs (N=262)

	Model 1		Model 2	
Variable	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr>Chi-Square	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr>Chi-Square
Respondent was in an Emergency or Overnight Shelter (1) versus Interim Housing (0) at Baseline interview	-0.5514 (0.2451)	0.0245*	-0.8179 (0.4079)	0.0450*
Respondent was homeless with family (1) versus single at the time of the baseline interview (0)	2.8804 (0.6812)	<.0001***	2.5072 (0.6823)	0.0002***
Respondent is African American (1) versus not African American (0)	-1.0242 (0.118)	0.0129*	-1.271 (0.5451)	0.0198*
Age of Respondent at Baseline Interview	-0.0163 (0.0174)	0.3478	0.0006 (0.0217)	0.9771
Respondent has less than a high school education (1) versus more than this (0)	-0.0693 (0.2219)	0.7547	0.1477 (0.2640)	0.5758
Respondent was convicted of a felony offense prior to the baseline interview (1) versus not convicted (0)	-0.2459 (0.0393)	0.7037	-0.3133 (0.3283)	0.3399
Respondent had a diagnosed disability at the time of the baseline interview (1) versus no disability (0)	0.1505 (0.3958)	0.7037	0.5706 (0.5403)	0.2909
Respondent was regularly employed either full or part time (1) at the baseline interview versus not regularly employed (0)	-0.1150 (0.4628)	0.8038	-0.2610 (0.4275)	0.5415
Number of days in 30 before baseline interview respondent drank to the point of feeling the effects	0.0340 (0.0130)	0.0090**	0.0125 (0.0212)	0.5549
Number of days in the 30 before the baseline interview respondent used drugs other than alcohol	-0.0286 (0.0156)	0.0660	-0.0268 (0.0185)	0.1473
Respondent was treated in a hospital at least once for a psychological or emotional problem prior to baseline interview	0.8091 (0.3742)	0.0306*	1.1483 (0.3888)	0.0031**
Number of days between entry into program and baseline interview	0.0001 (.0003)	.06343	-0.0001 (0.0003)	0.8485
Number of days between baseline and final interview	0.0062 (0.0019)	0.0010***	0.0064 (0.0023)	0.0059**
Total number of advocacy services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	———	———	0.3796 (0.2876)	0.1869

Total number of employment related services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	———	———	0.6606 (0.3155)	0.0363*
Respondent reports someone in the baseline program spoke to him or her about housing prior to the baseline interview (1) versus did not talk about this (0)	———	———	-0.8218 (0.4477)	0.0664
Respondent reported receiving TANF benefits in the 30 days before the last interview(1) versus not receiving TANF (0)	———	———	1.1202 (0.7815)	0.1518
Respondent reports receiving SSI benefits in the 30 days before the last interview (1) versus not receiving SSI (0)	———	———	-0.4605 (0.7024)	0.5121
Intercept	0.1123 (1.4791)	0.9395	-1.1142 (1.4948)	0.4560
-2 Log Likelihood Intercept Only	341.624		341.624	
-2 Log Likelihood Intercept and Covariates	255.702		242.412	
Chi-Square	85.9215		99.2116	
DF	16		23	
Pr > Chisq	<.0001		<.0001	

* p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Predicting Market Housing for Clients Originally in Permanent Housing Programs

Table 16 reports on the logistic regressions predicting residence in market housing at the final interview point for clients who originally were interviewed in permanent housing programs. Results in the first column report only one literally statistically significant relation: the probability of residing in market housing is positively related to the length of homelessness. This relation suggests that programs are managing to find openings for clients with highly chronic homeless problems. The results in the second column suggest that other relations emerge when adding the service and resource variables. There thus is a nearly, but not quite, statistically significant relation between the probability of living in market housing at the final interview point and having regular employment. Otherwise, the results suggest that the probability of living in market housing is positively related to the intensity of drug problems, and negatively related to having psychiatric hospital experience or having a diagnosed disability. In other words, when taking access to resources into account, the results suggest that the permanent housing programs hold on to clients who have mental health or disability problems.

Table 16 – Logistic Regression: The Likelihood of Being in Market Housing for Clients Originally in a Permanent Program (N=148)

	Model 1		Model 2	
Variable	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr>Chi-Square	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr>Chi-Square
Respondent was homeless with family (1) versus single at the time of the baseline interview (0)	-0.4164 (1.0863)	0.7015	-2.5780 (1.4438)	0.0742
Respondent is Male (1) versus female (2)	1.3136 (0.7728)	0.0892	0.6570 (0.6895)	0.3406
Respondent is White (1) versus not White (0)	-0.5732 (1.1668)	0.6233	-0.1768 (1.0558)	0.8670
Respondent is African American (1) versus not African American	0.6072 (0.7856)	0.4396	-0.4501 (0.9360)	0.6306
Age of Respondent at Baseline Interview	0.0337 (0.0236)	0.1529	0.0057 (0.0279)	0.8387
Respondent has less than a high school education (1) versus more than this (0)	-0.6357 (0.6536)	0.3308	-0.1762 (0.7803)	0.8214
Respondent was convicted of a felony offense prior to the baseline interview (1) versus not convicted (0)	-1.5122 (0.7788)	0.0522	-1.9724 (1.0948)	0.0716
Respondent had a diagnosed disability at the time of the baseline interview (1) versus no disability (0)	-1.0231 (0.3903)	0.0088**	-1.4053 (0.6351)	0.0269*
Respondent was regularly employed either full or part time (1) at the baseline interview versus not regularly employed (0)	0.6613 (0.5633)	0.2404	-0.0811 (1.2506)	0.9483
Number of days in 30 before baseline interview respondent drank to the point of feeling the effects	-0.2446 (0.2164)	0.2584	-0.3629 (0.3288)	0.2698
Number of days in the 30 before the baseline interview respondent used drugs other than alcohol	0.0244 (0.0318)	0.4431	0.0624 (0.0311)	0.0449*
Respondent was treated in a hospital at least once for a psychological or emotional problem prior to baseline interview	-1.0848 (0.5857)	0.0640	-2.3202 (0.8929)	0.0094**
Total months experienced homelessness in lifetime prior to baseline interview	0.0056 (0.0022)	0.0092**	0.0074 (0.0033)	0.0246*
Total number of professional services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	———	———	-0.0272 (0.2379)	0.9090
Total number of advocacy services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	———	———	0.6366 (0.4403)	0.1483
Total number of employment related services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	———	———	0.6954 (0.7443)	0.3502

Respondent reports someone in the baseline program spoke to him or her about housing prior to the baseline interview (1) versus did not talk about this (0)	____	____	2.2916 (1.4528)	0.1147
Number of days between entry into program and baseline interview	-0.0005 (0.0005)	0.3049	-0.0009 (0.0008)	0.2611
Number of days between baseline and final interview	0.0173 (0.0036)	<0.0001***	0.0124 (0.0045)	0.0061**
Intercept	-10.1312 (2.5397)	<.00001**	-8.0665 (2.3290)	0.0007**
-2 Log Likelihood Intercept Only	525.403		525.403	
-2 Log Likelihood Intercept and Covariates	342.270		291.864	
Chi-Square	183.1325		233.5388	
DF	15		19	
Pr > Chisq	<.0001		<.0001	

* p < .05; * p < 0.1; * p < .001

Summary of Results Concerning Other Outcomes for Single Individuals

Models similar to those described above were estimated in order to predict a number of other outcomes: measures of health, mental health, substance use, and service use. Since it would be too cumbersome to describe all of the results in depth, we only summarize some of the key results. We provide the Tables in the Appendix and do not here report details of the size of relations.

We first focus on results estimated for equations that include individuals who at baseline were either in shelters or interim housing programs. Results suggest that residing in a shelter as opposed to an interim housing program at the baseline interview does not predict almost all of the tested outcomes as measured at the final interview point. The outcomes that are not so predicted include: number of professional services used; experiencing emotional problems; experiencing medical problems; days of work; days of drinking to the point of feeling the effects. However, there is one exception; results reveal a *positive* relation between originally being in a shelter and the final tested outcome, drug use at the final interview point. Still, overall, the results continue to suggest that the housing first approach, here measured by residing in interim housing as opposed to emergency shelters, does not broadly affect problems other than homelessness.

It is possible to argue that outcomes would improve for clients who made a first move to a more stable location. To test this, additional variables measuring the location of the first move were added to the equation added above. However, results suggest that few measures of the housing arrangements at the first move statistically predict any outcome. The only statistically significant relation suggests that medical problems at the final interview point are negatively related to moving first to a homeless location (like a shelter). While some personal

traits predict the outcomes, these relations are not central to the purposes of the report and thus are relegated to a footnote.[1]

Summary of Results Concerning Other Outcomes for all Clients Originally in Shelters or Interim Housing

The results reported above do not substantially change when predicting the outcomes described above for all clients who were in shelters and interim housing programs at baseline. The equation adds a variable indicating whether clients were heads of family, and that variable does not predict outcomes (to a statistically significant degree) in any of the equations. The location of first moves also fails to predict any of the outcomes.[2]

Summary of Results Concerning Other Outcomes for Clients Originally in Permanent Housing

The results for clients who were in permanent housing programs at the time of the baseline interview primarily help to suggest whether programs are more successful with clients who have certain traits. Thus, we relegate most such results to a footnote.[3]

---

[1] There are sporadic findings suggesting that client personal traits are related to the outcomes described above. In brief, in equations equivalent to those reported in the first column of tables 11 through 13, the measure of drinking at the final interview point are negatively related to previously (at the baseline) experiencing emotional problems; days of experiencing medical problems at the final interview point are negatively related to previous homeless experience, and positively related to having a previous psychiatric hospitalization. Drug use at the final interview point is positively related to, at the baseline, reporting a disability. Days of work at the final interview point are negatively related to, at the baseline, reporting a disability.

[2] Again, other results suggest that drug use at the final interview point is positively related to residing in a shelter, but the other outcomes are not predicted by baseline housing type. Very scattered relations otherwise emerge, such as that days of work at the final interview point is positively related to first moving to interim housing, and days of drinking to the point of feeling the effects at the final interview point are negatively related to earlier obtaining employment services or moving to permanent housing. Arguably, this last relation provides some very limited evidence that moving to permanent housing and obtaining employment may help ameliorate substance abuse problems.

[3] However, there are no consistent relations, and thus no clear suggestions demonstrating that certain clients are particularly favored or unfavored by their permanent housing programs. For example, race and whether clients headed families do not predict any of the outcomes. Perhaps the most highly predictive variable is having a disability at the baseline, which is positively related to the measures at the final interview point of drug use and drinking and negatively related to work. A diagnosed disability can make work difficult and may be an indicator of a propensity to be involved in substance abuse (that is, substance abuse may be closely related to the disability). The outcome that varies most with other traits for clients

SUMMARY

All in all, what can we say from the data concerning the effects of the programs on clients? Again with the limits of the analyses kept in mind, several insights emerge about each of the three types of housing arrangements.

Permanent Housing

Permanent housing programs seem to meet the goals of the Ten-Year Plan by helping clients avoid homelessness. The central finding is that most of the clients who resided in permanent housing at the time of the baseline interview still lived there one year later. Indeed, these clients on average lived in the programs for many years.

Another positive finding is that, of clients who exited permanent housing programs, virtually none had more than a small exposure to homelessness. All were in a domicile at the final interview point. In short, then, clients who entered permanent housing programs seemed to be able to almost completely exit homelessness.

This lack of homelessness tends to occur because a very large proportion of clients remains in the permanent housing programs. However, another important finding is that relatively low numbers of clients originally residing in shelters (12.1 percent) and interim housing programs (18.8 percent) move to permanent housing programs during the period of interest. This is a possible downside to this stability, however. Since few clients leave, perhaps few clients can be referred from the other housing types. As mentioned earlier, the results may also reflect that permanent housing programs by design generally admit clients with disabilities.

Another attribute of the programs is that they seem to collect clients with serious problems. As our data analyses suggest, clients who remain in permanent housing programs by

---

originally in permanent housing programs is the measure of drinking at the final interview point. It is positively related to having a disability at the baseline and to homelessness at the baseline. Drinking at the final interview point also is positively related to using professional services at the baseline and negatively related to using employment services. These relations probably are not causal and may indicate that clients with a propensity to drink simply did not avail themselves of other services. Drinking as measured at the final interview point also is positively related to first moving to market housing. This suggests that certain programs take in clients with drinking problems. Perhaps those programs adhere to a Housing First – harm reduction model. Days of work at the final interview point are negatively related to having a disability, to drug use, and to age (as measured at baseline). Again, results make sense, given that older clients and those with other problems are less likely to be able to find work. Days of work also are positively related to first moving to market housing. If the relation is causal, it can indicate that clients who are in market housing have strong incentives to work. (Also sensibly, the results suggest that the number of employment services obtained at the final interview point is negatively predicted by having a felony conviction and by the measure of alcohol problems.) In short, while results suggest that drinking and drug use, in particular, make matters more difficult for clients, they do not suggest that programs treat clients with such problems less fully or seriously.

the final interview point tend to have unusually high levels of mental health problems, alcohol problems, felonies, and other disabilities. This suggests that the programs evince a laudable willingness to serve the needy, but it also leaves in question the potential for clients who aggregate in permanent housing to eventually leave the programs.

Interim Housing Programs

The central finding concerning interim housing programs is that the clients who originally resided in these programs are more likely to find and remain in a domicile than clients originally placed in shelters. These Plan-based programs thus seem to help to advance the goal of helping clients escape homelessness. As noted above, the descriptive information suggests that about sixty-six percent of the clients placed in the programs found a domicile by the final interview point. The vast majority of these resided in market housing. Of course, results also suggest that clients who originally were in permanent housing programs find a domicile more readily than clients originally in interim housing programs. Results further suggest that a moderately large 27.4 percent of clients who were in interim housing programs at the baseline still lived in the same or another interim housing program at the final interview point, that is, about one year later. In short, results suggest that much more can be accomplished with regard to reaching the goal of fully eliminating homelessness for those placed in interim housing. Still, the achievement of these programs seems significant.

However, a less than favorable finding is that very limited proportions of clients from this or any other type of program obtain subsidized housing. All in all, 17.1 percent of those living in market housing report obtaining a housing subsidy. Moreover, as noted, few clients manage to move from interim housing programs to permanent housing programs (which tend to admit disabled clients). These Plan-related paths of escape seem to require further improvement.

Shelters

Of the three types of programs, shelters seem least successful in helping clients escape homelessness. Indeed, our analyses suggest that half of clients housed in shelters at the baseline interview – many of whom were in the shelters for lengthy periods of time – remain there about a year later (at the final interview point). All in all, only 12.1 percent of clients interviewed at the baseline were in permanent housing programs at the final interview point, while 21.6 percent were in market housing. In other words, over the interview period, only 33.7 percent of those clients originally interviewed in emergency shelters found a permanent dwelling by the time of the final interview point.

On the other hand, results suggest that few clients leave the shelters for the street. Results also suggest that clients in the programs do not suffer unusually from declining health or mental health problems. Shelters seem successful in providing basic care. Their clients do to a degree find a way out of homelessness, if only at a limited rate. Our evidence suggests that the lack of programming may contribute to the lack of progress away from homelessness. But it always is possible that results also reflect unmeasured traits of the clients.

Multivariate Analyses

The multivariate analyses continue to suggest that interim housing programs are better than shelters at helping individuals escape homelessness. In other words, our findings tend to discount that the differences described above occur because of the personal traits of the clients. Our results hold up when controlling for a large group of such traits, including family status, the existence of alcohol and drug problems, education, mental health problems, and demographic characteristics. Results even hold up when separately analyzing the sample of single individuals. This is accomplished because few family heads reside in emergency shelters.

Multivariate analyses also suggest several reasons for the central difference. Evidence, while imperfect, suggests that the receipt of the three types of services taken together – professional, advocacy, and employment-related – contribute to the decline in homelessness, that employment-related services are particularly efficacious, and that interim housing programs are particularly successful when their clients first move to permanent housing or to market housing. Further, those clients leaving interim housing programs in order to move to market housing are found to have reasonable resources, including either jobs or some sort of welfare benefits. We cannot provide more detail on why this occurs because we cannot fully measure the degree to which the programs actively help clients obtain housing and the degree to which the general level of protection provided by the programs enables clients to find housing on their own.

Family Heads

The major finding concerning group differences is that family heads, and thus families, seem to fare better on homelessness than single individuals. The heads are particularly likely to enter market housing. Statistically, the difference in rates of homelessness across family types is not due to differences on control variables, like those listed above. To be sure, the difference is fully explained by obvious variables – whether the clients first move to either market housing or permanent housing upon leaving their program. In other words, for some reason, families have advantages over individuals in moving directly from shelters or interim programs to stable housing.

The analyses suggest that the differences in such a first move by family type are not explained by differential use of social services or by such personal traits as disability and alcohol use. Further other results suggest that only some of the differences between family heads and individuals in rates of escaping homelessness are explained by access to welfare benefits. Thus, the analyses do not fully explain why families are relatively successful in escaping homelessness. Our suspicion is that families are provided resources that are not measured here. For example, families may be preferred by landlords or by programs that offer certain types of market housing. It also is possible that services offered by interim housing programs at which families reside are superior in quality to those offered by interim housing programs at which single individuals reside (this report cannot examine that issue), and thus more fully help the families escape homelessness.

Client Needs and Program Experiences

Finally, the analyses provide little or perhaps no evidence that programs force out clients with disabilities, mental health problems, alcohol problems or the like. Indeed, results seem to suggest that problem-prone clients may aggregate over time at many programs. These same results imply that certain disabilities, like physical disabilities, make it difficult for clients to leave their baseline programs. Still, there also is evidence that other problems, like alcohol use and mental health problems, relate to outcomes in complex ways, sometimes seeming to increase the probability that clients from shelters obtain market housing, for example. Again, we suspect that these last patterns have less to do with the activities of the baseline programs than with special regulations or opportunities made available in the environment. For example, there are treatment programs for clients with alcohol problems, some of which offer market-like housing.

However, there only is very limited evidence that improvements in housing lead to improvement in health, mental health, drug use, and alcohol use, or even that clients improve after receiving treatment for personal problems. The aspect of the Housing First model suggesting that stability leads to various personal improvements cannot be confirmed with the data at hand.

Appendix

Appendix Table 1a - Regression Model Predicting Days Respondents Report Experiencing Medical or Health Problems in the 30 Prior to the Final Interview for Individuals who Began in a Emergency Shelter or Interim Housing (N=203)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Variable	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T
Intercept	-0.4177 (6.2682)	0.9477	0.8635 (6.0343)	0.8880	3.0336 (5.4858)	0.5879
Respondent is Male (1) versus female (2)	4.2934 (2.3473)	0.0861	3.8659 (1.9204)	0.0612	3.6713 (1.6265)	0.0383*
Respondent is White (1) versus not White (0)	0.7770 (5.0082)	0.8786	0.8773 (5.0461)	0.8642	0.3783 (5.1462)	0.9423
Respondent is African American (1) versus not African American (0)	-0.4588 (3.9231)	0.9084	-1.0725 (4.5239)	0.8156	-1.4146 (4.4232)	0.7532
Age of Respondent at Baseline Interview	-0.0299 (0.0652)	0.6525	-0.0691 (0.0598)	0.2650	-0.0994 (0.0594)	0.1135
Respondent was in an Emergency or Overnight Shelter (1) versus Interim Housing (0) at Baseline interview	1.1985 (1.1399)	0.3087	1.5586 (1.1940)	0.2102	1.7009 (1.0383)	0.1209
Respondent has less than a high school education (1) versus more than this (0)	-3.3850 (1.5207)	0.0407*	-3.3079 (1.6812)	0.0667	-3.0997 (1.3318)	0.0334*
Respondent was convicted of a felony offense prior to the baseline interview (1) versus not convicted (0)	0.0725 (1.3420)	0.9576	-0.0275 (1.2399)	0.9826	0.0519 (1.1417)	0.9643
Respondent had a diagnosed disability at the time of the baseline interview (1) versus no disability (0)	1.0607 (1.5356)	0.4996	0.7816 (1.6925)	0.6504	0.7965 (1.6072)	0.6269

Number of days between entry into program and baseline interview	0.0002 (0.0006)	0.7004	0.0002 (0.0006)	0.7080	0.0001 (0.0005)	0.8510
Number of days between baseline and final interview	-0.0002 (0.0079)	0.9763	-0.0018 (0.0066)	0.7874	0.0016 (0.0067)	0.8108
Number of days in 30 before baseline interview respondent drank to the point of feeling the effects	-0.2009 (0.1047)	0.0730	-0.2133 (0.1085)	0.0668	-0.2244 (0.0952)	0.0315*
Number of days in the 30 before the baseline interview respondent used drugs other than alcohol	0.0210 (0.0481)	0.6678	0.0165 (0.0480)	0.7349	0.0272 (0.0485)	0.5821
Respondent was treated in a hospital at least once for a psychological or emotional problem prior to baseline interview	5.2184 (1.8870)	0.0138*	4.9480 (1.6809)	0.0095**	5.1954 (1.6383)	0.0059**
Total months experienced homelessness in lifetime prior to baseline interview	0.0013 (0.0109)	0.9034	0.0031 (0.0093)	0.7394	0.0023 (0.0101)	0.8233
Total number of days experienced health problems in 30 before baseline interview	0.2568 (0.0514)	0.0001 ***	0.2539 (0.0448)	<.0001 ***	0.2600 (0.0425)	<.0001***
Total number of professional services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	-0.2564 (0.5908)	0.6701	-0.3814 (0.5777)	0.5184
Total number of advocacy services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	1.8115 (1.2552)	0.1683	1.8953 (1.1834)	0.1288
Total number of employment related services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	0.0991 (0.9404)	0.9174	0.2760 (0.9456)	0.7741

First Place Moved to was Market Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	-2.3977 (1.2832)	0.0801
First Place Moved to was Permanent Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	-0.2619 (2.3396)	0.9123
First Place Moved to was Interim Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	-1.3001 (2.0720)	0.5392
First Place Moved to was a Shelter (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	-5.8191 (1.0962)	<.0001***
RSquare **F (df)** **Pr < F**	0.2616 636.55 (15,16) <.0001		0.2740 642.82 (16,16) <.0001		0.3011 621.13 (16, 16) <.0001	

* p < .05
* * p < .01
*** p < .001

Appendix Table 1b - Regression Model Predicting Days Respondents Report Experiencing Emotional Problems in the 30 days Prior to the Final Interview for Individuals who Began in a Emergency Shelter or Interim Housing (N=196)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Variable	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T
Intercept	5.8525 (6.5719)	0.3864	6.6543 (6.8140)	0.3433	7.1248 (6.6565)	0.3003
Respondent is Male (1) versus female (2)	-0.6641 (1.6801)	0.6979	-0.9468 (1.5132)	0.5403	-1.4164 (1.3270)	0.3016
Respondent is White (1) versus not White (0)	5.3622 (4.6019)	0.2610	5.4921 (4.5186)	0.2418	6.0061 (4.3839)	0.1896
Respondent is African American (1) versus not African American (0)	1.8875 (2.7902)	0.5084	1.9482 (2.8564)	0.5050	2.1308 (2.7031)	0.4420
Age of Respondent at Baseline Interview	-0.0926 (0.0859)	0.2969	-0.1147 (0.0811)	0.1763	-0.1070 (0.0815)	0.2075
Respondent was in an Emergency or Overnight Shelter (1) versus Interim Housing (0) at Baseline interview	-0.3874 (1.0061)	0.7053	-0.0481 (1.6563)	0.9772	-0.3622 (1.8408)	0.8465
Respondent has less than a high school education (1) versus more than this (0)	0.3435 (1.8387)	0.8542	0.2091 (1.9338)	0.9152	0.4286 (1.8383)	0.8186
Respondent was convicted of a felony offense prior to the baseline interview (1) versus not convicted (0)	0.1975 (1.1057)	0.8605	0.0751 (1.0632)	0.9446	-0.0301 (1.0724)	0.9779
Respondent had a diagnosed disability at the time of the baseline interview (1) versus no disability (0)	0.1643 (1.0855)	0.8816	-0.1802 (1.2312)	0.8853	-0.1996 (1.1769)	0.8675
Number of days between entry into program and baseline interview	-0.0006 (0.0001)	0.0002***	-0.0006 (0.0001)	0.0004***	-0.0006 (0.0001)	0.0002***
Number of days between baseline and final interview	-0.0011 (0.0058)	0.8531	-0.0025 (0.0059)	0.6831	-0.0029 (0.0067)	0.6721

Number of days in 30 before baseline interview respondent drank to the point of feeling the effects	-0.1371 (0.0555)	0.0251*	-0.1349 (0.0570)	0.0310*	-0.1204 (0.0609)	0.0657
Number of days in the 30 before the baseline interview respondent used drugs other than alcohol	0.0313 (0.0550)	0.5770	0.0287 (0.0542)	0.6042	0.0240 (0.0504)	0.6409
Respondent was treated in a hospital at least once for a psychological or emotional problem prior to baseline interview	3.3070 (1.4217)	0.0335*	3.0310 (1.4291)	0.0499*	3.0509 (1.2887)	0.0309*
Total months experienced homelessness in lifetime prior to baseline interview	0.0062 (0.0071)	0.3973	0.0065 (0.0068)	0.3557	0.0072 (0.0061)	0.2541
Total number of days experienced emotional problems in 30 before baseline interview	0.2713 (0.1613)	0.1120	0.2790 (0.1593)	0.0990	0.2794 (0.1480)	0.0774
Total number of professional services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	0.1559 (0.5021)	0.7602	0.0869 (0.4320)	0.8430
Total number of advocacy services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	0.7701 (0.4467)	0.1040	0.9250 (0.4428)	0.0530
Total number of employment related services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	-0.6196 (1.1222)	0.5885	-0.4959 (1.1141)	0.6622
First Place Moved to was Market Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	-1.4381 (0.9282)	0.1408
First Place Moved to was Permanent Housing (1) versus not first place	___	___	___	___	-1.4039 (2.0182)	0.4967

moved or did not move (0)						
First Place Moved to was Interim Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	1.0929 (1.7947)	0.5511
First Place Moved to was a Shelter (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	0.0375 (2.3078)	0.9872
RSquare **F (df)** **Pr < F**	0.2446 193.50 (15,16) <.0001		0.2511 1205.96 (16,16) <.0001		0.2632 58.96 (16,16) <.0001	

* p < .05
* * p < .01
*** p < .001

Appendix Table 1c - Regression Model Predicting Days Respondents Report Using Drugs Other Than Alcohol in the 30 Prior to the Final Interview for Individuals who Began in a Emergency Shelter or Interim Housing (N=202)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Variable	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T
Intercept	-0.7666 (5.4644)	0.8902	-0.3765 (6.0381)	0.9511	-2.2059 (6.2443)	0.7285
Respondent is Male (1) versus female (2)	-2.2512 (3.6223)	0.5430	-2.0553 (3.5210)	0.5675	-1.1974 (4.0746)	0.7726
Respondent is White (1) versus not White (0)	2.0069 (5.6320)	0.7262	1.9108 (5.7351)	0.7433	1.3620 (7.0562)	0.8494
Respondent is African American (1) versus not African American (0)	-2.3223 (4.2666)	0.5937	-2.0150 (4.0868)	0.6287	-2.0795 (4.2254)	0.6293
Age of Respondent at Baseline Interview	0.0570 (0.0923)	0.5457	0.0762 (0.0910)	0.4149	0.0821 (0.0974)	0.4119
Respondent was in an Emergency or Overnight Shelter (1) versus Interim Housing (0) at Baseline interview	5.2733 (1.8973)	0.0134*	4.3624 (2.3806)	0.0856	4.2671 (2.1602)	0.0657
Respondent has less than a high school education (1) versus more than this (0)	1.8135 (2.4055)	0.4619	1.8923 (2.3061)	0.4239	1.5122 (2.5545)	0.5621
Respondent was convicted of a felony offense prior to the baseline interview (1) versus not convicted (0)	-1.9953 (1.5968)	0.2294	-1.7961 (1.5429)	0.2614	-1.5157 (1.6793)	0.3801
Respondent had a diagnosed disability at the time of the baseline interview (1) versus no disability (0)	8.1422 (1.9800)	0.0008***	8.5294 (2.0046)	0.0006***	8.7802 (2.0624)	0.0006***
Number of days between entry into program and baseline interview	-0.0004 (0.0004)	0.2830	-0.0004 (0.0004)	0.3110	-0.0005 (0.0003)	0.1757
Number of days between baseline and final interview	0.0136 (0.0108)	0.2248	0.0144 (0.0109)	0.2044	0.0155 (0.0101)	0.1436

Number of days in 30 before baseline interview respondent drank to the point of feeling the effects	0.0864 (0.0722)	0.2487	0.0921 (0.0626)	0.1608	0.0928 (0.0655)	0.1758
Respondent was treated in a hospital at least once for a psychological or emotional problem prior to baseline interview	-0.3519 (1.3923)	0.8037	-0.0087 (1.2788)	0.9947	-0.2142 (1.3679)	0.8776
Total months experienced homelessness in lifetime prior to baseline interview	0.0116 (0.0079)	0.1595	0.0117 (0.0098)	0.2472	0.0115 (0.0085)	0.1971
Number of days in the 30 before the baseline interview respondent used drugs other than alcohol	0.1375 (0.1081)	0.2215	0.1399 (0.1127)	0.2324	0.1362 (0.1052)	0.2141
Total number of professional services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	-0.2596 (0.8283)	0.7581	-0.0925 (0.8680)	0.9164
Total number of advocacy services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	-1.1085 (0.9001)	0.2359	-1.1187 (0.9760)	0.2685
Total number of employment related services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	-0.1564 (1.3167)	0.9069	-0.3741 (1.2639)	0.7710
First Place Moved to was Market Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	1.4586 (1.5349)	0.3561
First Place Moved to was Permanent Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	0.5647 (4.4666)	0.9010
First Place Moved to was Interim Housing (1) versus not first place moved or	___	___	___	___	-3.2423 (3.1389)	0.3170

did not move (0)						
First Place Moved to was a Shelter (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	2.6820 (2.0073)	0.2002
RSquare	0.1798		0.1843		0.2017	
F (df)	173.13 (14,16)		285.78 (16,16)		207.78 (16,16)	
Pr < F	<.0001		<.0001		<.0001	

* p < .05
* * p < .01
*** p < .001

Appendix Table 1d- Regression Model Predicting Days Individuals Report Using Alcohol to the Point of Feelings the Effects in the 30 days Prior to the Final Interview for Individuals who Began in a Emergency Shelter or Interim Housing (N= 204)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Variable	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T
Intercept	8.7035 (3.3523)	0.0195*	9.6630 (3.6782)	0.0183*	9.9281 (3.1417)	0.0061**
Respondent is Male (1) versus female (2)	-2.2255 (1.2079)	0.0840	-2.2135 (1.2334)	0.0916	-2.4919 (1.0249)	0.0272*
Respondent is White (1) versus not White (0)	0.6457 (1.9262)	0.7418	0.6665 (1.8622)	0.7251	1.3175 (1.8510)	0.4868
Respondent is African American (1) versus not African American (0)	-0.3986 (1.1613)	0.7359	0.3362 (0.9522)	0.7286	0.4041 (0.9547)	0.6777
Age of Respondent at Baseline Interview	-0.0698 (0.0544)	0.2176	-0.0643 (0.0501)	0.2177	-0.0594 (0.0491)	0.2445
Respondent was in an Emergency or Overnight Shelter (1) versus Interim Housing (0) at Baseline interview	0.5805 (0.8143)	0.4862	0.0908 (1.1187)	0.9363	0.2304 (1.0083)	0.8222
Respondent has less than a high school education (1) versus more than this (0)	-0.1071 (0.8659)	0.9031	-0.3128 (0.8714)	0.7243	-0.0153 (0.9233)	0.9870
Respondent was convicted of a felony offense prior to the baseline interview (1) versus not convicted (0)	0.6429 (0.8591)	0.4651	0.7032 (0.8095)	0.3979	0.4428 (0.8741)	0.6193
Respondent had a diagnosed disability at the time of the baseline interview (1) versus no disability (0)	-0.0207 (0.9158)	0.9822	-0.0158 (1.0770)	0.9885	-0.1402 (0.9653)	0.8863
Number of days between entry into program and baseline interview	0.0006 (0.0006)	0.3873	0.0005 (0.0006)	0.3829	0.0006 (0.0006)	0.3298
Number of days between baseline and final interview	-0.0046 (0.0046)	0.3312	-0.0048 (0.0050)	0.3501	-0.0074 (0.0048)	0.1421

Number of days in the 30 before the baseline interview respondent used drugs other than alcohol	-0.0317 (0.0369)	0.4027	-0.0306 (0.0365)	0.4154	-0.0325 (0.0345)	0.3605
Respondent was treated in a hospital at least once for a psychological or emotional problem prior to baseline interview	0.9956 (1.1854)	0.4133	1.0824 (1.3587)	0.4373	0.9863 (1.5072)	0.5221
Total months experienced homelessness in lifetime prior to baseline interview	0.0016 (0.0095)	0.8710	0.0009 (0.0087)	0.9159	0.0028 (0.0070)	0.6932
Number of days in 30 before baseline interview respondent drank to the point of feeling the effects	0.2672 (0.1497)	0.0932	0.2880 (0.1494)	0.0719	0.2942 (0.1458)	0.0608
Total number of professional services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	0.2549 (0.3180)	0.4345	0.2808 (0.2777)	0.3269
Total number of advocacy services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	-1.0603 (0.6336)	0.1137	-1.1077 (0.6722)	0.1189
Total number of employment related services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	-1.3413 (0.6577)	0.0583	-1.3389 (0.7023)	0.0747
First Place Moved to was Market Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	1.0595 (1.2256)	0.4001
First Place Moved to was Permanent Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	-1.3916 (0.7771)	0.0923
First Place Moved to was Interim Housing (1) versus not first place moved or	___	___	___	___	2.1728 (1.7798)	0.2399

did not move (0)						
First Place Moved to was a Shelter (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	-0.2800 (1.2901)	0.8309
RSquare	0.09743		0.1202		0.1405	
F (df)	53.44 (14,16)		76.77 (16,16)		59.34 (16,16)	
Pr < F	<.0001		<.0001		<.0001	

* $p < .05$
* * $p < .01$
*** $p < .001$

Appendix Table 1e- Regression Model Predicting Days Individuals Reported Working for Money in the 30 Days Prior to the Final Interview for Individuals who Began in a Emergency Shelter or Interim Housing (N=204)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Variable	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T
Intercept	16.3840 (5.1918)	0.0061**	16.8290 (5.3356)	0.0061**	15.9870 (4.5786)	0.0030**
Respondent is Male (1) versus female (2)	-1.5591 (1.3346)	0.2599	-1.4858 (1.2881)	0.2657	-1.4149 (1.3245)	0.3012
Respondent is White (1) versus not White (0)	-3.5536 (2.3779)	0.1545	-3.5969 (2.3646)	0.1477	-3.0704 (2.2201)	0.1857
Respondent is African American (1) versus not African American (0)	-2.7483 (1.6333)	0.1119	-2.5150 (1.5618)	0.1269	-2.4905 (1.3483)	0.0833
Age of Respondent at Baseline Interview	-0.1101 (0.0606)	0.0882	-0.1042 (0.0513)	0.0592	-0.0937 (0.0435)	0.0471*
Respondent was in an Emergency or Overnight Shelter (1) versus Interim Housing (0) at Baseline interview	-0.8164 (1.1467)	0.4868	-1.2696 (1.6078)	0.4413	-0.6780 (1.3922)	0.6329
Respondent has less than a high school education (1) versus more than this (0)	-1.0274 (0.9764)	0.3083	-1.0362 (1.0793)	0.3513	-0.8869 (1.0420)	0.4072
Respondent was convicted of a felony offense prior to the baseline interview (1) versus not convicted (0)	-1.0408 (1.5502)	0.5116	-0.9627 (1.6016)	0.5562	-1.2495 (1.6039)	0.4473
Respondent had a diagnosed disability at the time of the baseline interview (1) versus no disability (0)	-4.6264 (0.8251)	<.0001***	-4.4766 (0.9928)	0.0004***	-4.7720 (1.0102)	0.0002***
Number of days between entry into program and baseline interview	-0.0004 (0.0002)	0.0596	-0.0004 (0.0002)	0.0941	-0.0003 (0.0002)	0.0648
Number of days between baseline and final interview	0.00147 (0.0087)	0.8675	0.0017 (0.0086)	0.8480	-0.0033 (0.0080)	0.6896

Number of days in 30 before baseline interview respondent drank to the point of feeling the effects	0.19699 (0.0856)	0.0351*	0.2027 (0.0844)	0.0288*	0.1942 (0.0792)	0.0261*
Number of days in the 30 before the baseline interview respondent used drugs other than alcohol	-0.0327 (0.0537)	0.5508	-0.0325 (0.0524)	0.5429	-0.0334 (0.0463)	0.4804
Respondent was treated in a hospital at least once for a psychological or emotional problem prior to baseline interview	-2.0469 (1.5202)	0.1969	-1.9072 (1.4617)	0.2104	-2.0734 (1.4206)	0.1638
Total months experienced homelessness in lifetime prior to baseline interview	0.00236 (0.0055)	0.6748	0.0025 (0.0069)	0.7221	0.0036 (0.0054)	0.5089
Number of days in 30 before baseline interview respondent reported working for pay	0.24587 (0.1314)	0.0798	0.2480 (0.1324)	0.0795	0.2567 (0.1184)	0.0456*
Total number of professional services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	-0.0721 (0.5319)	0.8939	-0.0053 (0.5650)	0.9926
Total number of advocacy services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	-0.5594 (0.6931)	0.4314	-0.8905 (0.6591)	0.1955
Total number of employment related services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	-0.3353 (0.9891)	0.7390	-0.4557 (0.9184)	0.6265
First Place Moved to was Market Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	3.8173 (1.2839)	0.0090**
First Place Moved to was Permanent Housing (1) versus not first place	___	___	___	___	1.0900 (1.9276)	0.5796

moved or did not move (0)						
First Place Moved to was Interim Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	3.7871 (1.1061)	0.0035**
First Place Moved to was a Shelter (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	1.5412 (1.1055)	0.1823
RSquare **F (df)** **Pr < F**	0.2217 313.97 (15,16) <.0001		0.2217 865.86 (16,16) <.0001		0.2563 195.25 (16, 16) <.0001	

* p < .05
* * p < .01
*** p < .001

Appendix Table 1f - Regression Model Predicting Total Number of Professional Services Received in the 30 Days Prior to the Final Interview for Individuals who Began in a Emergency Shelter or Interim Housing (N=205)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Variable	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T
Intercept	0.3651 (0.8023)	0.6552	0.2554 (0.7881)	0.7500	0.2952 (0.7836)	0.7113
Respondent is Male (1) versus female (2)	0.1467 (0.2025)	0.4792	0.1565 (0.1930)	0.4292	0.1340 (0.1868)	0.4833
Respondent is White (1) versus not White (0)	0.0314 (0.2642)	0.9068	0.0301 (0.2600)	0.9092	0.0566 (0.2462)	0.8210
Respondent is African American (1) versus not African American (0)	-0.2345 (0.2048)	0.2689	-0.2643 (0.1837)	0.1694	-0.2491 (0.1747)	0.1731
Age of Respondent at Baseline Interview	0.0019 (0.0091)	0.8330	0.0028 (0.0089)	0.7585	0.0030 (0.0090)	0.7391
Respondent was in an Emergency or Overnight Shelter (1) versus Interim Housing (0) at Baseline interview	0.0134 (0.1689)	0.9377	0.0419 (0.1703)	0.8089	-0.0254 (0.1894)	0.8951
Respondent has less than a high school education (1) versus more than this (0)	0.0075 (0.1054)	0.9440	0.0168 (0.1034)	0.8731	0.0275 (0.0988)	0.7844
Respondent was convicted of a felony offense prior to the baseline interview (1) versus not convicted (0)	0.1373 (0.1782)	0.4522	0.1362 (0.1778)	0.4547	0.1424 (0.1844)	0.4512
Respondent had a diagnosed disability at the time of the baseline interview (1) versus no disability (0)	0.3009 (0.1478)	0.0586	0.3055 (0.1594)	0.0733	0.3361 (0.1514)	0.0412*
Number of days between entry into program and baseline interview	-0.0001 (0.0001)	0.1868	-0.0001 (0.0001)	0.1943	-0.0001 (0.0001)	0.1339
Number of days between baseline and final interview	-0.0004 (0.0014)	0.7449	-0.0004 (0.0013)	0.7753	-0.0001 (0.0012)	0.9070

Number of days in 30 before baseline interview respondent drank to the point of feeling the effects	0.0030 (0.0133)	0.8267	0.0020 (0.0132)	0.8798	0.0041 (0.0135)	0.7661
Number of days in the 30 before the baseline interview respondent used drugsother than alcohol	-0.0012 (0.0063)	0.8481	-0.0011 (0.0064)	0.8621	-0.0015 (0.0065)	0.8177
Respondent was treated in a hospital at least once for a psychological or emotional problem prior to baseline interview	0.4262 (0.2582)	0.1183	0.4268 (0.2475)	0.1039	0.4245 (0.2316)	0.0855
Total months experienced homelessness in lifetime prior to baseline interview	0.0004 (0.0008)	0.5786	0.0004 (0.0008)	0.6071	0.0005 (0.0008)	0.5301
Total number of professional services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	0.3347 (0.0892)	0.0017**	0.3294 (0.0937)	0.0029**	0.3313 (0.0895)	0.0019**
Total number of advocacy services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	0.0197 (0.1219)	0.8739	0.0563 (0.1180)	0.6396
Total number of employment related services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	0.0830 (0.1010)	0.4231	0.0922 (0.1040)	0.3884
First Place Moved to was Market Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	-0.2867 (0.2119)	0.1949
First Place Moved to was Permanent Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	-0.3333 (0.2051)	0.1238
First Place Moved to was Interim Housing (1) versus not first place moved or	___	___	___	___	-0.2305 (0.1906)	0.2441

did not move (0)						
First Place Moved to was a Shelter (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	-0.0357 (0.1799)	0.8454
RSquare	0.3143		0.3159		0.3262	
F (df)	156.01 (15,16)		283.43 (16, 16)		15.29 (16,16)	
Pr < F	<.0001		<.0001		<.0001	

* p < .05
* * p < .01
*** p < .001

Appendix Table 2a - Regression Model Predicting Days Respondents Report Experiencing Medical or Health Problems in the 30 Prior to the Final Interview for Individuals and Families who Began in Emergency or Interim Housing (N=264)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Variable	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T
Intercept	-1.4893 (6.0037)	0.8062	-0.6004 (5.8182)	0.9187	1.4760 (5.3326)	0.7843
Respondent is Male (1) versus female (2)	3.5300 (2.2415)	0.1284	3.1413 (1.8896)	0.1094	2.8908 (1.6059)	0.0844
Respondent is White (1) versus not White (0)	2.2931 (3.9932)	0.5711	2.3082 (3.9312)	0.5626	2.0383 (4.0506)	0.6194
Respondent is African American (1) versus not African American (0)	-0.4433 (3.0221)	0.8846	-0.6874 (3.3436)	0.8389	-0.9055 (3.2644)	0.7839
Age of Respondent at Baseline Interview	0.0090 (0.0581)	0.8786	-0.0164 (0.0534)	0.7619	-0.0370 (0.05206)	0.4839
Respondent was in shelter (1) versus in an interim program (0) at the time of the baseline interview	-0.1522 (1.1478)	0.8956	0.1831 (1.1470)	0.8745	-0.0000 (1.0471)	1.0000
Respondent was homeless with family (1) versus single at the time of the baseline interview (0)	-2.8361 (2.4440)	0.2573	-3.1152 (2.5012)	0.2250	-2.646 (2.1589)	0.2322
Respondent has less than a high school education (1) versus more than this (0).	-2.3159 (1.4722)	0.1288	-2.4039 (1.5237)	0.1277	-2.2046 (1.2910)	0.1006
Respondent was convicted of a felony offense prior to the baseline interview (1) versus not convicted (0)	-0.9388 (1.2970)	0.4762	-1.0392 (1.2195)	0.4026	-1.0126 (1.1487)	0.3868
Respondent had a diagnosed disability at the time of the baseline interview (1) versus no	1.0625 (1.4557)	0.4725	0.7297 (1.5853)	0.6495	0.9129 (1.4812)	0.5435

disability (0)						
Number of days between entry into program and baseline interview	0.0002 (0.0006)	0.6904	0.0002 (0.0006)	0.7589	0.0000 (0.0005)	0.9379
Number of days between baseline and final interview	0.0025 (0.0073)	0.7383	0.0011 (0.0065)	0.8668	0.0039 (0.0061)	0.5308
Number of days in 30 before baseline interview respondent drank to the point of feeling the effects	-0.1166 (0.1015)	0.2618	-0.1169 (0.1048)	0.2759	-0.1103 (0.0998)	0.2798
Number of days in the 30 before the baseline interview respondent used drugs other than alcohol	0.0150 (0.0455)	0.7443	0.0156 (0.0453)	0.7329	0.0244 (0.0461)	0.6015
Respondent was treated in a hospital at least once for a psychological or emotional problem prior to baseline interview	4.1922 (1.7529)	0.0250*	3.9607 (1.6530)	0.0247*	4.2098 (1.5901)	0.0141*
Total months experienced homelessness in lifetime prior to baseline interview	0.0035 (0.0114)	0.7644	0.0045 (0.0105)	0.6761	0.0046 (0.0110)	0.6801
Total number of days experienced health problems in 30 before baseline interview	0.2511 (0.0447)	<.0001***	0.2453 (0.0391)	<.0001***	0.2460 (0.0381)	<.0001***
Total number of professional services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	0.0524 (0.5178)	0.9202	-0.0232 (0.4936)	0.9628
Total number of advocacy services	___	___	1.2563 (1.0438)	0.2405	1.4160 (0.9353)	0.1431

received in 30 days prior to baseline interview						
Total number of employment related services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	——	——	-0.7718 (0.71245)	0.2894	-0.5901 (0.6706)	0.3876
First Place Moved to was Market Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	——	——	——	——	-2.8996 (1.2280)	0.0267*
First Place Moved to was Permanent Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	——	——	——	——	-1.7224 (2.08780)	0.4175
First Place Moved to was Interim Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	——	——	——	——	-1.5499 (1.91928)	0.4273
First Place Moved to was to a shelter or on the street or they remained in shelter and never moved (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	——	——	——	——	-4.8627 (0.9083)	<.0001***
RSquare **F (df)** **Pr < F**	0.2299 78.52 (16,24) <.0001		0.2392 159.23 (19, 24) <.0001		0.2581 848.00 (23,24) <.0001	

* p < .05

* * p < .01

*** p < .001

Appendix Table 2b - Regression Model Predicting Days Respondents Report Experiencing Emotional Problems in the 30 Prior to the Final Interview for Individuals and Families who Began in Emergency or Interim Housing (N =254)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Variable	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T
Intercept	3.5164 (5.6580)	0.5401	3.3826 (5.7415)	0.5613	3.5464 (5.7492)	0.5431
Respondent is Male (1) versus female (2)	-0.3319 (1.5408)	0.8313	-0.61096 (1.3764)	0.6611	-0.9351 (1.3051)	0.4806
Respondent is White (1) versus not White (0)	5.8771 (3.4608)	0.1024	5.8830 (3.4060)	0.0970	6.2958 (3.3831)	0.0750
Respondent is African American (1) versus not African American (0)	1.9195 (1.8217)	0.3025	1.7339 (1.9234)	0.3763	1.7898 (1.8484)	0.3426
Age of Respondent at Baseline Interview	-0.0422 (0.0684)	0.5436	-0.0546 (0.0657)	0.4140	-0.0436 (0.0675)	0.5246
Respondent was in shelter (1) versus in an interim program (0) at the time of the baseline interview	-0.4373 (0.8257)	0.6012	0.0594 (1.1824)	0.9604	-0.0872 (1.2390)	0.9445
Respondent was homeless with family (1) versus single at the time of the baseline interview (0)	-1.2747 (1.7153)	0.4649	-1.5233 (1.7997)	0.4057	-0.8163 (1.6995)	0.6354
Respondent has less than a high school education (1) versus more than this (0)	-0.3385 (1.2929)	0.7957	-0.3783 (1.3886)	0.7876	-0.2467 (1.2816)	0.8490
Respondent was convicted of a felony offense prior to the baseline interview (1) versus not convicted (0)	0.8570 (0.9444)	0.3732	0.7157 (0.9179)	0.4432	0.6661 (0.9130)	0.4728

Respondent had a diagnosed disability at the time of the baseline interview (1) versus no disability (0)	0.5854 (1.0888)	0.5958	0.1924 (1.1811)	0.8719	0.1980 (1.1284)	0.8622
Number of days between entry into program and baseline interview	-0.0005 (0.0001)	<.0001***	-0.0006 (0.0001)	0.0001***	-0.0006 (0.0001)	<.0001***
Number of days between baseline and final interview	-0.0034 (0.0045)	0.4534	-0.0041 (0.0046)	0.3905	-0.0043 (0.0051)	0.4129
Number of days in 30 before baseline interview respondent drank to the point of feeling the effects	-0.1456 (0.0606)	0.0245*	-0.1467 (0.0628)	0.0281*	-0.1350 (0.0699)	0.0653
Number of days in the 30 before the baseline interview respondent used drugs other than alcohol	0.0312 (0.0491)	0.5315	0.0321 (0.0481)	0.5108	0.0285 (0.0459)	0.5411
Respondent was treated in a hospital at least once for a psychological or emotional problem prior to baseline interview	2.9632 (1.1615)	0.0175*	2.7093 (1.1486)	0.0268*	2.7258 (1.0426)	0.0152*
Total months experienced homelessness in lifetime prior to baseline interview	0.0052 (0.0078)	0.5146	0.0056 (0.0074)	0.4549	0.0062 (0.0066)	0.3599
Total number of days experienced emotional problems in 30 before baseline interview	0.3042 (0.1124)	0.0123*	0.3100 (0.1100)	0.0095**	0.3159 (0.1057)	0.0064**
Total number of	___	___	0.1462 (0.3981)	0.7167	0.1364 (0.3401)	0.6919

professional services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview						
Total number of advocacy services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	——	——	0.9544 (0.5540)	0.0978	0.9834 (0.5562)	0.0897
Total number of employment related services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	——	——	-0.3008 (0.70168)	0.6720	-0.0794 (0.7190)	0.9129
First Place Moved to was Market Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	——	——	—–	——	-1.1953 (0.9572)	0.2238
First Place Moved to was Permanent Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	——	——	—–	——	-1.6321 (1.7285)	0.3545
First Place Moved to was Interim Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	——	——	—–	——	0.9241 (1.7757)	0.6075
First Place Moved to was to a shelter or on the street or they remained in shelter and never moved (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	——	——	—–	——	-0.5481 (1.8602)	0.7708
RSquare **F (df)** **Pr < F**	0.2681 49.61(16,24) <.0001		0.2752 68.91(19,24) <.0001		0.2846 606.79 (23,24) <.0001	

* p < .05 ; ** p < .01 ; *** p < .001

Appendix Table 2c - Regression Model Predicting Days Respondents Report Using Drugs Other Than Alcohol in the 30 Prior to the Final Interview for Individuals and Families who Began in Emergency or Interim Housing (N =263)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Variable	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T
Intercept	-4.3084 (5.4706)	0.4387	-4.8594 (5.1169)	0.3517	-5.8099 (5.4501)	0.2970
Respondent is Male (1) versus female (2)	-0.9632 (3.5903)	0.7908	-0.3979 (3.6630)	0.9144	0.3066 (4.0344)	0.9400
Respondent is White (1) versus not White (0)	0.6331 (4.0465)	0.8770	0.6557 (4.0211)	0.8718	-0.0782 (4.7590)	0.9870
Respondent is African American (1) versus not African American (0)	-2.2704 (3.0336)	0.4615	-1.7681 (2.5914)	0.5016	-1.7995 (2.7172)	0.5141
Age of Respondent at Baseline Interview	0.1111 (0.0701)	0.1259	0.1430 (0.0653)	0.0386*	0.1306 (0.0721)	0.0824
Respondent was in shelter (1) versus in an interim program (0) at the time of the baseline interview	7.7935 (1.4284)	<.0001***	7.1786 (1.9219)	0.0010**	7.3932 (1.7762)	0.0003**
Respondent was homeless with family (1) versus single at the time of the baseline interview (0)	5.2052 (3.1051)	0.1066	5.8596 (3.2754)	0.0863	4.4685 (3.8608)	0.2585
Respondent has less than a high school education (1) versus more than this (0)	-0.4916 (2.0081)	0.8087	-0.4883 (1.9919)	0.8084	-0.7484 (1.9898)	0.7101
Respondent was convicted of a felony offense prior to the baseline interview (1) versus not convicted (0)	-1.1324 (1.4842)	0.4529	-0.9029 (1.4979)	0.5523	-0.7391 (1.6377)	0.6558

Respondent had a diagnosed disability at the time of the baseline interview (1) versus no disability (0)	8.6278 (1.6735)	<.0001***	9.1572 (1.6670)	<.0001***	9.1074 (1.7256)	<.0001***
Number of days between entry into program and baseline interview	-0.0006 (0.0004)	0.1475	-0.0006 (0.0004)	0.1647	-0.0006 (0.0003)	0.1181
Number of days between baseline and final interview	0.0078 (0.0083)	0.3565	0.0093 (0.0085	0.2806	0.0096 (0.0077)	0.2268
Number of days in 30 before baseline interview respondent drank to the point of feeling the effects	0.0741 (0.0770)	0.3454	0.0804 (0.0715)	0.2718	0.0626 (0.0723)	0.3957
Respondent was treated in a hospital at least once for a psychological or emotional problem prior to baseline interview	0.8421 (1.2186)	0.4962	1.1683 (1.1527)	0.3209	1.0007 (1.2225)	0.4211
Total months experienced homelessness in lifetime prior to baseline interview	0.0103 (0.0069)	0.1477	0.0086 (0.0082)	0.3026	0.0072 (0.0069)	0.3059
Number of days in the 30 before the baseline interview respondent used drugs other than alcohol	0.1405 (0.0926)	0.1422	0.1385 (0.0935)	0.1518	0.1412 (0.0869)	0.1174
Total number of professional services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	-0.0430 (0.7009)	0.9516	-0.0157 (0.7317)	0.9831

Total number of advocacy services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	-2.0200 (0.8176)	0.0210*	-2.0350 (0.8229)	0.0209*
Total number of employment related services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	0.6558 (0.9315)	0.4882	0.2220 (0.8977)	0.8068
First Place Moved to was Market Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	2.3140 (1.5695)	0.1534
First Place Moved to was Permanent Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	3.3271 (3.6861)	0.3757
First Place Moved to was Interim Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	-1.9599 (2.8359)	0.4961
First Place Moved to was to a shelter or on the street or they remained in shelter and never moved (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	1.9703 (1.8798)	0.3050
RSquare **F (df)** **Pr < F**	0.2178 99.29 (15,24) <.0001		0.2300 108.88 (18,24) <.0001		0.2467 950.88 (22,24) <.0001	

* p < .05

* * p < .01

*** p < .001

Appendix Table 2d - Regression Model Predicting Days Respondents Report Using Alcohol to the Point of Feelings it Effects in the 30 Prior to the Final Interview for Individuals and Families who Began in Emergency or Interim Housing (N =263)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Variable	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T
Intercept	7.6992 (2.9172)	0.0144*	8.8924 (3.07029)	0.0079**	8.6127 (2.6706)	0.0036**
Respondent is Male (1) versus female (2)	-1.9987 (1.0883)	0.0787	-1.9727 (1.0753)	0.0790	-2.1225 (0.9688)	0.0384*
Respondent is White (1) versus not White (0)	0.6401 (1.4990)	0.6732	0.6340 (1.4589)	0.6677	1.1068 (1.4587)	0.4554
Respondent is African American (1) versus not African American (0)	-0.4496 (0.8940)	0.6196	-0.0715 (0.7220)	0.9220	0.0188 (0.7176)	0.9794
Age of Respondent at Baseline Interview	-0.0596 (0.0413)	0.1620	-0.0649 (0.0377)	0.0981	-0.0547 (0.0359)	0.1408
Respondent was in shelter (1) versus in an interim program (0) at the time of the baseline interview	0.5941 (0.6543)	0.3729	0.4337 (0.8157)	0.5998	0.4883 (0.7473)	0.5197
Respondent was homeless with family (1) versus single at the time of the baseline interview (0)	0.5375 (0.8549)	0.5355	1.2095 (0.7277)	0.1095	1.4353 (0.8034)	0.0866
Respondent has less than a high school education (1) versus more than this (0)	-0.1494 (0.7143)	0.8361	-0.3950 (0.6938)	0.5744	-0.2838 (0.7139)	0.6945
Respondent was convicted of a felony offense prior to the baseline interview (1) versus not convicted (0)	0.9953 (0.7202)	0.1797	1.0849 (0.6933)	0.1307	0.9504 (0.7331)	0.2072
Respondent had a diagnosed disability at	0.1057 (0.7418)	0.8879	0.1374 (0.8548)	0.8736	0.0958 (0.7967)	0.9053

the time of the baseline interview (1) versus no disability (0)						
Number of days between entry into program and baseline interview	0.0006 (0.0006)	0.3501	0.0006 (0.0006)	0.3406	0.0006 (0.0006)	0.3205
Number of days between baseline and final interview	-0.0048 (0.0035)	0.1779	-0.0055 (0.0036)	0.1404	-0.0065 (0.0034)	0.0711
Number of days in the 30 before the baseline interview respondent used drugs other than alcohol	-0.0267 (0.0335)	0.4327	-0.0292 (0.0346)	0.4069	-0.0305 (0.0322)	0.3534
Respondent was treated in a hospital at least once for a psychological or emotional problem prior to baseline interview	1.0422 (0.9237)	0.2703	1.0181 (1.0194)	0.3279	0.9528 (1.1379)	0.4107
Total months experienced homelessness in lifetime prior to baseline interview	0.0020 (0.0089)	0.8207	0.0012 (0.0084)	0.8855	0.0024 (0.0071)	0.7395
Total number of days used alcohol to the point of feeling its effects in the 30 before baseline interview	0.3059 (0.1530)	0.0570	0.3160 (0.1519)	0.0484	0.3240 (0.1480)	0.0386*
Total number of professional services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	——	——	0.1890 (0.2622)	0.4780	0.2269 (0.2399)	0.3536
Total number of advocacy services received in 30	——	——	-0.6936 (0.4854)	0.1659	-0.7514 (0.5574)	0.1903

days prior to baseline interview						
Total number of employment related services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	—	—	-0.8148 (0.3849)	0.0448*	-0.7383 (0.5186)	0.1674
First Place Moved to was Market Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	—	—	—	—	0.3844 (1.0202)	0.7097
First Place Moved to was Permanent Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	—	—	—	—	-1.3529 (0.5486)	0.0212*
First Place Moved to was Interim Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	—	—	—	—	1.2525 (1.6094)	0.4440
First Place Moved to was to a shelter or on the street or they remained in shelter and never moved (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	—	—	—	—	-0.1381 (1.1236)	0.9032
RSquare **F (df)** **Pr < F**	0.1263 38.02 (15,24) <.0001		0.1403 61.47 (18,24) <.0001		0.1515 68.00 (22,24) <.0001	

* p < .05

* * p < .01

*** p < .001

Appendix Table 2e- Regression Model Predicting Days Respondents Reported Working for Money in the 30 Prior to the Final Interview for Individuals and Families who Began in Emergency or Interim Housing (N =263)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Variable	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T
Intercept	10.2376 (4.7947)	0.0436*	11.1347 (4.7856)	0.0291*	10.4815 (4.3946)	0.0257*
Respondent is Male (1) versus female (2)	-1.0712 (1.4753)	0.4751	-1.2230 (1.4821)	0.4178	-1.3641 (1.4798)	0.3662
Respondent is White (1) versus not White (0)	-2.8459 (2.0257)	0.1734	-2.8504 (2.0529)	0.1783	-2.3113 (1.9104)	0.2386
Respondent is African American (1) versus not African American (0)	-2.4839 (1.5328)	0.1188	-2.5226 (1.5465)	0.1165	-2.4705 (1.4376)	0.0991
Age of Respondent at Baseline Interview	-0.0760 (0.0539)	0.1716	-0.0885 (0.0466)	0.0702	-0.0782 (0.0430)	0.0820
Respondent was in shelter (1) versus in an interim program (0) at the time of the baseline interview	0.5016 (0.8813)	0.5748	0.4015 (1.3686)	0.7719	0.7614 (1.2901)	0.5608
Respondent was homeless with family (1) versus single at the time of the baseline interview (0)	1.0872 (1.7613)	0.5431	1.0361 (1.9162)	0.5939	0.9198 (2.1394)	0.6712
Respondent has less than a high school education (1) versus more than this (0)	0.1979 (0.9740)	0.8408	0.1705 (1.0018)	0.8664	0.3296 (1.0601)	0.7587
Respondent was convicted of a felony offense prior to the baseline interview (1) versus not convicted (0)	-0.0191 (1.4368)	0.9895	-0.0130 (1.5037)	0.9932	-0.2289 (1.5386)	0.8830
Respondent had a diagnosed disability at the time of the baseline interview (1) versus no	-3.7982 (0.7684)	<.0001***	-3.8587 (0.9873)	0.0007***	-4.0608 (1.0699)	0.0009***

disability (0)						
Number of days between entry into program and baseline interview	-0.0004 (0.0002)	0.0446*	-0.0004 (0.0002)	0.0473*	-0.0003 (0.0002)	0.0675
Number of days between baseline and final interview	0.0061 (0.0065)	0.3576	0.0053 (0.0068)	0.4383	0.0023 (0.0065)	0.7233
Total number of days used alcohol to the point of feeling its effects in the 30 before baseline interview	0.1569 (0.0849)	0.0774	0.1568 (0.0840)	0.0746	0.1594 (0.0797)	0.0574
Number of days in the 30 before the baseline interview respondent used drugs other than alcohol	-0.0274 (0.0502)	0.5900	-0.0278 (0.0505)	0.5877	-0.0245 (0.0479)	0.6137
Respondent was treated in a hospital at least once for a psychological or emotional problem prior to baseline interview	-1.6388 (1.3364)	0.2325	-1.6789 (1.2385)	0.1884	-1.6867 (1.2249)	0.1818
Total months experienced homelessness in lifetime prior to baseline interview	0.0010 (0.0054)	0.8546	0.0017 (0.0061)	0.7879	0.0025 (0.0054)	0.6501
Number of days in 30 before baseline interview respondent reported working for pay	0.2978 (0.1092)	0.0120*	0.3020 (0.1134)	0.0139*	0.3043 (0.1065)	0.0089**
Total number of professional services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	——	——	-0.0696 (0.5192)	0.8945	-0.0789 (0.5479)	0.8867

Total number of advocacy services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	——	——	0.3467 (0.6115)	0.5763	0.0636 (0.5812)	0.9138
Total number of employment related services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	——	——	-0.4577 (0.8437)	0.5927	-0.4137 (0.8179)	0.6178
First Place Moved to was Market Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	——	——	——	——	2.3553 (1.2836)	0.0795
First Place Moved to was Permanent Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	——	——	——	——	0.8257 (1.7972)	0.6503
First Place Moved to was Interim Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	——	——	——	——	3.7966 (1.1218)	0.0026**
First Place Moved to was to a shelter or on the street or they remained in shelter and never moved (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	——	——	——	——	0.2121 (1.0304)	0.8388
RSquare **F (df)** **Pr < F**	0.1860 30.21 (16,23) <.0001		0.1877 136.48 (19,23) <.0001		0.2064 355.57 (23,23) <.0001	

* p < .05

* * p < .01

*** p < .001

Appendix Table 2f- Regression Model Predicting Total Number of Professional Services Received in the 30 Days Prior to the Final Interview for Individuals and Families who Began in Emergency or Interim Housing (N =266)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Variable	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T
Intercept	-0.1665 (0.7611)	0.8287	-0.0301 (0.7607)	0.9688	0.0430 (0.7795)	0.9564
Respondent is Male (1) versus female (2)	0.2492 (0.1939)	0.2108	0.2516 (0.1819)	0.1793	0.2432 (0.1729)	0.1724
Respondent is White (1) versus not White (0)	0.0450 (0.2651)	0.8666	0.0434 (0.2629)	0.8702	0.0300 (0.2571)	0.9080
Respondent is African American (1) versus not African American (0)	-0.1754 (0.1868)	0.3570	-0.1392 (0.1929)	0.4776	-0.1412 (0.1819)	0.4452
Age of Respondent at Baseline Interview	0.0081 (0.0075)	0.2919	0.0074 (0.00747)	0.3341	0.0071 (0.0078)	0.3715
Respondent was in shelter (1) versus in an interim program (0) at the time of the baseline interview	0.0064 (0.1496)	0.9661	-0.0175 (0.1470)	0.9062	-0.0586 (0.1595)	0.7164
Respondent was homeless with family (1) versus single at the time of the baseline interview (0)	0.1744 (0.2545)	0.4999	0.2337 (0.2640)	0.3848	0.2918 (0.2472)	0.2494
Respondent has less than a high school education (1) versus more than this (0)	-0.0156 (0.1010)	0.8782	-0.0381 (0.1023)	0.7132	-0.0423 (0.0997)	0.6748
Respondent was convicted of a felony offense prior to the baseline interview (1) versus not convicted (0)	0.2290 (0.1577)	0.1593	0.2387 (0.1521)	0.1297	0.2524 (0.1540)	0.1142
Respondent had a diagnosed disability at the time of the baseline	0.4285 (0.1619)	0.0141*	0.4337 (0.1635)	0.0140*	0.4538 (0.1591)	0.0088**

interview (1) versus no disability (0)						
Number of days between entry into program and baseline interview	-0.0001 (0.0001)	0.1874	-0.0001 (0.0001)	0.1914	-0.0001 (0.0001)	0.1323
Number of days between baseline and final interview	-0.0005 (0.0011)	0.6913	-0.0005 (0.0011)	0.6489	-0.0003 (0.0010)	0.7862
Total number of days used alcohol to the point of feeling its effects in the 30 before baseline interview	-0.0009 (0.0119)	0.9396	0.0000 (0.0116)	0.9993	0.0004 (0.0120)	0.9732
Number of days in the 30 before the baseline interview respondent used drugs other than alcohol	0.0027 (0.0061)	0.6634	0.0024 (0.0060)	0.6860	0.0020 (0.0062)	0.7520
Respondent was treated in a hospital at least once for a psychological or emotional problem prior to baseline interview	0.5247 (0.2209)	0.0258*	0.5239 (0.2196)	0.0253*	0.5247 (0.2042)	0.0168*
Total months experienced homelessness in lifetime prior to baseline interview	0.0007 (0.0008)	0.8388	0.0001 (0.0008)	0.8938	0.0001 (0.0009)	0.9004
Total number of professional services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	0.3194 (0.0794)	0.0005***	0.3325 (0.0849)	0.0006***	0.3341 (0.0832)	0.0005***
Total number of advocacy services received in 30 days prior to baseline	___	___	-0.0652 (0.1174)	0.5838	-0.0392 (0.1133)	0.7320

interview						
Total number of employment related services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	—	—	-0.0814 (0.0969)	0.4088	-0.0712 (0.0914)	0.4433
First Place Moved to was Market Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	—	—	—	—	-0.2772 (0.2084)	0.1961
First Place Moved to was Permanent Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	—	—	—	—	-0.2212 (0.1870)	0.2482
First Place Moved to was Interim Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	—	—	—	—	-0.2684 (0.1979)	0.1876
First Place Moved to was to a shelter or on the street or they remained in shelter and never moved (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	—	—	—	—	-0.0609 (0.2081)	0.7725
RSquare **F (df)** **Pr < F**	0.3324 32.42 (16,24) <.0001		0.3357 37.37(18,24) <.0001		0.3429 99.36 (22,24) <.0001	

* p < .05

* * p < .01

*** p < .001

Appendix Table 3a - Regression Model Predicting Days Respondents Report Experiencing Medical or Health Problems in the 30 Prior to the Final Interview for Respondents who Began in Permanent Supportive Housing (N=151)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Variable	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T
Intercept	7.4158 (8.9384)	0.4189	8.2480 (9.2290)	0.3847	3.6859 (9.2631)	0.6960
Respondent is Male (1) versus female (2)	2.0449 (1.4487)	0.1772	2.2865 (1.6464)	0.1839	2.7205 (1.7732)	0.1445
Respondent is White (1) versus not White (0)	3.8961 (4.0520)	0.3506	3.7017 (3.9575)	0.3635	3.7447 (4.5608)	0.4237
Respondent is African American (1) versus not African American (0)	0.8764 (3.1014)	0.7811	0.8372 (3.2796)	0.8018	0.6841 (3.6108)	0.8521
Age of Respondent at Baseline Interview	0.0767 (0.1309)	0.5659	0.0678 (0.1371)	0.6277	0.0900 (0.1389)	0.5263
Respondent was homeless with family (1) versus single at the time of the baseline interview (0)	2.1870 (2.0869)	0.3102	2.3869 (2.2142)	0.2970	1.9905 (2.3061)	0.4008
Respondent has less than a high school education (1) versus more than this (0)	1.3970 (1.3716)	0.3236	1.3217 (1.3070)	0.3269	1.5263 (1.3740)	0.2830
Respondent was convicted of a felony offense prior to the baseline interview (1) versus not convicted (0)	2.5679 (1.8639)	0.1873	2.6311 (1.8292)	0.1696	2.0128 (2.0201)	0.3339
Respondent had a diagnosed disability at the time of the baseline interview (1) versus no disability (0)	-1.0115 (2.2725)	0.6622	-0.9028 (2.3551)	0.7065	-1.5400 (2.4968)	0.5460
Number of days between entry into program and baseline interview	0.0022 (0.0014)	0.1284	0.0021 (0.0015)	0.1743	0.0021 (0.0014)	0.1562
Number of days between	-0.0460	0.0238*	-0.0453	0.0360*	-0.0334	0.1346

baseline and final interview	(0.0184)		(0.0198)		(0.0212)	
Number of days in 30 before baseline interview respondent drank to the point of feeling the effects	0.3140 (0.1533)	0.0573	0.3115 (0.1733)	0.0911	0.3077 (0.1601)	0.0725
Number of days in the 30 before the baseline interview respondent used drugs other than alcohol	0.1557 (0.1374)	0.2738	0.1555 (0.1362)	0.2704	0.1550 (0.1325)	0.2591
Respondent was treated in a hospital at least once for a psychological or emotional problem prior to baseline interview	2.0963 (2.5847)	0.4292	2.0212 (2.9131)	0.4977	1.8311 (2.7818)	0.5198
Total months experienced homelessness in lifetime prior to baseline interview	-0.0206 (0.0107)	0.0736	-0.0209 (0.0093)	0.0394*	-0.0193 (0.0091)	0.0505
Total number of days experienced health problems in 30 before baseline interview	0.3958 (0.0663)	<.0001***	0.3950 (0.0779)	0.0001***	0.3895 (0.0805)	0.0002***
Total number of professional services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	0.0947 (0.7571)	0.9020	-0.0510 (0.7699)	0.9480
Total number of advocacy services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	-0.5257 (1.3250)	0.6968	0.0397 (1.3653)	0.9771
Total number of employment related services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	-0.5936 (1.1235)	0.6045	-0.3874 (1.1038)	0.7302
First Place Moved to was	___	___	___	___	-3.9563 (2.2838)	0.1024

Market Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)						
First Place Moved to was Permanent Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	0.6052 (2.8183)	0.8327
First Place Moved to was Interim Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	-7.3615 (4.9113)	0.1534
RSquare **F (df)** **Pr < F**	0.2915 87.22 (15,16) <.0001		0.2932 25.34 (16,16) <.0001		0.3061 115.10 16,16) <.0001	

* p < .05

* * p < .01

*** p < .001

Appendix Table 3b - Regression Model Predicting Days Respondents Report Experiencing Emotional Problems in the 30 Prior to the Final Interview for Respondents who Began in Permanent Supportive Housing (N=149)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Variable	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T
Intercept	16.0395 (4.2727)	0.0017**	13.6096 (5.6057)	0.0274*	12.7699 (8.1290)	0.1358
Respondent is Male (1) versus female (2)	1.5800 (2.6610)	0.5610	0.5347 (2.0127)	0.7939	0.6584 (1.9256)	0.7369
Respondent is White (1) versus not White (0)	1.3540 (3.6267)	0.7138	2.0338 (3.6617)	0.5863	1.1917 (3.3770)	0.7288
Respondent is African American (1) versus not African American (0)	-2.0007 (3.6962)	0.5958	-1.6838 (4.0299)	0.6816	-2.8901 (3.1094)	0.3665
Age of Respondent at Baseline Interview	-0.0765 (0.0697)	0.2884	-0.0654 (0.0815)	0.4339	-0.0589 (0.0835)	0.4906
Respondent was homeless with family (1) versus single at the time of the baseline interview (0)	1.5021 (2.3099)	0.5247	0.6118 (2.4063)	0.8026	-0.0636 (2.6157)	0.9809
Respondent has less than a high school education (1) versus more than this (0)	1.5976 (1.4831)	0.2973	1.5413 (1.3488)	0.2699	1.7440 (1.4468)	0.2456
Respondent was convicted of a felony offense prior to the baseline interview (1) versus not convicted (0)	-0.1466 (2.0189)	0.9430	-0.5239 (2.0149)	0.7982	-0.3891 (1.9840)	0.8470
Respondent had a diagnosed disability at the time of the baseline interview (1) versus no disability (0)	1.3902 (1.5692)	0.3888	0.6183 (1.7790)	0.7982	0.4469 (1.6025)	0.7839
Number of days between	0.0002 (0.0009)	0.8344	0.0008 (0.0011)	0.4815	0.0007 (0.0011)	0.5241

entry into program and baseline interview						
Number of days between baseline and final interview	-0.0341 (0.0244)	0.1811	-0.0344 (0.0238)	0.1677	-0.0282 (0.0269)	0.3100
Number of days in 30 before baseline interview respondent drank to the point of feeling the effects	0.3923 (0.0768)	0.0001 ***	0.4035 (0.0799)	0.0001***	0.3777 (0.0843)	0.0004***
Number of days in the 30 before the baseline interview respondent used drugs other than alcohol	0.1402 (0.1043)	0.1973	0.1427 (0.0903)	0.1337	0.1275 (0.0867)	0.1605
Respondent was treated in a hospital at least once for a psychological or emotional problem prior to baseline interview	-1.5487 (1.6511)	0.3622	-1.3062 (1.8979)	0.5012	-1.3065 (1.8751)	0.4959
Total months experienced homelessness in lifetime prior to baseline interview	-0.0156 (0.0157)	0.3362	-0.0137 (0.0125)	0.2896	-0.0151 (0.0124)	0.4959
Total number of days experienced emotional problems in 30 before baseline interview	0.3982 (0.0945)	0.0007 ***	0.4018 (0.0912)	0.0004***	0.4088 (0.0854)	0.0002***
Total number of professional services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	-0.4988 (0.6716)	0.4684	-0.6071 (0.6862)	0.3894
Total number of advocacy services received in 30 days prior to baseline	___	___	2.4983 (1.2912)	0.0709	2.8533 (1.1530)	0.0249 *

interview						
Total number of employment related services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	—	—	1.2584 (1.0492)	0.2478	1.2877 (1.0797)	0.2504
First Place Moved to was Market Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	—	—	—	—	-0.9906 (3.2873)	0.7670
First Place Moved to was Permanent Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	—	—	—	—	-6.2522 (3.9026)	0.1287
First Place Moved to was Interim Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	—	—	—	—	-5.1562 (4.2897)	0.2469
RSquare **F (df)** **Pr < F**	0.2829 2925.23 (15,16) <.0001		0.3173 454.85(16,16) <.0001		0.3315 60.93 (16,16) <.0001	

* p < .05

* * p < .01

*** p < .001

Appendix Table 3c - Regression Model Predicting Days Respondents Report Using Drugs Other Than Alcohol in the 30 Prior to the Final Interview for Respondents who Began in Permanent Supportive Housing (N=155)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Variable	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T
Intercept	7.1774 (15.8374)	0.6565	9.8559 (13.6745)	0.4815	1.8109 (14.1422)	0.8997
Respondent is Male (1) versus female (2)	2.9555 (3.3244)	0.3872	2.7306 (3.4315)	0.4378	3.4495 (3.7645)	0.3731
Respondent is White (1) versus not White (0)	4.2674 (2.5843)	0.1182	3.3442 (3.4331)	0.3445	6.3961 (2.5692)	0.0242*
Respondent is African American (1) versus not African American (0)	5.0696 (5.6367)	0.3818	3.9148 (6.0542)	0.5270	5.9894 (4.1283)	0.1662
Age of Respondent at Baseline Interview	0.0170 (0.1411)	0.9057	-0.0469 (0.1225)	0.7071	-0.0039 (0.1132)	0.9731
Respondent was homeless with family (1) versus single at the time of the baseline interview (0)	1.1504 (4.1181)	0.7836	-1.4489 (3.8344)	0.7105	-1.3159 (4.1821)	0.7571
Respondent has less than a high school education (1) versus more than this (0)	-1.0385 (2.7162)	0.7072	-0.8232 (2.7634)	0.7696	-0.0841 (2.9717)	0.9778
Respondent was convicted of a felony offense prior to the baseline interview (1) versus not convicted (0)	0.8965 (3.1101)	0.7769	0.3823 (2.6644)	0.8877	-0.3213 (2.7938)	0.9099
Respondent had a diagnosed disability at the time of the baseline interview (1) versus no disability (0)	8.3556 (2.6297)	0.0058**	5.4441 (2.9348)	0.0821	4.7358 (3.0921)	0.1452

Number of days between entry into program and baseline interview	0.0027 (0.0009)	0.0077**	0.0013 (0.0008)	0.1346	0.0016 (0.0008)	0.0533
Number of days between baseline and final interview	-0.0508 (0.0227)	0.0396*	-0.0469 (0.0174)	0.0158*	-0.0396 (0.0223)	0.0957
Number of days in 30 before baseline interview respondent drank to the point of feeling the effects	0.0312 (0.1435)	0.8307	-0.0773 (0.1519)	0.6178	-0.0225 (0.1247)	0.8589
Respondent was treated in a hospital at least once for a psychological or emotional problem prior to baseline interview	1.2273 (4.0627)	0.7665	-0.7988 (3.9207)	0.8411	-0.8451 (3.7963)	0.8267
Total months experienced homelessness in lifetime prior to baseline interview	0.0429 (0.0174)	0.0256*	0.0304 (0.0176)	0.1036	0.0328 (0.0182)	0.0902
Number of days in the 30 before the baseline interview respondent used drugs other than alcohol	0.2447 (0.0966)	0.0221*	0.2140 (0.0895)	0.0295*	0.2260 (0.0952)	0.0305*
Total number of professional services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	2.3522 (0.5091)	0.0003***	2.3231 (0.5761)	0.0010***
Total number of advocacy services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	1.6955 (2.0061)	0.4105	1.7173 (2.1490)	0.4359

Total number of employment related services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	-2.6861 (1.1224)	0.0293*	-2.6936 (1.1083)	0.0272
First Place Moved to was Market Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	0.3946 (2.6075)	0.8816
First Place Moved to was Permanent Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	13.9698 (5.2893)	0.0178*
First Place Moved to was Interim Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	-8.2111 (8.2270)	0.3331
RSquare **F (df)** **Pr < F**	0.2472 263.80 (14,16) <.0001		0.3060 140.17 (16,16) <.0001		0.3374 49.19 (16,16) <.0001	

* p < .05

* * p < .01

*** p < .001

Appendix Table 3d - Regression Model Predicting Days Respondents Report Using Alcohol to the Point of Feelings it Effects in the 30 Prior to the Final Interview for Respondents who Began in Permanent Supportive Housing (N=155)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Variable	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T
Intercept	-2.0109 (3.7811)	0.6022	-0.8104 (4.5005)	0.8594	-1.1289 (4.7623)	0.8156
Respondent is Male (1) versus female (2)	-1.2303 (1.1623)	0.3055	-0.9242 (1.2885)	0.4836	-0.8968 (1.3081)	0.5028
Respondent is White (1) versus not White (0)	-0.7434 (1.1137)	0.5139	-1.0651 (1.0489)	0.3250	-0.8942 (1.1619)	0.4527
Respondent is African American (1) versus not African American (0)	1.9992 (1.4579)	0.1892	1.6107 (1.4078)	0.2694	1.7562 (1.6813)	0.3118
Age of Respondent at Baseline Interview	-0.0292 (0.0347)	0.4115	-0.0407 (0.0344)	0.2548	-0.0391 (0.0349)	0.2791
Respondent was homeless with family (1) versus single at the time of the baseline interview (0)	1.0995 (1.3324)	0.4214	0.9440 (1.3877)	0.5061	0.9803 (1.3896)	0.4907
Respondent has less than a high school education (1) versus more than this (0)	1.7597 (0.9027)	0.0690	1.8558 (0.8859)	0.0525	1.8759 (0.9743)	0.0721
Respondent was convicted of a felony offense prior to the baseline interview (1) versus not convicted (0)	-0.9530 (0.9803)	0.3454	-0.9399 (0.8822)	0.3025	-0.9791 (0.8923)	0.2888
Respondent had a diagnosed disability at the time of the baseline interview (1) versus no disability (0)	1.0041 (0.4668)	0.0471*	0.7895 (0.4489)	0.0977	0.7655 (0.4474)	0.1063
Number of days between entry into program and baseline	0.0010 (0.0005)	0.0894	0.0005 (0.0005)	0.2952	0.0005 (0.0005)	0.2938

interview						
Number of days between baseline and final interview	0.0048 (0.0058)	0.4193	0.0053 (0.0059)	0.3885	0.0053 (0.0059)	0.3785
Number of days in the 30 before the baseline interview respondent used drugs other than alcohol	-0.0373 (0.0285)	0.2098	-0.0428 (0.0271)	0.1336	-0.0416 (0.0267)	0.1380
Respondent was treated in a hospital at least once for a psychological or emotional problem prior to baseline interview	0.9461 (0.6590)	0.1703	0.4962 (0.5662)	0.3939	0.4948 (0.5735)	0.4010
Total months experienced homelessness in lifetime prior to baseline interview	0.0191 (0.0092)	0.0551	0.0161 (0.0074)	0.0440*	0.0163 (0.0075)	0.0454*
Total number of days used alcohol to the point of feeling its effects in the 30 before baseline interview	0.3595 (0.1562)	0.0351*	0.3348 (0.1583)	0.0505	0.3383 (0.1632)	0.0546
Total number of professional services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	0.6272 (0.3609)	0.1014	0.6294 (0.3561)	0.0962
Total number of advocacy services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	-0.5967 (0.3697)	0.1261	-0.6097 (0.3636)	0.1130
Total number of employment related services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	-0.7141 (0.3271)	0.0443*	-0.7143 (0.3299)	0.0458*

First Place Moved to was Market Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	0.0365 (0.5080)	0.9436
First Place Moved to was Permanent Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	0.8959 (1.4991)	0.5584
First Place Moved to was Interim Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	-0.1205 (1.8990)	0.9502
RSquare **F (df)** **Pr < F**	0.4030 91.98 (14,16) <.0001		0.4305 635.00 (16,16) <.0001		0.4312 10.16 (16,16) <.0001	

* p < .05

* * p < .01

*** p < .001

Appendix Table 3e - Regression Model Predicting Days Respondents Reported Working for Money in the 30 Prior to the Final Interview for Respondents who Began in Permanent Supportive Housing (N=155)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Variable	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T
Intercept	8.4527 (3.8877)	0.0450*	8.4308 (4.2555)	0.0650	10.3806 (5.0268)	0.0555
Respondent is Male (1) versus female (2)	-0.2195 (1.1162)	0.8465	-0.1806 (1.1848)	0.8808	-0.3174 (1.1898)	0.7930
Respondent is White (1) versus not White (0)	-0.4589 (1.6756)	0.7877	-0.4446 (1.7107)	0.7983	-0.0103 (1.7102)	0.9952
Respondent is African American (1) versus not African American (0)	2.9107 (1.6097)	0.0894	2.8315 (1.5632)	0.0889	3.1560 (1.6329)	0.0712
Age of Respondent at Baseline Interview	-0.1437 (0.0605)	0.0304*	-0.1387 (0.0636)	0.0445*	-0.1446 (0.0608)	0.0302*
Respondent was homeless with family (1) versus single at the time of the baseline interview (0)	1.2295 (1.2355)	0.3345	1.2689 (1.2375)	0.3205	1.5444 (1.1727)	0.2064
Respondent has less than a high school education (1) versus more than this (0)	-1.1091 (0.7804)	0.1745	-1.0473 (0.7497)	0.1815	-1.0344 (0.8552)	0.2440
Respondent was convicted of a felony offense prior to the baseline interview (1) versus not convicted (0)	-1.0986 (0.9521)	0.2655	-1.0701 (0.9504)	0.2768	-0.7058 (0.9574)	0.4717
Respondent had a diagnosed disability at the time of the baseline interview (1) versus no disability (0)	-3.7178 (1.4154)	0.0183*	-3.6694 (1.5905)	0.0348*	-3.3896 (1.5366)	0.0424*
Number of days between entry into program and baseline interview	-0.0006 (0.0005)	0.1845	-0.0007 (0.0006)	0.2857	-0.0006 (0.0006)	0.3088
Number of days between baseline and final interview	0.0076 (0.0107)	0.4850	0.0071 (0.0113)	0.5385	0.0000 (0.0133)	0.9995
Total number of days used alcohol to the point of feeling its effects in the 30 before	-0.0411 (0.0352)	0.2595	-0.0439 (0.0378)	0.2630	-0.0373 (0.0404)	0.3698

baseline interview						
Number of days in the 30 before the baseline interview respondent used drugs other than alcohol	-0.0993 (0.0401)	0.0249*	-0.0995 (0.0393	0.0220*	-0.0985 (0.0390)	0.0227*
Respondent was treated in a hospital at least once for a psychological or emotional problem prior to baseline interview	1.3544 (1.1552)	0.2582	1.3354 (1.0855)	0.2364	1.4439 (1.0301)	0.1801
Total months experienced homelessness in lifetime prior to baseline interview	-0.0108 (0.0075)	0.1691	-0.0111 (0.0076)	0.1639	-0.0118 (0.0075)	0.1369
Number of days in 30 before baseline interview respondent reported working for pay	0.6383 (0.1013)	<.0001***	0.6333 (0.1150)	<.0001***	0.6193 (0.1094)	<.0001***
Total number of professional services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	0.0679 (0.2818)	0.8127	0.1646 (0.2812)	0.5664
Total number of advocacy services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	-0.1647 (0.9684)	0.8670	-0.6034 (1.0010)	0.5551
Total number of employment related services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	0.1888 (1.0920)	0.8649	0.0138 (1.0547)	0.9897
First Place Moved to was Market Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	3.1727 (1.4401)	0.0426*
First Place Moved to was Permanent Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	1.3923 (1.9033)	0.4750
First Place Moved to was Interim Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	3.2596 (2.7030)	0.2454
RSquare **F (df)** **Pr < F**	0.6038 113.92 (15,16) <.0001		0.6042 244.79 (16,16) <.0001		0.6160 249.58 (16,16) <.0001	

* p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001

Appendix Table 3f - Regression Model Predicting Total Number of Professional Services Received in the 30 Days Prior to the Final Interview for Respondents who Began in Permanent Supportive Housing (N=155)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
Variable	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T	Est. (Standard Error)	Pr > T
Intercept	2.4898 (1.3954)	0.0934	2.4415 (1.3664)	0.0929	2.5326 (1.4870)	0.1079
Respondent is Male (1) versus female (2)	0.4368 (0.1490)	0.0098**	0.3113 (0.1743)	0.0932	0.3038 (0.1840)	0.1182
Respondent is White (1) versus not White (0)	-0.3523 (0.2609)	0.1957	-0.3595 (0.2550)	0.1777	-0.3267 (0.2658)	0.2368
Respondent is African American (1) versus not African American (0)	-1.0067 (0.3484)	0.0107*	-0.9620 (0.2642)	0.0022**	-0.9417 (0.2305)	0.0009***
Age of Respondent at Baseline Interview	-0.0003 (0.0083)	0.9724	-0.0054 (0.0085)	0.5373	-0.0057 (0.0086)	0.5209
Respondent was homeless with family (1) versus single at the time of the baseline interview (0)	-0.1987 (0.3779)	0.6062	-0.4049 (0.3858)	0.3096	-0.3927 (0.3993)	0.3400
Respondent has less than a high school education (1) versus more than this (0)	-0.3332 (0.2235)	0.1555	-0.3770 (0.2106)	0.0924	-0.3721 (0.2167)	0.1054
Respondent was convicted of a felony offense prior to the baseline interview (1)versus not convicted (0)	1.1948 (0.2229)	<.0001***	1.1339 (0.1767)	<.0001***	1.1552 (0.1689)	<.0001***
Respondent had a diagnosed disability at the time of the baseline interview (1) versus no disability (0)	0.2099 (0.2924)	0.4833	-0.0345 (0.3315)	0.9183	-0.0139 (0.3261)	0.9665
Number of days between entry into	0.0002 (0.0002)	0.2102	0.0002 (0.0001)	0.1887	0.0002 (0.0002)	0.2072

program and baseline interview						
Number of days between baseline and final interview	-0.0068 (0.0033)	0.0552	-0.0063 (0.0033)	0.0699	-0.0067 (0.0037)	0.0865
Total number of days used alcohol to the point of feeling its effects in the 30 before baseline interview	0.0265 (0.0108)	0.0259*	0.0250 (0.0103)	0.0267*	0.0255 (0.0105)	0.0273*
Number of days in the 30 before the baseline interview respondent used drugs other than alcohol	0.0007 (0.0104)	0.9491	-0.0004 (0.0096)	0.9617	-0.0004 (0.0104)	0.9663
Respondent was treated in a hospital at least once for a psychological or emotional problem prior to baseline interview	0.2084 (0.2823)	0.4711	0.1589 (0.2539)	0.5403	0.1668 (0.2567)	0.5251
Total months Experienced homelessness in lifetime prior to baseline interview	-0.0033 (0.0020)	0.1138	-0.0034 (0.0018)	0.0718	-0.0035 (0.0018)	0.0744
Total number of professional services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	0.4893 (0.0830)	<.0001***	0.4893 (0.0882)	<.0001***	0.4949 (0.0916)	<.0001***
Total number of advocacy services received in 30 days prior to baseline interview	___	___	0.4008 (0.1291)	0.0068**	0.3777 (0.1276)	0.0092**
Total number of employment related services received in 30 days prior to baseline	___	___	-0.1460 (0.1302)	0.2786	-0.1567 (0.1307)	0.2481

interview						
First Place Moved to was Market Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	0.2033 (0.3380)	0.5560
First Place Moved to was Permanent Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	0.0883 (0.4756)	0.8550
First Place Moved to was Interim Housing (1) versus not first place moved or did not move (0)	___	___	___	___	0.1629 (0.6065)	0.7917
RSquare **F (df)** **Pr < F**	0.5539 319.32 (15,16) <.0001		0.5806 15932.0 (16,16) <.0001		0.5820 94.15 (16,16) <.0001	

* p < .05

* * p < .01

*** p < .001

REFERENCES

Barrow, S M, Hellman, F, Lovell, M, Plapinger, JD, Robinson, DR, & Streuning, EL. (1985). *Personal History Form*. New York: New York State Psychiatric Institute.

Chicago Continuum of Care. (2000). *Getting Housed, Staying Housed: A Collaborative Plan to End Homelessness*. Chicago, IL: Mimeo.

Drake, RE, McHugo, GJ & Biesanz, J. (1995). The Test-Retest reliability of standardized instruments among homeless persons with substance use disorders. *Journal of Studies of Alcohol 56*:161-167.

Fullerton, C. S., Ursano, R.J., Epstein, R.S., Crowley, B., Vance, K.l., Craig, K.J. & Baum. A. (2000). Measurement of posttraumatic stress disorder in community samples. *Nordic Journal of Psychiatry, 54*: 5-12.

McLellan, AT, Luborsky, L, Caccioloa, MA, Griffith, J, Evans, F, Barr, L, & Obrien, CP. (1985). New Data from the Addiction Severity Index: Reliability and validity in three centers. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 173*:412-423.

Rosenheck, R, Leda, C, Frisman, L, & Gallup, P. (1997). Homeless mentally ill veterans: Race, service use, and treatment outcomes. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 67*: 632-638.

Sosin, M.R., George, C. G., Grossman, S.F., Hilvers, J. & Davis, J. (November 2010). *First Wave Results: A Preliminary Evaluation of Chicago's Ten Year Plan to End Homelessness.* Chicago: Loyola University Chicago and The University of Chicago.

Sosin, M.R., Yamaguchi, J., Bruni, M., Grossman, S., Leonelli, B., & Reidy, M. (1994). *Treating homelessness and substance abuse in community context: A case management and supported housing demonstration*. Chicago: School of Social Service Administration, The University of Chicago

Sosin, M.R., Colson, P., & Grossman, S. (1988). *Homelessness in Chicago: Poverty and pathology, social institutions and social change*. Chicago: Chicago Community Trust and School of Social Service Administration, The University of Chicago

Stahler, GJ & Stimmel, B. (Eds.) (1995). *The effectiveness of social interventions for homeless substance abusers.* NY: Haworth Medical Press.

Wenzel SL, Bakhtiar L, Caskey NH, Hardie E, Redford C, Sadler N, & Gelberg L. (1995). Homeless veterans' utilization of medical, pychiatric, and substance abuse services. *Medical Care, 33*: 1132-1144.