Housing First Literature: Different Orientations and Political-Practical Arguments

Suvi Raitakari and Kirsi Juhila

University of Tampere, School of Social Sciences and Humanities, Finland

> **Abstract_** *Over about twenty years, Housing First (HF) and its adaptations have become internationally promoted housing models for long-term homeless people with mental health difficulties or/and substance abuse issues. The model called Pathways Housing First (PHF) created in New York by Sam Tsemberis, the founder of the Pathway to Housing organization, is the most well-known. PHF model is depicted in the research literature as the original implementation of Housing First (HF). In addition to a housing model, HF has been defined as a philosophy and it is a rapidly growing research branch. In this review article, HF is approached first and foremost as a diverse research branch and the aim is to map HF literature from 1990 to 2014. The article is based on 184 publications. The main criterion for including a publication in the database was that it takes as a starting point and/or comments on the original PHF model. The following research questions were asked: 1) what are the research types that are represented in HF literature? (we call these 'literature orientations'), and 2) what kind of political-practical arguments and objectives are expressed within each type i.e. orientation? The review found nine different types of research: 1) comparative studies, 2) guidelines and text books, 3) evaluation reports, 4) commentaries, 5) reviews, 6) implementation and outcome studies, 7) the development of scales and tests, 8) experiences and interaction studies and 9) critical social science research. As a conclusion, possible future directions of HF research are discussed.*

> **Keywords_** *Housing First, literature orientations, review, future directions and argumentation*

Introduction

Homelessness is a globally persistent social problem. Long-term homelessness, in particular, is an indicator of extreme exclusion, poverty and human vulnerability. Long-term homelessness is often intertwined with severe mental health problems and substance abuse issues (e.g., Waegemakers-Schiff and Rook, 2012; Watson *et al.,* 2013). It is a major burden on individuals and societies (Whittaker *et al.,* 2015). In order to understand long-term homelessness and tackle it successfully, we need to scrutinize and influence societal structures, organization-level policies and practices, and human agency (e.g., Watson *et al.*, 2013). In Western societies, governments and non-governmental organizations have made great efforts to diminish long-term homelessness. For example, the Finnish government recently launched two programmes to reduce long-term homelessness (running 2008–2011; 2012–2015) (Tainio and Fredriksson, 2009). Australia, Denmark and the Netherlands also launched national level homelessness strategies and targeted initiatives to decrease homelessness (Benjaminsen, 2013b; Whittaker *et al.,* 2015). Van Wormer and van Wormer (2009) describe nationwide developments in US. These initiatives, programmes and strategies are seen to represent a homelessness policy shift from the linear residential treatment (LRT) model (also called the continuum of care or the staircase model) to the Housing First (HF) model

Over the last twenty years or so, HF and its adaptations have become internationally promoted housing models for long-term homeless people with mental health difficulties and/or substance abuse issues. It is often argued that the original model called Pathways Housing First was created in New York by the Pathway to Housing organization, founded by Sam Tsemberis (for a history, see Felton, 2003; Waegemakers-Schiff and Rook, 2012). PHF is depicted in the literature as the original and truest way to implement HF. In addition, it has been presented as an evidence-based practice and, as a result of this research evidence, it has received a great deal of international recognition (Johnsen and Teixeira, 2012; Johnson *et al.*, 2012; Pleace, 2012; Pleace and Bretherton, 2012a; b; Greenwood *et al.*, 2013b) and has been widely adopted across the US, Canada, Australia and Europe (Greenwood *et al.*, 2013b).

The aim of the HF model is to provide immediate access to permanent housing and sufficient, sustained support for former long-term homeless people with their special support needs. The HF model comprises the following principles: housing is a human right and a precondition for a decent life and recovery; to be housed should not require adherence to treatment and care and, thus, housing and support are to be separated; and residents are to be encountered with empathy, respect and patience without coercive practices. Freedom of choice and self-determination are important preconditions in successful housing and recovery. Scattered housing

is to be the primary option. Both recovery-orientation and harm reduction are to be combined in support services (e.g., Tsemberis, 2010a; Busch-Geertsema, 2013; Gilmer *et al.*, 2013; Kaakinen, 2013).

In addition to a housing model, HF has also been defined as a philosophy and it is a rapidly growing research branch. Some scholars even talk about a paradigm shift in homelessness and mental health policy and practices (Nelson, 2010; Bostad först som.., 2013; Kaakinen, 2013). As stated by Greenwood *et al*. (2013a; b), research was a crucial precursor to the implementation of HF from the 1990s in the US and Canada, and from the 2000s in many European countries. Commonly, HF initiatives are demonstration projects with strong research and evaluation components and political-practical objectives (Greenwood *et al.*, 2013a).

In this review article, we approach HF first as a diverse research branch and our aim is to map and give an overall view of the HF literature, from the 1990s to 2014. The review identified nine different types of literature: 1) comparative studies, 2) guidelines and text books, 3) evaluation reports, 4) commentaries, 5) reviews, 6) implementation and outcome studies, 7) the development of scales and tests, 8) experiences and interaction studies and 9) critical social science research.[1] HF has thus generated a wide range of homelessness research and societal discussion on homelessness. The starting point of this review is the idea that, after twenty years of HF research, it is worth taking the time to analyse and classify the growing number of publications that relate to applying, translating, evaluating, examining and discussing HF across many Western countries. By doing this, the review also captures future directions of HF research. Before presenting the nine different types of literature identified, we clarify how the literature was collected and mapped in the database and how the analysis was conducted.

The Review: Data and Research Questions

In this review article, the aim is to map HF literature from 1990 to 2014. The first objective is to classify publications according to the scientific genre they represent – i.e., what kinds of research tasks are set and data and methods used. The review covers HF literature broadly, and includes e.g. policy reviews, debate papers, reports and textbooks. The second objective is to study the publications in terms of the political-practical arguments and objectives they set forth. This aim is grounded in the assumption that the HF literature is linked to promoting the HF model itself as a practical and working solution to homelessness, and that the

[1] Waegemakers-Schiff and Rook (2012, p.11) categorize HF literature in the following way: a) quantitative studies, b) qualitative studies, c) program descriptions, d) program outcomes, e) policy review, f) health outcomes, g) cost-effective studies, and h) population studies.

literature thus primarily produces knowledge and arguments that are useful for political decision-making and for implementing local HF models (Stanhope and Dunn, 2011; Waegemakers-Schiff and Rook, 2012; Greenwood *et al.*, 2013a). Accordingly, scrutiny of the political-practical arguments contained in the literature constitutes the core conceptual framework for this review. The following research questions were asked: 1) what are the research types that are represented in HF literature? (we call these literature orientations), and 2) what kind of political-practical arguments and objectives are expressed within each type i.e. orientation?

The database of the review was created and reported on in two phases. The first publication search was conducted in November 2013 (in total, 77 publications) and reported on as a Finnish review article (Raitakari and Juhila, 2014). In the second phase, a supplementary data search was done in November 2014, which increased the total number of publications to 184. This article is based on the 184 publications identified by these first and second publication searches. We included a variety of literature produced within different genres and using different research designs, and also literature that represents non-scientific contributions, such as policy reviews and debates. The main criteria were that a publication was officially published (at least on the internet) between 1990 and 2014 and that it takes as a starting point and/or comments on the original PHF model. Accordingly, the database comprises academic research articles, evaluation reports, literature reviews, textbooks, manuals, policy reviews and debate papers. In the publication search we used 'Housing First' and 'Asunto Ensin' ('Housing First' in Finnish) as keywords. Only one key word was used to find a wide range of HF literature types (academic and policy literature) that explicitly use the term Housing First. We searched publications from different sources and used search engines, such as Google Scholar and Academic Search Premier. Important sources turned out to be the reference lists of previous publications. They led us to new publications and ensured that we had relevant literature included in the database. Although we aimed for a comprehensive review, there are certainly publications missing. This is mostly due to the fact that we only read publications in English and Finnish (excepting two texts in Swedish) and that the search engines used are not all-inclusive. Another major challenge has been the accelerated speed at which new HF publications are appearing. Despite these notable limitations, the large data corpus makes it possible to specify the different orientations of literature on HF, and the political-practical arguments expressed by each of them to a sufficient extent.

In practice, the review was conducted in the following way. We spent a great amount of time reading through the publications from the angles of the different scientific genres and research questions, and eventually grouped the texts according to: a) what kind of data was used, b) what kind of research design and method was established, c) how the text was written, and d) for whom and for what

purpose the publication was intended. Nine 'literature orientation charts' were created to document the publications within each orientation; these charts included the names of the authors, the year of publication and the political-practical arguments expressed.

Each of the orientations represents a different way of doing HF research and discussing HF. Thus, the content of the publication was not the criterion for the grouping, but rather the way the publication was composed and the scientific genre it represented. When categorizing the literature orientations, we were influenced both by established methods of naming different publication types and by the terms used in the HF literature itself (e.g., in evaluation reports and reviews), and we applied them to the specific purposes of the article (Waegemakers-Schiff and Rook, 2012; Publication Characteristics, 2014). Categorizing was not a straightforward task. For example, only fine-grained differences exist between some qualitative evaluation reports, implementation studies and experiences and interaction studies, as they all are based on grassroots-level experiences and views of HF. Thus, in some cases a publication could straddle two orientations and we were forced to choose one over the other, depending on the publication's dominant features. In so doing, we concentrated on the main features of each orientation and the factors that differentiate the literature orientations from each other, thus bypassing many details when sketching the 'big picture' of the HF literature.

The order of the literature orientations displayed in the article shows how HF publications have changed over time; the 'comparisons' orientation is the 'root', from which the current diverse HF literature sprouted. Research orientations are built on previous research, inspired by perceived gaps and deficiencies. The orientations also move from less critical modelling, testing and evaluating of HF to more critical research. As HF practice and research diversifies, the vocabularies become richer; alongside the original PHF come many different applications and translations of the HF model, and this produces new concepts including 'housing-led', 'light HF' and 'mixed-model'. This trend in HF research literature also brings conceptual variety to the article.

Comparative Studies

Table 1. Comparative Studies

PUBLICATIONS (36)	POLITICAL-PRACTICAL ARGUMENTS	OBJECTIVES
Tsemberis 1999; Tsemberis *et al.,* 2002; Gulcur *et al.,* 2003; Tsemberis *et al.,* 2003; Tsemberis *et al.* 2004; Greenwood *et al.,* 2005; Padgett *et al.,* 2006; Gulcur *et al.,* 2007; Stefancic and Tsemberis 2007; Yanos *et al.,* 2007; Gilmer *et al.* 2009; Larimer *et al.,* 2009; Robbins *et al.,* 2009; Gilmer *et al.* 2010; Tsai *et al.,* 2010; Edens *et al.,* 2011; Goering *et al.,* 2011; Henwood *et al.,* 2011; Padgett *et al.,* 2011; Appel *et al.,* 2012; Collins *et al.,* 2012b; Hwang *et al.,* 2012; Padgett and Henwood 2012; Watson 2012; Collins *et al.,* 2013; Henwood and Shinn *et al.,* 2013; Montgomery *et al.,* 2013; Palepu *et al.,* 2013; Patterson and Moniruzzaman *et al.,* 2013; Patterson and Rezansoff *et al.,* 2013; Somers and Patterson *et al.,* 2013; Somers and Rezansoff, 2013; Srebnik *et al.,* 2013; Tinland *et al.,* 2013; Patterson *et al.,* 2014; Russolillo *et al.,* 2014	1. HF clients' housing is more sustainable than LRT clients' and thus HF is a more effective solution to long-term homelessness 2. HF decreases the use of emergency and inpatient services more than LTR and is thus a more cost-effective option 3. HF clients use alcohol and they have mental health difficulties to the same degree (or less) than LRT clients 4. Permanent housing, client choice and self-determina-tion decreases mental health symptoms and increases quality of life; HF thus supports mental wellbeing better than LRT 5. Social integration is an essential element in successful housing, yet multifased and complex process 6. The essential principal of HF i.e. adherence to mental health treatment is not a requirement of obtaining housing is well met in practice according to the residents' accounts	Convince the politics, civil servants, managers, practitioners and researchers worldwide that HF is more cost-effective way than LRT to tackle with long-term homelessness, and that individuals with major deficiencies in daily functioning can live in a scattered housing if sufficient support is available Advocate for support services based on permanent housing, voluntariness, client choice, long-term support and harm reduction and recovery

In the 'Comparative Studies' orientation we included publications that are based on comparative research designs. The publications make use of different types of experimental designs to compare LRT and HF housing models and their client outcomes, including pre-test and post-test designs, quasi-experimental designs and true experimental designs, or RCTs. Studies commonly utilize administrative documents (registers), client surveys and different kinds of ability-to-function tests

as data.[2] A common way to collect data is to do baseline survey-interviews with the clients and renew them every three to four months for a one- to two-year period. As seen in the forthcoming sections, the data of the comparative studies can also be used in other kinds of research designs and publication types (e.g., in evaluation reports and in outcome and implementation studies).

The HF model itself and comparative studies concerning it are motivated by the critics of the LRT model (e.g., Tsemberis and Henwood, 2011). The early HF literature was almost solely about comparing HF to other treatment/housing models or to existing services. In the LRT model, the basic idea is to build a continuum of treatment-accommodation units (such as a hospital-shelter, group home, supportive housing or normal apartment) to help people recover from mental health and substance abuse problems and homelessness. Thus, adherence to treatment and recovery endeavours are embedded in accommodation solutions. The transition from homeless to housed is thought to require abstinence and, at the beginning of the continuum (more or less), professional control and regulations. Many contributors (e.g., Tsemberis and Asmussen, 1999; Atherton and McNaughton-Nicholls, 2008; Johnsen and Teixeira, 2010; Pleace, 2011; Haahtela, 2013; Granfelt, 2014) have brought up that the LRT model is not suitable for those categorized as the 'most difficult to house' and 'having severe mental health and substance abuse problems', and that it has many deficiencies, including the fact that many individuals with severe conditions have difficulties going along with the restrictions, fulfilling recovery expectations and moving forward in the continuum. Thus, the model easily excludes those with the greatest needs. In contrast, the HF model is argued to serve the most needy individuals. Long-term homelessness is not perceived as being caused by 'difficult to house' individuals but rather by unsuitable housing solutions and structural obstacles (Tsemberis and Asmussen, 1999).

'Comparative studies' is a strong research orientation in the HF field (36 publications). From the 1990s, the Pathways to Housing organization was successful in arguing for the (cost-) effectiveness of PHF compared to LRT, or 'treatment as usual' (TAU). Tsemberis' article 'From Street to Home: An Innovative Approach to Supported Housing for Homeless Adults with Psychiatric Disabilities' (1999) started a series of articles that constituted the foundation of the international debate on PHF. In this way, PHF grew from a small-scale, innovative experiment to an acknowledged programme model with the status of an evidence-based practice (Pleace and Bretherton, 2012a; Greenwood *et al.*, 2013a). This research

---

2   The following studies represent exceptions to this: Patterson *et al.* (2013) carried out the first study "to use longitudinal, narrative data from adults with mental illness who were randomly assigned to HF or TAU." Henwood *et al.* (2013) conducted a mix-method comparison of the perspectives and values of HF and LRT providers. Watson (2012) compared HF and LRT by using interviews of HF clients and staff members.

orientation achieved a major reinforcement in 2009 when the Mental Health Commission of Canada funded a five-year, randomized controlled trial (RCT) study called 'At Home / Chez Soi', which implemented and evaluated PHF in five Canadian cities (Goering *et al.*, 2011).

The 'comparative studies' research orientation is based on the making of a distinction between the HF and LRT models. It reinforces the idea that the models are clearly separable and ideologically different. In recent studies, comparison is additionally made between different applications of HF – i.e., between scattered and congregate housing (e.g., Somers, Patterson *et al*., 2013; Patterson, Moniruzzaman *et al.*, 2013; Russolillo *et al.*, 2014). The other, more resent research publications utilize, repeat and expand this polarized view and also the main political-practical arguments of this orientation (e.g., Johnson *et al.*, 2012; Johnsen and Teixeira, 2012).

The main political-practical arguments of this research orientation are: 1) HF client housing is more sustainable than that of LRT clients and HF is therefore a more effective solution to long-term homelessness (e.g., Tsemberis, 1999; Tsemberis and Eisenberg, 2000; Tsemberis *et al.*, 2004; Stefancic and Tsemberis, 2007; Collins *et al.*, 2013); 2) HF decreases the use of emergency and inpatient services (more than LTR/TAU) and is thus a cost-effective option (e.g., Gulcur *et al*., 2003; Gilmer *et al.* 2009; Larimer *et al*., 2009; Gilmer *et al.* 2010; Padgett *et al*., 2011; Srebnik *et al.*, 2013; Russolillo *et al*., 2014); 3) HF clients use alcohol and they have mental health difficulties to the same (or lesser) degree than LRT clients (Tsemberis *et al.*, 2003; Tsemberis *et al.*, 2004; Padgett *et al.*, 2006; Robbins *et al.*, 2009; Collins *et al.*, 2012a; b; Padgett *et al.*, 2011); 4) permanent housing, client choice and self-determination decrease mental health symptoms and increase quality of life – HF thus supports mental wellbeing better than LRT (e.g., Greenwood *et al.*, 2005; Patterson, Moniruzzaman *et al.*, 2013); 5) social integration is an essential element in successful housing, yet it cannot be expected to mean the same thing for everyone, or for HF clients to be more integrated than people in general in urban life – social integration is a multifaceted process, influenced by the neighbourhood, the form of housing (the model), daily activities and the resident's characteristics (Yanos *et al.*, 2007; Patterson *et al.*, 2014); 6) the essential principle of HF – i.e., that adherence to mental health treatment is not a requirement of obtaining housing – is well met in practice, according to the accounts of residents (Robbins *et al.*, 2009).

In this research orientation, the objectiveness of experiments and the practical mission are combined to support the dissemination and development of the HF model. The objective is to build up evidence for an evidence-based practice and, through doing this, convince politicians, civil servants, managers, practitioners and researchers worldwide that HF is a cost-effective way to tackle long-term homelessness and that individuals with major deficiencies in daily functioning can live in

scattered housing if sufficient support is available (e.g., Tsemberis, 1999; Tsemberis and Eisenberg, 2000; Gulcur *et al.*, 2003). In addition, the authors of literature within this orientation advocate for support services based on voluntariness, client choice, long-term support, and harm reduction and recovery (Greenwood *et al.*, 2005; Larimer *et al.*, 2009; Padgett and Henwood, 2012).

A critical reading of the orientation's publications requires special knowledge about register-based designs, RCTs and quasi-experimental research designs. In contrast, the political-practical arguments and objectives come across easily to a wide range of audiences, as is evidenced through the circulation of these arguments in other research orientations.

Tackling long-term homelessness means asking the question: which housing/ treatment model is the most (cost-)effective for those categorized as the 'most difficult to house'? The following literature orientation gives tools and guidelines to plan and run such a housing project effectively.

Guidelines and Textbooks

Table 2. Guidelines and Textbooks

PUBLICATIONS (11)	POLITICAL-PRACTICAL ARGUMENTS	OBJECTIVES
Tsemberis and Asmussen, 1999; Lanzerotti, 2004; Tsemberis, 2010a; 2010b; McManus *et al.,* 2011; Tsemberis and Henwood, 2011; De Decker, 2012; Bostad först som …2013; Gaetz *et al.,* 2013; Goering and Tsemberis, 2014; Polvere *et al.,* 2014	1. Guidelines and exemplars are needed in developing and implementing HF in practice. 2. HF possesses the values, ingredients and practical means to tackle long-term homelessness so it is worth taking seriously and making it known to a variety of audiences.	Model HF's values, ingredients and practices into clear ways of doing homelessness work. Generate and distribute knowledge about HF and to enhance proper ways of implementing it.

In the 'guidelines and text books' literature orientation we included HF textbooks, book chapters and toolkits (11 publications). The publications included follow the professional textbook tradition, presenting proper professional practices in an educational and idealistic way. In addition, they are written in an introductory and practical style, and HF is depicted as a successful intervention that transforms long-term homeless with mental health and substance abuse difficulties into responsible residents. The guidelines and textbooks are based on the practical/ personal knowledge of experts groups, researchers, practitioners and clients, yet references to this knowledge are not always made in an exact and explicit way.

The textbooks and toolkits in this literature orientation offer practical guidelines to putting PHF into practice, and they can be identified by the simplified and educational way in which they present PHF (Tsemberis and Assmussen, 1999; Lanzerotti, 2004; Tsemberis, 2010b; McManus, 2011; De Decker, 2012; Gaetz *et al.*, 2013; Polvere *et al.*, 2014). Tsemberis and his co-authors have described the PHF model's core principles, implementation processes and current research evidence (Tsemberis and Assmussen, 1999; Tsemberis, 2010a; b; Tsemberis and Henwood, 2011; Goering and Tsemberis, 2014). The guidelines and textbooks are addressed to those who plan, establish, develop, provide, run and engage with HF – i.e., to the actual 'doers' of HF projects. Book chapters (Tsemberis 2010b; Tsemberis and Henwood, 2011; Goering and Tsemberis, 2014) comprise overall introductions to HF's background, principles, research evidence and successes. Book chapters are aimed at a wide range of societal and scientific audiences and they are written in more academic language than guidelines and textbooks. Yet they can be read as 'advertising' HF's particularities and the advantages to 'outsiders' of the HF field (e.g., Tsemberis and Henwood, 2011).

The orientation's main political-practical arguments are that: 1) guidelines and exemplars are needed in developing and implementing HF in practice; and 2) the HF model contains the values, ingredients and practical means to tackle long-term homelessness, so it is worth taking seriously and making it known to a variety of audiences. The main objective is to model HF's values, ingredients and practices into clear ways of doing homelessness work. Another objective is to generate and distribute knowledge about HF and to enhance proper ways of implementing it.

Tackling long-term homelessness requires making the best use of existing knowledge about HF when planning and running local HF projects. HF research evidence comes very much from demonstration projects that have strong evaluation research components; these are presented next.

Evaluation Reports

Table 3. Evaluation Reports

PUBLICATIONS (27)	POLITICAL-PRACTICAL ARGUMENTS	OBJECTIVES
Perlman and Parvensky, 2006; Toronto Shelter Support…, 2007; Pearson *et al.,* 2007; Pearson *et al.,* 2009; Busch-Geertsema, 2010; Goering *et al.,* 2012; Johnsen and Fitzpatrick, 2012; 2013; Kristiansen and Espmarker, 2012; Mental Health Commission… 2012 a, 2012b; Stergiopoulos *et al.,* 2012; Benjaminsen, 2013a; Busch-Geertsema, 2013; Fehér and Balogi, 2013; Johnsen and Fitzpatrick, 2013; Nelson and Macnaughton *et al.,* 2013a; Ornelas, 2013; Wewerinke *et al.,* 2013; Aubry *et al.,* 2014; Busch-Geertsema, 2014; Currie *et al.,* 2014; Distasio *et al.*, 2014; Wewerinke *et al.,* 2013; Goering *et al.,* 2014; Latimer *et al.,* 2014; Stergiopoulos *et al.,* 2014	1. HF generates cost savings, increases wellbeing and is an effective route out of homelessness 2. In successful implementation of HF it is crucial to have sustainable resources and skilled practitioners 3. Scattered housing is to be preferred 4. Clients value HF principals, scattered housing and long-term support, and report their life situation being improved 5. To achieve the best outcomes, HF programmes should demonstrate high fidelity to the core aspects of the PHF model 6. HF can be effectively implemented and disseminated in Canadian and European cities of different size and with different 'ethno-racial' and cultural composition 7. To overcome stigmatization, social isolation, poverty and unemployment, structural level measures are needed	Document and display the pivotal elements of each individual demonstration project and thus to prove the advantages of HF and to promote its development, funding and research. Take a stance on the issue of adapting and disseminating HF in a different contexts Call for national and EU-level responsibility to enhance and support HF research and practice Support the implemen- tation of demonstration projects by constructing the success and hindrance factors when putting HF into practice

Evaluation reports typically involve qualitative data (or both qualitative and quantita-tive), and carefully describe implementation processes, client characteristics and housing stability rates. In addition, they assess changes in the wellbeing and life situations of clients. This literature orientation is based on an evaluation research tradition, although methodological commitments and decisions are not commonly reflected in depth. Mostly methodological considerations are embedded in the final reports (Busch-Geertsema, 2013; Goering *et al.*, 2014). (Evaluation) research has long been a crucial element in advocating for, and disseminating the concept of HF in the US, Canada and most recently in Europe. As Greenwood, Stefancic *et al.* (2013b, p. 310) state: "Many European HF initiatives are demonstration projects with strong research or evaluation components that stakeholders hope will build a strong European evidence base for HF." There have been several (some remarkably large-scale) HF projects, which have produced a major number of evaluation reports). 27 reports were included in the 'evaluation reports' literature orientation.

The first three reports (Perlman and Parvensky, 2006; Toronto Shelter Support and Housing Administration, 2007; Pearson *et al.*, 2007) are evaluations of HF models in the US and Canada.[3] More recently, the world's largest trial of HF – i.e., Canada's 'At Home / Chez Soi' five-year (2009–2013) implementation and research project with RCT and mixed-method research design – has made a significant contribution to the HF literature.[4] As stated by Goering and the team (2014, p.11): 'At Home / Chez Soi' was designed to "help identify what works, at what cost, for whom, and in which environments." Evaluation was carried out by examining various aspects of the lives of HF clients, such as housing stability, quality of life, community functioning, recovery, employment, inclusion and costs. In addition, the researchers conducted assessments of fidelity to the original PHF, documented the local implementation processes, and provided extensive training and technical assistance at the sites (Nelson, Macnaughton *et al.,* 2013a; Goering *et al.*, 2014). The data used includes both quantitative and qualitative components and thus facilitates a variety of research publications from different research orientations (Goering *et al.*, 2014).

A major boost to European HF projects and evaluation research has been ´Housing First Europe' (HFE, 2011-2013), funded by the European Commission. HFE was a demonstration project, which promoted mutual learning across several European cities that were implementing HF, and synthesized the findings of local evaluations (Busch-Geertsema, 2011; 2013; Greenwood, Stefancic *et al.*, 2013b).[5] As stated in the final report (Busch-Geertsema, 2013), European HF projects have been

---

[3]   Pearson and his colleagues (2007) conducted a multi-site, descriptive, implementation-outcome evaluation of three HF sites that were: 1) Downtown Emergency Service Center, Seattle, Washington, 2) Pathways to Housing, New York City, New York; and 3) Reaching Out and Engaging to Achieve Consumer Health, San Diego, California. Perlman and Parvensky (2006, p.1) carried out a "Cost Benefit Analysis focused on examining the actual health and emergency service records of a sample of participants [N=19, *number added by the authors*] of the DHFC (Denver Housing First Collaborative) for the 24-month period prior to entering the program and the 24-month period after entering the program."

[4]   Local demonstration projects of 'At Home / Chez Soi' in Vancouver, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montréal and Moncton are documented in several evaluation reports (Aubry *et al.*, 2014; Currie *et al.*, 2014; Distasio *et al.*, 2014; Latimer *et al.*, 2014; Stergiopoulos *et al.*, 2014). The final evaluation report, which summarizes the cross-setting implementation processes and general outcomes, was conducted by Goering and the research team (Goering *et al.*, 2014). 'At Home / Chez Soi' research was based on the following data types: a) interviews with clients at baseline and every three months for up to two years of follow-up, b) information from the demonstration projects (such as the number of clients and conducted service encounters), and c) national and provincial administrative data sources on the use of health and justice services before and after the beginning of the study.

[5]   HFE comprised five 'test site cities' (Amsterdam, Budapest, Copenhagen, Glasgow and Lisbon) and additional partners – i.e., 'peer site cities' (Dublin, Ghent, Gothenburg, Helsinki and Vienna) (Socialstyrelsen/Housing First Europe). The final report summarizing the implementation processes and outcomes was written by Busch-Geertsema (2013).

pioneering attempts to implement HF in an environment dominated either by the LRT model or by emergency sheltering services. Only Copenhagen's demonstration project was part of a national homelessness strategy to promote HF on a national scale. Danish and Finnish endeavours to eliminate long-term homelessness and to implement, study and stabilize HF at a national level have encouraged literature and discussion on HF (Busch-Geertsema, 2010; Benjaminsen, 2013a; b). None of the HFE test sites were an exact replica of the original PHF, although they did follow the core ideas of PHF in many aspects. The 'fidelity test' was not conducted and it was difficult to verify implementation of some of the principles in practice (Busch-Geertsema, 2013). There was diversity between test sites in terms of scale and implementation, data collection and evaluation methods. Administrative data and interviews with the participants were important sources of information. Both of these large-scale demonstration projects support and give grounds to argue that HF can be successfully carried out outside the U.S context with significant outcomes in housing sustainability and the well-being of clients.

The evaluation reports often end up with political-practical arguments that are similar to those of the comparative studies, although the literature orientations differ from each other in terms of research design and data types (evaluation reports are mostly based on qualitative data and descriptive analysis). The main political-practical arguments of the evaluation reports orientation are: 1) HF generates cost savings, increases wellbeing and is an effective route out of homelessness (e.g., Perlman and Parvensky, 2006); 2) for successful implementation of HF, it is crucial to have sustained and sufficient resources (e.g., affordable apartments) and skilled practitioners (Busch-Geertsema, 2013; Goering *et al.*, 2014); 3) scattered housing is to be favoured as much as possible, yet other options are possible if they are in line with client choice and expressed needs (Benjaminsen, 2013a); 4) clients value HF principles, scattered housing and long-term support, and report their life situation as being improved (Kristiansen and Espmarker, 2012; Benjaminsen, 2013a; Johnsen and Fitzpatrick, 2012; 2013; Wewerinke *et al.*, 2013); 5) to achieve the best outcomes, HF programmes should demonstrate high fidelity to the core aspects of the PHF model (Goering *et al.,* 2014); 6) HF can be effectively implemented and disseminated in Canadian and European cities of different size and with different 'ethno-racial' and cultural composition (Goering *et al.*, 2014; Busch-Geertsema, 2013); 7) to overcome stigmatization, social isolation, poverty and unemployment, structural level measures are needed (Busch-Geertsema, 2013).

The aim of the 'evaluation reports' orientation is to document and display the pivotal elements of each individual demonstration project (and/or those of multi-site totalities) and thus prove the advantages of HF and promote its development, funding and research. The intent is to take a stance on the issue of adapting and disseminating HF in different contexts. The orientation calls for national and EU-level

responsibility to enhance and support HF research and practice. It also supports the implementation of current and future demonstration projects by documenting the factors leading to success and hindrance when putting HF into practice. Hindrance factors include difficulties in getting proper apartments (delays in access to housing), in integrating clients into society and in engaging them in meaningful daily activities. Endeavours to quit substance abuse and scattered housing increase the risk of isolation and loneliness (Busch-Geertsema, 2013; Johnsen and Fitzpatrick, 2012; 2013). Having provided an apartment, the question of 'what next?' arises. Recently, social integration has become a strengthened theme in HF literature. The publications in this orientation make it possible to assess and discuss the following: What is HF in different contexts? Who are HF clients? What are the effects and client outcomes of HF? How are demonstration projects implemented and what are the critical factors leading to success and hindrance? The knowledge in this orientation is aimed at those who fund, plan, establish, develop, provide, run and engage with HF projects.

The homelessness issue leads to questions of what works in what context and how to balance PHF fidelity with adapting the initiative to local circumstances. These issues are also central in the following literature orientation: 'Commentaries'.

Commentaries

Table 4. Commentaries

PUBLICATIONS (32)	POLITICAL-PRACTICAL ARGUMENTS	OBJECTIVES
Fitzpatrick, 2004; Jensen, 2005; Atherton and McNaughton-Nicholls, 2008; Tainio and Fredriksson, 2009; Housing-led Policy... , 2011; Busch-Geertsema, 2011; Johnson, 2011; Kettunen and Granfelt, 2011; Pleace, 2011a; 2011b; Busch-Geertsema, 2012a, 2012b; Hansen Löfstrand, 2012; Johnsen, 2012; Johnson, 2012; Johnson *et al.,* 2012; Pleace and Bretherton 2012a; 2012b; Raitakari and Juhila, 2012; Tsai and Rosenheck, 2012; Tsemberis, 2012; Tsemberis *et al,* 2012; Benjaminsen 2013b; Culhane *et al.,* 2013; Kaakinen, 2013; Kettunen, 2013; Knutagård and Kristiansen, 2013; Padgett, 2013, Pleace, 2013; Stefancic *et al.,* 2013; Tsemberis, 2013; Cornes *et al.,* 2014	1. More research is needed on HF and other housing models in a European context 2. Previous research evidence on HF is not unquestionable nor totally robust 3. HF has shown outstanding outcomes on housing sustainability but less promising results concerning recovery and social integration 4. There are many structural and cultural constraints to be taken into account when transferring HF from one locality to another 5. Most important is to hold on to the PHF ethos, i.e. strong housing rights, scattered housing, off-site and intensive support, client choice, self-determination, a resilient and compassionate attitude 6. HF is not an all-powerful solution to long-term homelessness and structural changes are crucial in the fight against poverty and marginalization 7. HF has lot to offer, but critical thinking and research is essential	Advance the academic discussion and research on HF Make HF better known to a variety of administrative/professional/ academic audiences

The 'Commentaries' literature orientation covers texts that are not empirical studies, reviews or text books. Thus, these texts do not include empirical data or any systematic way of going through previous literature or presenting analysis. The orientation includes a variety of text types, including debates, (critical) discussions, policy reviews and descriptions of on-going HF projects. These texts are usually quite short and they offer particular input into on-going (academic) discussions on HF, relying on the author's existing knowledge of the HF field. In the database, there are 32 such publications in total. Texts in this orientation can be identified on the

one hand by arguments that call for 'orthodoxy' and on the other hand by arguments that set forth the need to modify HF to different contexts. The texts can be either positive towards or critical of HF.

The HF model is applied in different contexts and in many different ways. Unlike the original PHF model, HF projects may include such elements as 'light support', congregate or on-site housing (a well-know example of this is the Downtown Emergency Service Center in Seattle), fixed-term housing, limited client choice, or the use of social housing and existing support services (e.g., Tainio and Fredriksson, 2009; Johnson *et al.*, 2012; Pleace, 2012a; Kettunen, 2013). Raitakari and Juhila (2012) discuss the dilemmas embedded in both the LRT and HF models, while Kettunen and Granfelt (2011) raise the issue of how demanding it is to do support work by relying on the harm reduction principle. As HF has become more popular, the risk has been highlighted of projects drifting away from the core elements of HF and of the term 'Housing First' being used loosely (e.g., Pleace and Bretherton, 2013). As such, housing projects may be labelled as HF without major, transformative changes in the practitioners' LRT-related patterns of thinking and acting (e.g., Knutagård and Kristiansen, 2013). Accordingly, there are great numbers of discussion texts in HF literature that deal with the problem of 'drifting away' from PHF, and how to apply HF and scale it to different contexts. The puzzling question is as to what a HF project is and what is not (e.g., Hansen Löfstrand, 2012). As Tsemberis (2013, p.236) asks: "which project components are flexible enough to be adapted to new localities as well as serve new populations, and which components are core principles that must remain constant?"

For example, in relation to scaling HF to different contexts, Atherton and McNaughton-Nicholls (2008) state that client groups, national and local differences in legislation, social and health services, and housing markets have a crucial impact on the implementation and outcomes of HF (see also Johnson, 2011; Johnson *et al.*, 2012). Accordingly, it is important to scrutinize the local constraints and possibilities of a particular HF project and evaluate its outcomes according to that knowledge (e.g., Knutagård and Kristiansen, 2013). Atherton and McNaughton-Nicholls (2008) conclude, as do many authors in the texts of other orientations, that in order to adapt HF successfully to different societal contexts, we need more European research on the success and hindrance factors in HF models.

Pleace (2011) also sets forth cautionary arguments concerning the translation of HF to different contexts, in particular the 'drifting away' phenomenon and about the term 'Housing First' being used in a loose way. It is also likely that for some clients, better outcomes can be achieved using models other than HF (see also Culhane *et al.*, 2013), and there is a risk of HF dominating the social discussion on homelessness, which may lead to an overemphasis on the vulnerabilities and

troubles of particular individuals instead of an emphasis on the structural and societal barriers that sustain long-term homelessness in Western societies (Pleace, 2011). In addition, Johnson and his co-writers (2012) bring up the possibility that, in political-practical discussions, the research evidence of HF may be interpreted in a simplified and overly positive way, thus setting too high expectations on it. It should not be forgotten that setting up a proper HF project requires major and sustained resources.

Some of the publications in this literature orientation present endeavours to promote HF as a national-level policy (e.g., Fitzpatrick, 2004; Tainio and Fredriksson, 2009; Benjaminsen, 2013b; Culhane *et al.*, 2013) while others introduce and summarize on-going demonstration projects (Busch-Geertsema, 2011; 2012a; b). Yet there are also articles that reflect more critically on translating HF to local contexts and on its potentials and constraints (Pleace, 2011; Hansen Löfstrand, 2012; Johnsen, 2012; Knutagård and Kristiansen, 2013).

From the publications in this orientation, the following main political-practical arguments can be summarized: 1) more research is needed on HF and other housing models in a European context (e.g., Atherton and McNaughton-Nicholls, 2008; Tainio and Fredriksson, 2009; Tsai and Rosenheck, 2012); 2) previous research evidence on HF is not absolute nor should it automatically be considered robust (Johnson *et al.*, 2012); 3) HF has led to outstanding outcomes in terms of housing sustainability but has shown less promising results in terms of recovery and social integration (Pleace, 2011; Johnson *et al.*, 2012); 4) there are many structural and cultural constraints to be taken into account when transferring HF from one locality to another (Knutagård and Kristiansen, 2013); 5) the most important thing is to hold on to the PHF ethos – i.e., strong housing rights, scattered housing, off-site and intensive support, client choice, self-determination, and a resilient and compassionate attitude; 6) HF is not an all-powerful solution to long-term homelessness, and structural changes are crucial in the fight against poverty and marginalization; 7) HF has lot to offer, but critical thinking and research are essential (Padgett, 2013; Pleace, 2013; Pleace and Bretherton, 2013).

The objective of the orientation is to advance academic discussion and research on HF. Texts are meaningful in making HF better known to a variety of administrative, professional and academic audiences. They are based on previous research and discussion papers, yet references to these are often made in implicit ways. Previous research is made much more explicit in the 'reviews' orientation that is presented next.

Reviews

Table 5. Reviews

PUBLICATIONS (6)	POLITICAL-PRACTICAL ARGUMENTS	OBJECTIVES
Johnsen and Teixeira, 2010; Nelson, 2010; Pleace, 2012; Waegemakers-Schiff and Rook, 2012; Groton, 2013; Raitakari and Juhila, 2014	1. It is essential to gather, compare and critically evaluate the existing research evidence of different housing models and to make informed choices concerning homeless peoples' services 2. Present research evidence is incomplete and, in part, not robust enough methodologically; yet the evidence supports adapting and implementing HF in different contexts 3. It is essential to do more research on housing models and also to develop the methodology of such research	Develop existing HF research Provide bases for informed decision making in homelessness services and policies

For the 'reviews' orientation, we included articles and reports that are based purely on previous HF publications and that summarize existing HF knowledge and research evidence. The publications commonly map and categorize previous HF literature, summarize and assess the existing research evidence and/or conceptualize different approaches to HF research and practice. Johnsen and Teixeira's review (2010) provides an overview of research and (critical) discussions related to the LRT model, and it contrasts this with research on the HF model. They state here, as do many other contributors, that departures from the original PHF model make it difficult to draw firm conclusions regarding the effectiveness of different HF projects, yet the existing literature does identify a number of key outcomes and advantages. These results are summarized in the review and the authors conclude with recommendations on how to strengthen (evaluation) research on different housing models (Johnsen and Teixeira, 2010). Nelson (2010) analyses the historical shifts in housing approaches (from institutions to housing to homes) for people with a serious mental illness. He describes HF under the 'supported housing' approach and argues that a shift to that approach represents a transformative change in mental health policy and practice.

In a review report, Pleace (2012) makes an interesting grouping of different kinds of HF applications. There are housing projects, which are very much exact replicas of PHF. In addition, some housing projects can be defined as Communal Housing First (CHF), as they are based on congregate housing and on-site support. By Housing First 'Light' Services, Pleace (2012) refers to living in ordinary apartments and receiving less intensive floating support. This classification extends the 'boundaries' of the concept of HF, yet also makes it clearer what the original PHF is and what the different ways of mixing it with other housing models are.

Groton's quite recent article (2013) scrutinizes studies that compare the effectiveness of various HF programmes with the effectiveness of LRT programmes – i.e., studies included in the 'comparative studies' orientation. Client outcomes related to housing retention, substance use and mental health are compared. The article concludes that, while HF provides strong promise, existing studies contain methodological deficiencies and, thus, a reserved attitude towards HF should be maintained. Waegemakers-Schiff and Rook (2012) include a much more comprehensive range of HF literature in their review report than Groton (2013), but the authors, similarly, seek and critically evaluate evidence on HF. They (2012, p.17) come to the following conclusion: "given the paucity of highly controlled outcome studies, we examined the process whereby HF had so rapidly become accepted as a 'best practice'. Declaring the Housing first model a best practice appears to be a political decision rather than a scientific research decision."

The political-practical arguments of the 'reviews' literature orientation are the following: 1) it is essential to gather, compare and critically evaluate the existing research evidence of different housing models and to make informed choices concerning services for homeless people (Johnsen and Teixeira, 2010); 2) existing research evidence is incomplete and, in part, not sufficiently robust methodologically, but it supports adapting and implementing HF in different contexts (Waegemakers-Schiff and Rook 2012; Groton, 2013); 3) it is essential to do more research on housing models and also to develop the methodology of such research (e.g., Johnsen and Teixeira, 2010; Groton, 2013). The objectives of this literature orientation are to develop existing HF research and to provide bases for informed decision-making in homelessness services and policies. These objectives are also essential in the following, and sixth, research orientation: 'implementation and outcome studies'.

Implementation and Outcome Studies

Table 6. Implementation and Outcome Studies

PUBLICATIONS (28)	POLITICAL-PRACTICAL ARGUMENTS	OBJECTIVES
Felton, 2003; Falvo, 2009; Pearson *et al.,* 2009; van Wormer and van Wormer 2009: Stergiopoulos *et al.,* 2010; McNaughton and Atherton, 2011; Wideman, 2011; Collins *et al.,* 2012; Goldbloom and Bradley, 2012; Zabkiewicz *et al.,* 2012; Bean *et al.,* 2013; Clifasefi *et al.,* 2013; Gilmer *et al.,* 2013; Greenwood and Stefancic *et al.,* 2013a; Greenwood and Stefancic , *et al.,* 2013b ; Keller *et al.,* 2013; Macnaughton *et al.,* 2013; Nelson *et al.,* 2013; Palepu *et al.,* 2013; Watson *et al.,* 2013; Davidson *et al.,* 2014; Gilmer *et al.,* 2014; Granelli *et al.,* 2014; Henwood and Matejkowski *et al.,* 2014; Henwood and Melekis *et al.* 2014; Nelson *et al.,* 2014; Stergiopoulos *et al.,* 2014; West *et al.,* 2014	1. Describing and exploring programme implementation is central to a better understanding of the critical ingredients and practices that help clients to achieve positive outcomes and life changes 2. High fidelity to PHF associates with better housing stability and quality of life outcomes 3. The combination of research, 'evidence-based' practices and advocacy will foster new programmes in the future that will continue to expand the use of PHF with new client groups and localities 4. Especially important in successful implementation is the recruiting of staff whose technical and interpersonal skills, and personal values are congruent with the HF model	Document and display the implementation of HF projects Study the relations between planning, implementation, local contexts, fidelity and outcomes – and thus to strengthen the understanding and credibility of the HF initiatives

The publications within this literature orientation are academic, empirical research articles based on implementation-outcome research. They describe and scrutinize a particular HF project (or HF projects) in its (or their) own right – the HF project is not compared to other housing models or evaluated in such a context. Both qualitative and quantitative data, such as interviews, surveys and documents are used. Research articles that deal with the following were included in this orientation: a) the outcomes and success/hindrance factors of a particular HF project (e.g., McNaughton and Atherton, 2011; Bean *et al.*, 2013; Nelson *et al.*, 2014); b) the implementation of a particular HF project (or HF projects) and its (or their) fidelity to the original PHF (Greenwood, Stefancic *et al.*, 2013b; Nelson, Macnaughton *et al.*, 2013b; Nelson *et al.*, 2014); and c) a description of a particular research design used in HF research (Zabkiewicz, 2012). There are 28 publications in literature orientation 'implementation and outcome studies' and it is a rapidly expanding

area. This kind of research has been generated by HF demonstration and research projects in particular (see the section 'evaluation reports') and these two literature orientations are therefore very closely related.

For example, with regard to the outcomes of a particular HF project, Clifasefi and his co-writers (2013, p.291) state that "[m]onths of project-based HF exposure – not prior criminal histories – predicted significant decreases in jail days and bookings from the two years prior and subsequent to participants' move into HF." Similarly, Collins, Malone and Larimer (2012) conducted a quantitative secondary study to shed light on the potential mechanisms associated with improved alcohol-use outcomes following engagement in a HF project. The study utilizes data gathered in a HF context. It is common for implementation and outcome studies to be based on data gathered in large-scale and multi-site comparative (and/or evaluative case study) HF research projects (e.g., Palepu *et al.*, 2013a; b). In such studies, a particular research question, preliminary observation or theme, which has come up in the original 'host' study, is analysed in more detail. For example, Henwood, Matejkowski *et al.* (2014) focused especially on quality of life and community inte-gration outcomes, which are the rising themes in current HF research.

Some studies depict and reflect on the implementation of HF *per se* (e.g., Henwood, Melekis *et al.*, 2014). For example, Greenwood, Stefancic *et al.* (2013a) tell the 'triumph story' of HF moving from exile to mainstream. The article explains how research was used to persuade key stakeholders to support funding for and dissemination of HF. It also presents strategies to maximize social change impact, as well as the key challenges that were faced along the way to triumph. Van Wormer and van Wormer (2009) describe the policy shift from a sobriety-first requirement to a Housing First philosophy in the US through a case study from Portland. Felton (2003) describes and analyses the implementation – both barriers and facilitators – of a particular HF project as understood by stakeholders in the change. As she concludes (2003, p.321): "The narrative method reveals on-going concern with interagency relations and, possibly, ambivalence about the values and assumptions of the new practice, and thus offers a richer and more content-based picture of the change process." Nelson, Macnaughton *et al.* (2013b) describe the planning process of the 'At Home / Chez Soi' demonstration project and the challenges associated with it.

Other publications investigate the relationship between the implementation and outcomes of housing projects and their fidelity to PHF (e.g.. Davidson *et al.*, 2014; Gilmer *et al.*, 2014). The need to examine the fidelity of a particular HF project to the original PHF arises from the dilemma of PHF being a flexible model for dissemination in different locations, yet being on the other hand a clearly articulated procedure with its own premises, practices, 'rules' and values (Stefancic, Tsemberis *et al.*, 2013; Gilmer *et al.*, 2014). In addition, outcomes are seen as being bound to implementation

processes. If there are major differences and flaws in implementation between HF projects, it makes it difficult to compare the results and argue for the 'evidence base' of HF (Watson, Wagner and Rivers, 2013). Watson, Wagner and Rivers (2013, p.169) define the following six critical ingredients of a successful HF project: 1) a low-threshold admissions policy, 2) harm reduction, 3) eviction prevention, 4) reduced service require-ments, 5) the separation of housing and services and 6) consumer education.

Greenwood and co-authors (2013b) describe and evaluate the fidelity to the PHF model of HF initiatives in six European countries (Finland, France, Ireland, the Netherlands, Portugal and Scotland) and they examine the larger social and historical factors that may foster or impede model fidelity. Key stakeholders repre-senting six European HF initiatives completed semi-structured phone interviews. Greenwood, Stefancic *et al.* (2013b, p.307) summarize implementation challenges as involving "skepticism and resistance from existing services, availability of afford-able private-market housing, and moral judgments about worthiness for housing." The 'At Home / Chez Soi' demonstration project's fidelity, and the factors facilitating or hindering its implementation, were assessed in a large qualitative study using key stakeholders as informants (Nelson, Macnaughton *et al.*, 2013b). Both studies (Greenwood, Stefancic *et al.*, 2013b; Nelson, Macnaughton *et al.*, 2013b; Nelson *et. al*, 2014) find that, although local context meant the need for unique adaptations of HF, the principles of the model provided the foundation for a common approach across sites and nations.

The main objective of the literature in this orientation is to document and display the implementation of HF projects and to study the relations between planning, imple-mentation, local contexts, fidelity and outcomes – and thus to strengthen the under-standing and credibility of the HF initiatives. The publications are research articles and are addressed primarily to academic readers. They include the following political-practical arguments: 1) describing and exploring programme implementation is central to a better understanding of the critical ingredients and practices that help clients to achieve positive outcomes and life changes (Davidson *et al.*, 2014); 2) high fidelity to PHF is associated with better housing stability and quality of life outcomes; 3) the combination of research, 'evidence-based' practices and advocacy will foster new programmes in the future that will continue to expand the use of PHF with new client groups and localities (Greenwood, Stefancic *et al.*, 2013b); 4) especially important in successful implementation is the recruiting of staff whose technical and interpersonal skills, and personal values are congruent with the HF model (Nelson, Macnaughton *et al.*, 2013b; Nelson *et Al.*, 2014). In this literature orientation, looking at how to tackle long-term homelessness comes back to the question of how to implement a housing project that is sufficiently in line with PHF principles yet fits well in the local context, in order to produce outcomes as remarkable as those reported from the original PHF model (see section on 'comparative studies').

An interesting observation is that the term 'fidelity' is increasingly used and circulated in the most recent HF literature; fidelity is to be defined, assessed, measured and put into practice. The next, quite marginal (at this time) literature orientation concerns the development of fidelity and outcome tests. The viewpoint shifts from implementation of HF projects to developing reliable research instruments and data to assess fidelity.

Development of Scales and Fidelity Tests

Table 7. Development of Scales and Fidelity Tests

PUBLICATIONS (6)	POLITICAL-PRACTICAL ARGUMENTS	OBJECTIVES
Clifasefi *et al.,* 2011; Raphael-Greenfield, 2012; Gilmer *et al.,* 2013; Stefancic *et al.,* 2013; Watson *et al.,* 2013; Adair *et al.,* 2014	1. The fidelity scale is to be used as a guide in programme development and training, and as a research tool 2. It is necessary for researchers, policy makers and practitioners to have tools for measuring the extent to which a housing model is implemented according to PHF principals and procedures 3. Fidelity tests help to assess the relations between model ingredients, implementation and outcomes 4. Point 3 promotes a broader understanding of how to facilitate stable housing and recovery from homelessness and other adversities at a grass roots level	Provide a tool to define and measure in a reliable way the elements and practices of particular HF initiatives Enhance dissemination of more consistent and accurate replicas of PHF

The research articles in this literature orientation describe and make explicit the making of a measuring tool. The aim is to develop a tool to define and measure in a reliable way the elements and practices of particular HF initiatives, and through this to enhance dissemination of more consistent and accurate replicas of PHF. Authors make use of mostly qualitative data produced during the development process, such as interviews and focus groups of wide range of stakeholders. This orientation is quite new and marginal within the HF research field and it contains six publications.

Debates surrounding the implementation, outcomes and dissemination of HF have prompted the creation of 'fidelity tests', which measure the fidelity of housing projects to the PHF model along both structural and philosophical dimensions (Johnsen and Teixeira, 2010). As Watson, Orwat *et al.* (2013, p.1) argue, "[a] lack of clear fidelity guidelines has resulted in inconsistent implementation." They continue (2013, p.3) to say that "[n]o fidelity instrument had been created at the time we

started development of the HFM (Housing First Model) Fidelity Index." This research orientation includes descriptions of creating and validating fidelity measuring tools, and texts that address use of the Observer-Rated Housing Quality Scale (Adair *et al.*, 2014) as well as use of the Executive Function Performance Test to assess executive and community functioning among homeless persons with substance use disorders (Raphael-Greenfield, 2012).

Gilmer, Stefancic *et al.* (2013) describe the development and validation of the HF fidelity survey; the 46-item survey was created to measure fidelity across five domains: housing process and structure, the separation of housing and services, service philosophy, service array and team structure. The staff and clients of 93 supported-housing programmes in California validated the survey. Similarly, Stefancic, Tsemberis *et al.* (2013) conducted a study to develop and test a PHF fidelity scale. In the article they (2013, p.241) describe the process of making the scale and summarize it in the following way: "The PHF model's guiding principles and prospective ingredients were identified through reviews of PHF literature and relevant fidelity scales, interviews with PHF administrators and a survey administered to HF providers. An expert panel developed the items into a fidelity scale, which was field-tested as part of two large-scale research initiatives in California and Canada." Watson, Orwat *et al.* (2013, p.3) argue that they have conducted "a bottom-up approach to the development of the index that sought to identify and operationalize the critical elements of the HFM that differentiate it from the abstinence-based approach". They come up with a five-dimensional index (staff, client enrolment, flexible policies, low demand, and intensive case management and housing arrangements) by which to assess and measure project implementation.

The texts are written primarily for researchers, funders, planners and those running HF projects. The following political-practical arguments are contained in the articles: 1) the fidelity scale is to be used as a guide in programme development and training, and as a research tool (Stefancic, Tsemberis *et al.*, 2013); 2) it is necessary for researchers, policy-makers and practitioners to have tools for measuring the extent to which a housing model is implemented according to PHF principals and procedures; 3) fidelity tests help to assess the relationships between model ingredients, implementation and outcomes, and, thus, they 4) promote a broader understanding of how to facilitate stable housing and recovery from homelessness and other adverse situations at a grass roots level. Next we will turn to the research orientation that examines the grass roots level of HF – i.e., the joint encounters and experiences of practitioners and clients.

Experiences and Interaction Studies

Table 8. Experiences and Interaction Studies

PUBLICATIONS (22)	POLITICAL-PRACTICAL ARGUMENTS	OBJECTIVES
Yanos *et al.,* 2004; Padgett, 2007; Padgett et. al., 2008; Burlingham *et al.,* 2010; Collins *et al.,* 2012; Padgett and Henwood, 2012; Piat *et al.* 2012; Stefancic *et al.,* 2012; Granfelt 2013a; 2013b; Haahtela 2013; Henwood *et al.,* 2013; Polvere *et al.,* 2013; Tiderington *et al.,* 2013; Austin *et al.,* 2014; Balogi and Fehér 2014; Henwood and Padgett *et al.,* 2014; Juhila *et al.* 2014; Kirst *et al.,* 2014; Ornelas *et al.,* 2014; Zerger and Pridham *et al.,* 2014a; Zerger and Pridham *et al.,* 2014b	1. It is important to study HF as the local, mutual and interactional accomplishment of clients and practitioners 2. Stakeholders construct and realize HF 'in-action' and in particular settings 3. The extent to which macro-level conceptualizations and ideals are able to make social changes are dependent on the transfer processes at the micro-level 4. HF is to be understood and studied as societal, local, interactional and situational social practice and experience	Scrutinize how macro-level ways of thinking and policies are transferred and understood in micro-level practices and in personal experiences Make visible the relations between current politics, policies and everyday practices, and by doing this to inform the development of HF initiatives and support work more generally

The 'experiences and interaction studies' literature orientation involves qualitative methods and data. We included research articles in this orientation that focus on everyday interactional practices and the experiences of clients, practitioners and policy-makers in HF contexts. The purpose of these studies is to scrutinize how macro-level ways of thinking and policies (e.g., recovery and harm reduction) are transferred to and understood in micro-level practices and in personal experiences. The research agenda is to make visible the relations between current politics, policies and everyday practices, and by doing this to inform the development of HF initiatives and support work more generally (Juhila *et al.*, 2014). Only after a housing model has been planned and implemented can its micro-level practices be studied – i.e., as a joint endeavour accomplished in practitioner–client interaction, producing and being affected by particular experiences and emotions. Thus, it is not surprising that the 'experiences and interaction studies' orientation is quite recent, though rapidly expanding and strengthening (22 publications). It overlaps with the qualitative evaluation reports, which are based on stakeholders' accounts (e.g., Johnsen and Fitzpatrick, 2012; 2013; Kristiansen and Espmarker, 2012; Piat *et al.*, 2012; Polvere *et al.*, 2013; Balogi and Fehér, 2014), and as this orientation is a rapidly growing one, the publications included in this review likely do not cover this research field properly.

Researchers within this orientation analyse the realization of HF initiatives in terms of practitioner–client interaction and from the viewpoints and experiences of practitioners (e.g., Collins *et al.*, 2012a; b; Granfelt, 2013a; b; Haahtela, 2013; Henwood, Padgett *et al.*, 2014), clients (Collins *et al.*, 2012a; b; Granfelt, 2013a; b; Haahtela, 2013; Kirst *et al.*, 2014) and civil servants (Johnsen and Teixeira, 2012). There are also texts that more generally map the experience of transferring from homelessness to having an apartment, being at home and experiencing 'ontological security' (Padgett, 2007; Henwood, Hsu *et al.*, 2013). Kirst and her colleagues (2014) use clients' narratives of 'hopes for recovery' and see housing as a pivotal condition in creating hope for future recovery. Yet, they mention (as do the other researchers, including Johnsen and Fitzpatrick (2012; 2013) and Granfelt (2013b)) that there are risks such as isolation, boredom, poverty and insecurity, which might temper the success of independent living and recovery. Accordingly, housing is essential but is not on its own a sufficient resource for living in the community and for recovery. Burlingham *et al.*'s (2010) phenomenological study analyses accounts of women with alcohol issues who become homeless, and examines how personal life histories explain decisions to stay or leave (HF) housing.

Granfelt (2013a; b) has developed the concept of 'housing social work'. This working method comprises the following dimensions: interactional skills (particular skills involved in negotiating with, for example, tenants, neighbours, social housing authorities and other stakeholders); 'therapeutic' skills for genuine and empathic presence in support work; and the ability to set boundaries and to support (often severely traumatized) persons in converting apartments into secure homes (rather than a distressing trap). Tiderington *et al.*'s (2013) ethnographic study, based on observations and interviews, explores how the principle of harm reduction is interpreted as an element that enhances trust in a practitioner–client relationship. The article is a good example of the mission of this literature orientation to make sense of how HF principals and procedures are talked into being and understood in everyday encounters with clients and practitioners.

The common political-practical arguments set forth in the publications within this orientation are: 1) it is important to study HF as the local, mutual and interactional accomplishment of clients and practitioners; 2) stakeholders construct and realise HF 'in-action' and in particular settings; 3) the extent to which macro-level conceptualizations and ideals are able to make social changes are dependent on the transfer processes at the micro-level; 4) HF is to be understood and studied as a societal, local, interactional and situational social practice and experience; accordingly, the essential question in the fight against homelessness is: how is HF (to be) accomplished as an everyday practice, and how is it conceptualized and experienced by different stakeholders?

Next we turn to the final literature orientation, which approaches HF as an exemplar of Western thinking and is ready to question it.

Critical Social Science

Table 9. Critical Social Science

PUBLICATIONS (6)	POLITICAL-PRACTICAL ARGUMENTS	OBJECTIVES
Kertesz *et al.,* 2009; Kertesz and Winer, 2009; Willse, 2010; Stanhope and Dunn, 2011; Hansen Löfstrand and Juhila, 2012; Lindovská, 2014	1. HF is based on liberal values and premises 2. Alliance between HF research and politics is strong, yet not unproblematic 3. We need to be cautious about the ways research results and political-practical arguments are used in homelessness policy and in making decisions about housing, health and social services 4. HF research and practice is a creation of our time and it must be both questioned and promoted	To question common premises, norms, expectations and values To open up our minds to doing things differently, in a new way

This literature orientation approaches HF as a case exemplar, which informs us about our time and Western thinking patterns. The research articles included draw from the critical research tradition that questions and deconstructs our common ways of thinking and acting as citizens in Western societies. By doing this, the aim is to open up our minds to doing things differently, in a new way. All articles have strong theoretical frameworks and most of them are based on and scrutinise previous HF writings and documents. Texts are written for academic and professional audiences and for those interested in questioning common premises, norms, expectations and values.

This research orientation is at the margin of the HF literature with only six publications. These texts critically scrutinise the presumptions of HF, including intertwined practices of evidence-based research and evidence-based policy (Stanhope and Dunn, 2011), (restricted) client choice (Hansen Löfstrand and Juhila, 2012) and support for liberal economics and individualized interpretations of social problems (Willse, 2010).

Willse (2010) shows how HF leans on and is in line with liberal thinking – how it takes as self-evident the primacy of economics. Homeless persons are not housed for ethical reasons but for economic ones. HF is not advocated by using an ethical-humanistic argument but by using economic arguments. Accordingly, HF is not targeted at changing society or dismantling the inequalities that are causing and maintaining long-term homelessness in the first place. This makes it very understandable that, although HF is shown to be successful in securing sustained housing, the total number of homeless people may not decrease (or it even may increase) in

Western societies due to, for example, high unemployment rates. Hansen Löfstrand and Juhila (2012) analyse the consumer discourse in Tsemberis' (2010) textbook: 'Housing First'. They discuss how on the one hand, the textbook emphasises client choice and self-determination, yet on the other hand, in the HF model (as in the society as a whole) the client's choices are limited and restricted. The client is expected to make the 'right choices' and if he/she does not comply, the possibilities for making choices become scarcer. Accordingly, HF does not totally solve the question of what happens to those who are not able to, or do not want to, conform to 'normal' life and to its demanding expectations and rules of acting.

Stanhope and Dunn (2011) outline HF's assumptions about (scientific) knowledge, and power and influence on political decision-making. HF research is depicted as an apparatus for making policies and advocating 'what works' initiatives. As Stanhope and Dunn (2011, p.276) argue, "[f]or EBPol's (Evidence Based Policy) proponents, the search for 'what works' is guided by survey research, experimental and quasi-experimental designs, cost-benefit analysis and system analysis." HF offers the possibility for reflection on the relationship between knowledge claims, research and policy, and on the place that values have in this bigger picture. There is the risk that the triumph of the 'evidence base' simplifies the understanding of decision-making, which in real life involves moral issues, conflicting interests and difficult negotiations of power. Also, Kertesz, Crouch *et al.* (2009) warn about the risks associated with the close alliance of HF research and policy-making; there is a possibility that policy actors overreach, interpret the research findings too positively and place exaggerated expectations on HF initiatives. There is no quick, easy or inexpensive fix for social problems or ethical injustices.

Publications in this literature orientation present three pivotal political-practical arguments, which are: 1) HF is based on liberal values and premises; 2) alliance between HF research and politics is strong, yet not unproblematic; 3) we need to be cautious about the ways in which research results and political-practical arguments are used in homelessness policy and in making decisions about housing, health and social services – HF research and practice is a creation of our time and it must be both questioned and promoted.

Conclusions and Discussion

In this article, we have introduced and mapped out nine different literature orientations, which approach HF from different genres and research designs, pursue different audiences and set forth a variety of political-practical arguments. The teasing out of the political-practical arguments made it clear that the majority of HF research is practice-oriented and motivated by promoting the HF model at interna-

tional, national and local levels. The analysis also shows how contributors within different literature orientations end up with quite similar political-practical arguments, such as: HF generates cost savings, increases wellbeing and is an effective route out of homelessness; high fidelity to PHF is associated with better housing stability and quality of life outcomes; and there are many structural and cultural constraints to be taken into account when transferring HF from one locality to another. Although there are doubtful and questioning voices in the HF literature, there is considerable agreement that HF is a promising, (cost-)effective and client-friendly housing solution for long-term homeless people with special needs and barriers in life. However, analytical and questioning arguments are crucial and valuable in further developing HF discussions, research and practice. It is essential to evaluate existing HF literature critically and, most importantly, to develop the conceptual-theoretical frameworks, methodological grounds and methods employed within each orientation.

It can be concluded that HF research has both expanded and developed enormously in the last few years; HF literature has grown quantitatively, new orientations have appeared and traditional ones have been made more solid. New texts have been published since our literature search, from which we include some examples in this conclusion section (and which are not included in the database). Yet research is never completed; new questions are asked, new directions and critical stances taken. This is how research orientations develop and go from exile to mainstream or in the opposite direction (see for HF research's future directions Nelson and MacLeod in progress). The main body of HF literature consists of: quantitative comparisons between the HF and LRT/TAU models (Nelson, Patterson *et al.,* 2015); evaluations of HF demonstration projects and national strategies and descriptions of their implementation processes (Nelson, Macnaughton *et al.,* 2015; Macnaughton *et al*., 2015; Pleace *et al*., 2015); and discussions on the transferability of PHF to different contexts and societies.

Theoretically oriented research has a valuable role in deconstructing taken-for-granted HF discourses and thereby advancing societal thinking (and endeavours). For example, HF provides many possibilities to study current macro-level discourses and ideals (and their realization in practice), such as, for example, responsibilization, consumerism and deinstitutionalization. Thus, there is much potential within the (critical) social sciences for HF research and practice. There are also increasing numbers of qualitative studies on the experiences of clients, practitioners and and other stakeholders on everyday HF practices (e.g. Aubry *et al.* 2015). This line of research is particularly valuable in unpacking the dilemmas of translating abstract principles (like choice, harm reduction, integration, resilience and recovery) into everyday practices and interactions between the clients and practitioners who apply these principles (Raitakari *et al.,* 2015). There is much untapped potential for

research on experiences and micro-level interaction. For example, outcome evaluations and qualitative studies on HF are usually done separately rather than being integrated. However, there is a call for mixed method approaches that integrate qualitative and quantitative approaches (and current research is going to this direction) as well as macro-micro level analyses. In addition, there is a need for innovative research projects that concentrate solely on grass roots level HF experiences and practices.

Another rising direction for research lies in comparing different ways of putting HF into practice – i.e., scattered and congregate housing sites and the variety of ways to provide support services (e.g. Stergiopoulos *et al*., 2015; Whittaker *et al.* 2015). There is also a call for long-term follow-up studies, as most studies follow clients for only one or two years at most (Nelson and MacLeod in progress). Greater attention should be devoted to examining the variety of ways in which support can be offered (e.g., informal and formal; peer- and professionally driven; intensive and less intensive; short- and long-term; practical and therapeutic).

The development of fidelity tests is also an interesting future direction for HF research, yet this should also be approached with caution. This direction has major advantages since fidelity has been shown to be critically important for successful client outcomes. However, there is a risk that we start to rely on fidelity tests too much, as they can only inform us about the realities of housing projects from a narrow, specific point of view. There is also the dilemma that while effective professional support work requires (ethical) guidelines and procedures, it also requires autonomy, discretion and the ability not to go by the book. In addition, fidelity tests do not tell us how HF is actually put into practice in situ.

Since HF is not implemented in a vacuum, it is also vital to examine further what contemporary policy trends in relation to public services (such as active and responsible citizenship discourse) mean for the implementation of HF in different contexts and for the life conditions of the people with severe mental and substance abuse difficulties. When value for money and demonstrable client outcomes are increasingly emphasized in society, this might bring undesirable consequences for homelessness services, such as 'creaming' and tightening eligibility criteria. That is why research on client selection processes as well as 'client failures' is topical. As stated in the HF literature, a minority of clients cannot yet be helped or housed through HF; they are important for research, as there are valuable lessons to be learned from them and their situations, although they are hard to reach. Eligibility criteria, and failures and successes should be studied, for example in regard to differences among long-term homeless people. Are some client groups more vulnerable (women, former prisoners, young people, immigrants), and do they become dropouts from the HF models more easily and, if so, for what reasons?

Alasuutari (2009, p.70) uses the concept 'domestication' in examining how "supra-national policy models are introduced within a nation-state." He claims that the actual implementation of new models at a national level is always culturally bound and the result of compromise between different stakeholders. The concept of domestication might be useful in analysing how HF models are applied in different countries and in more local contexts (municipalities or service providers with certain histories and cultures of working with homelessness). How the culturally strong LRT approach is present and mixed in the ideas of HF in local homelessness work practices should be studied more closely, even though the HF model is widely accepted as the new approach to be applied. When analysing the possibly mixed housing practices, the starting point should not be that the practices are divided into 'bad' (old) and 'good' (new). Mixed models might include innovative practices to tackle long-term homelessness.

As a final remark, we conclude that the HF literature seems to be a rather internal research field in the sense that the publications refer to each other a lot. However, there is range of research conducted in other fields, especially in mental health studies, that might produce new insights for both HF research and practice, and support the research findings presented in the HF field. For instance, research done on deinstitutionalization and home-based services includes many relevant themes for HF, among others – scattered housing, community integration and support work based on home visiting or floating support. Also, literature related to recovery and citizenship (in mental health and substance abuse studies) and desistance (in criminal studies) would probably be useful. Some social work studies also come very close to the topics dealt with in HF research (e.g., topics related to client choice, involvement and participation). Without doubt, HF research would also have a lot to offer these other research fields. Research develops through reciprocal, respectful dialogues between different disciplines and through innovative crossing of the boundaries of research fields.

> **References**

Adair, C., Kopp, B., Lavoie, J., Distasio, J., Hwang, S., Watson, A., Veldhuizen, S., Chislett, K., Voronka, J., Ahmad, M., Ahmed, N. and Goering, P. (2014) Development and Initial Validation of the Observer-Rated Housing Quality Scale (OHQS) in a Multisite Trial of Housing First, *Journal of Urban Health* 91(2) pp.242-255.

Alasuutari, P. (2009) The Domestication of Worldwide Policy Models, *Ethnologia Europea* 39(1) pp.66-71.

Atherton, I. and McNaughton-Nicholls, C. (2008) Housing First as a Means of Addressing Multiple Needs and Homelessness, *European Journal of Homelessness* 2 pp.289-303.

Aubry, T., Bourque, J., Volk, J., Leblanc, S., Nolin, D. and Jetté, J. (2014) *At Home / Chez Soi Project: Moncton Site Final Report* (Calgary, AB: Mental Health Commission of Canada).

Aubry, T., Cherner, R., Ecker, J., Jetté, J., Rae, J., Yamin, S., Sylvestre, J., Bourque, J. and McWilliams, N. (2015) Perceptions of Private Market Landlords Who Rent to Tenants of a Housing First Program, *American Journal of Community Psychology* 55(3/4) pp.292-303.

Balogi, A. and Fehér, B. (2014) The Possibilities and Limitations of Housing-led Projects: A Hungarian Example, *European Journal of Homelessness* 8(1) pp.57-75.

Bean, K.F., Shafer, M.S. and Glennon, M. (2013) The Impact of Housing First and Peer Support on People Who are Medically Vulnerable and Homeless, *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal* 36(1) pp.48-50.

Benjaminsen, L. (2013a) *Housing First Europe Local Evaluation Report Copenhagen. Rehousing Homeless Citizens with Assertive Community Treatment. Experiences from an ACT-programme in Copenhagen* (Copenhagen: The Danish National Centre of Social Research).

Benjaminsen, L. (2013b) Policy Review Up-date Results from Housing First Based Danish Homelessness Strategy, *European Journal of Homelessness* 7(2) pp.9-131.

Bostad först som innovation – ett sätt att bekämpa extreme fattigdom? [Housing First as Innovation – A Way to Combat Extreme Poverty] (2013), in: R. Rønning, M. Knutagård, C. Heule and H. Swärd (Eds.) *Innovationer i välfärden: – möjligheter och begränsningar*, pp.125-147. (Tukholma: Liber AB).

Burlingham, B., Andrasik, M.P., Larimer, M., Marlatt, G.A. and Spigner, C. (2010) A House is not a Home: A Qualitative Assessment of the Life Experiences of Alcoholic Homeless Women, *Journal of Social Work Practice in the Addictions* 10(2) pp.158-179.

Busch-Geertsema, V. (2010) *Finland 2010. The Finnish National Programme to Reduce Long-Term Homelessness. Synthesis Report for European Peer Review* (Vienna: OESB).

Busch-Geertsema, V. (2011) Housing First Europe: A Social Experimentation Project*, European Journal of Homelessness* 5(2) pp.209-211.

Busch-Geertsema, V. (2012a) The Potentials of Housing First from a European Perspective, *European Journal of Homelessness* 6(2) pp.209-245.

Busch-Geertsema**,** V. (2012b) Housing First Europe: Progress Report on a Social Experimentation Project, *European Journal of Homelessness* 6(2) pp.241-245.

Busch-Geertsema, V. (2013) *Housing First Europe. Final Report* (Brussels*:* EU).

Clifasefi, S.L. Malone, D.K. and Collins, S.E. (2013) Exposure to Project-based Housing First Is Associated with Reduced Jail Time and Bookings, *International Journal of Drug Policy* 24(4) pp.291-296.

Collins, S.E., Clifasefi, S.L., Dana, E.A., Andrasik, M.P., Stalh, N., Kirouac, M., Welbaum, C., King, M. and Malone, D.K. (2012a) Where Harm Reduction Meets Housing First: Exploring Alcohol's Role in a Project-Based Housing First Setting, *International Journal of Drug Policy* 23(2) pp.111-119.

Collins, S.E., Malone, D.K. and Clifasefi, S.L (2013) Housing Retention in Single-Site Housing First for Chronically Homeless Individuals With Severe Alcohol Problems, *American Journal of Public Health* 103(S2) pp.S269-S274.

Collins, S.E., Malone, D.K., Clifasefi, S.L., Ginzler, J.A., Garner, M.D., Burlingham, B., Lonczak, H.S., Dana, E.A., Kirouac, M., Tanzer, K., Hobson, W.G., Marlatt, A. and Larimer, M.E. (2012b) Project-based Housing First for Chronically Homeless Individuals with Alcohol Problems: Within-subjects Analyses of 2-year Alcohol Trajectories, *American Journal of Public Health* 102(3) pp.511-519.

Collins, S.E., Malone, D.K. and Larimer, M.E. (2012) Motivation to Change and Treatment Attendance as Predictors of Alcohol-use Outcomes Among Project-based Housing First Residents, *Addictive Behaviors* 37(8) pp.931-939.

Culhane, D.P., Kane, V. and Johnston, M. (2013) Homelessness Research: Shaping Policy and Practice, Now and Into the Future, *American Journal of Public Health* 103(52) Supplement 2, pp.S181-S183.

Currie, L.B., Moniruzzaman, A., Patterson, L.M. and Somers, J.M. (2014) *At Home / Chez Soi Project: Vancouver Site Final Report* (Calgary, AB: Mental Health Commission of Canada).

Davidson, D., Neighbors, C., Hall, G., Hogue, A., Cho, R., Kutner, B. and Morgenstern, J. (2014) Association of Housing First Implementation and Key Outcomes Among Homeless Persons with Problematic Substance Use, *Psychiatric Services* 65(11) pp.1318-1324.

De Decker, P. (2012) Good Practice Briefing. Societal Rental Agencies: An Innovative Housing-led Response to Homeless (FEANTSA). [On-line] available from: http://www.feantsa.org/spip.php?article620 [28.05.2015].

Distasio, J., Sareen, J. and Isaak, C. (2014). At *Home / Chez Soi Project: Winnipeg Site Final Report* (Calgary, AB: Mental Health Commission of Canada)

Felton, J.B. (2003) Innovation and Implementation in Mental Health Services for Homeless Adults: A Case Study, *Community Mental Health Journal* 39(4) pp.309-322.

Fitzpatrick, C. (2004) Housing First Becoming The Standard Model for Homeless Population, *Alcoholism & Drug Abuse Weekly* 16(41) pp.1-3.

Gaetz, S., Scott, F. and Gulliver, T. (Eds.) (2013) *Housing First in Canada: Supporting Communities to End Homelessness* (Toronto: Canadian Homelessness Research Network Press).

Gilmer, T.P., Manning, W.G. and Ettner, S.L. (2009) A Cost Analysis of San Diego County's REACH Program for Homeless Persons, *Psychiatric Services* 60(4) pp.445-450.

Gilmer, T.P., Ojeda, V.D., Hiller, S., Stefancic, A., Tsemberis, S., Palinkas, L.A. (2013) Variations in Full Service Partnerships and Fidelity to the Housing First Model, *American Journal of Psychiatric Rehabilitation* 16(4) pp.313-328.

Gilmer, T., Stefanic, A., Ettner, S., Manning, W. and Tsemberis, S. (2010) Effect of Full-Service Partnerships on Homelessness, Use and Costs of Mental Health Services, and Quality of Life Among Adults with Serious Mental Illness, *Archives of General Psychiatry* 67(6) pp.645-652.

Gilmer, T.P., Stefancic, A., Katz, M.L., Sklar, M., Tsemberis, S. and Palinkas, L.A. (2014) Fidelity to the Housing First Model and Effectiveness of Supported Housing in California, *Psychiatric Services* 65(11) pp.1311-1317.

Gilmer, T.P., Stefancic, A., Sklar, M. and Tsemberis, S. (2013) Development and Evaluation of a Housing First Fidelity Survey, *Psychiatric Services* 64(9) pp.911-914.

Goering, P., Streiner, D., Adair, C., Aubry, T., Barker, J., Distasio, J., Hwang, S., Komaroff, J., Latimer, E., Somers, J. and Zabkiewicz, D. (2011) At Home/Chez Soi Trial Protocol. A Pragmatic, Multi-Site, Randomised Controlled Trial of a Housing First Intervention for Homeless Individuals with Mental Illness in Five Canadian Cities, *British Medical Journal Open* 1(2) pp.1-18.

Goering, P. and Tsemberis, S. (2014) Housing First and System/Community Transformation, in: G. Nelson, B. Kloos and J. Ornelas (Eds.) *Community Psychology and Community Mental Health: Towards Transformative Change,* pp.278-291. (New York: Oxford University Press).

Goering, P., Veldhuizen, S., Watson, A., Adair, C., Kopp, B., Latimer, E., Nelson, G., MacNaughton, E., Streiner, D. and Aubry, T. (2014) *National At Home / Chez Soi Final Report* (Calgary, AB: Mental Health Commission of Canada).

Granfelt, R. (2013a) Asumissosiaalinen työ läsnäolotyönä – Kokemuksia naisten yhteisöstä [Housing Related Social Work as Being Close By And Available – Experiences on a Women's Community], in: M. Laitinen and A. Niskala (Eds.) *Asiakkaat toimijoina sosiaalityössä*, pp.219-243. (Tampere: Vastapaino).

Granfelt, R. (2013b) Asumissosiaalinen työ rikosseuraamusalalla [Housing Related Social Work in Criminal Justice], in: S. Hyväri and S. Kainulainen (Eds.) *Paikka asua ja elää? Näkökulmia asunnottomuuteen ja asumispalveluihin*, pp.209-228. (Helsinki: Diaconia University of Applied Sciences).

Granfelt, R. (2014) Asunto vai rikoksettomuus ensin? Asumissosiaalisen työn tuella irti asunnottomuudesta ja rikollisuudesta [Housing First or Crimelessness First?], In: H. Lindeborg, M. Suonio and T. Lassila (Eds.) *Sosiaalityö ja sosiaalinen tuki rikosseuraamusalalla,* pp. 255-274. (Helsinki: Rikosseuraamuslaitos).

Greenwood**,** R.M., Schaefer-McDaniel, N.J., Winkel, G. and Tsemberis, S. (2005) Decreasing Psychiatric Symptoms by Increasing Choice in Services for Adults with Histories of Homelessness, *American Journal of Community Psychology* 36(3-4) pp.223-228.

Greenwood, R.M., Stefancic, A. and Tsemberis, S. (2013a) Pathways Housing First for Homeless Persons with Psychiatric Disabilities: Program Innovation, Research, and Advocacy, *Journal of Social Issues* 69(4) pp.645-663.

Greenwood, R.M, Stefancic, A., Tsemberis, S. and Busch-Geertsema, V. (2013b) Implementations of Housing First in Europe: Successes and Challenges in Maintaining Model Fidelity, *American Journal of Psychiatric Rehabilitation* 16(4) pp.290-312.

Groton, D. (2013) Are Housing First Programs Effective? A Research Note, *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare* 40(1) pp.51-63.

Gulcur, L., Stefancic, A., Shinn, M., Tsemberis, S. and Fischer, S. (2003) Housing, Hospitalization, and Cost Outcomes for Homeless Individuals with Psychiatric Disabilities Participating in Continuum of Care and Housing First Programs, *Journal of Community and Social Psychology* 13(2) pp.171-186.

Haahtela, R. (2013) Työntekijöiden ja asiakkaiden kohtaamisia asumisyksikössä [Encounters Between Workers and Clients in A Supported Housing Unit], in: S. Hyväri and S. Kainulainen (Eds.) *Paikka asua ja elää? Näkökulmia asunnottomuuteen ja asumispalveluihin*, pp.183-208. (Helsinki: Diaconia University of Applied Sciences).

Hansen Löfstrand, C. (2012) On the Translation of the Pathways Housing First Model, *European Journal of Homelessness* 6(2) pp.175-182.

Hansen Löfstrand, C. and Juhila, K. (2012) The Discourse of Consumer Choice in the Pathways Housing First Model, *European Journal of Homelessness* 6(2) pp.47-68.

Henwood, B.F., Hsu, H.-T., Dent, D., Winetrobe, H., Carranza, A. and Wenzel, S. (2013) Transitioning from Homelessness: A 'Fresh-start' Event, *Journal of the Society for Social Work and Research* 4(1) pp.47-57.

Henwood, B.F., Matejkowski, J., Stefancic, A. and Lukens, J.M. (2014) Quality of Life After Housing First for Adults with Serious Mental Illness Who Have Experienced Chronic Homelessness, *Psychiatry Research* 220(1/2) pp.549-555.

Henwood, B.F., Melekis, K. and Stefancic, A. (2014) Introducing Housing First in a Rural Service System: A Multistakeholder Perspective, *Global Journal of Community Psychology Practice* 5(1) pp.1-13.

Henwood, B.F., Padgett, D.K and Tiderington, E. (2014) Provider Views of Harm Reduction Versus Abstinence Policies Within Homeless Services for Dually Diagnosed Adults, *Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research* 41(1) pp.80-89.

Henwood, B.F, Shinn, M., Tsemberis, S. and Padgett, D.K. (2013) Examining Provider Perspectives Within Housing First and Traditional Programs, *American Journal of Psychiatric Rehabilitation* (16)4 pp.262-274.

Johnsen, S. (2012) Shifting the Balance of the Housing First Debate, *European Journal of Homelessness* 6(2) pp.193-197.

Johnsen, S. and Fitzpatrick, S. (2012) *Turning Point Scotland's Housing First Pilot Evaluation: Interim Report* (Edinburgh: Heriot-Watt University).

Johnsen, S. and Teixeira, L. (2010) *Staircases, Elevators and Cycles of Change. 'Housing First' and Other Housing Models for Homeless People with Complex Support Needs* (York and London: The University of York and Crisis).

Johnsen, S. and Teixeira, L. (2012) 'Doing It Already?' Stakeholders' Perceptions of 'Housing First' in the UK, *International Journal of Housing Policy* 12(2) pp.183-203.

Johnson, G. (2011) *Homelessness and Housing First: Issues for Australian Policy and Practice.* (Melbourne: Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute).

Johnson, G. (2012) Housing First 'Down Under': Revolution, Realignment or Rhetoric?, *European Journal of Homelessness* 6(2) pp.183-189.

Johnson, G., Parkinson, S. and Parsell, C. (2012) *Policy Shift or Program Drift? Implementing Housing First in Australia* (Melbourne: Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, AHURI).

Juhila K., Hall C., Günther, K., Raitakari, S. and Saario, S. (2014) Accepting and Negotiating Service Users' Choices in Mental Health Transition Meetings, *Social Policy & Administration.* Article first published online 9 June 2014 DOI: 10.1111/spol.12082.

Kaakinen, J. (2013) Asunto ensin ja sitten [Housing First and What Then?], in: S. Hyväri and S. Kainulainen (Eds.) *Paikka asua ja elää? Näkökulmia asunnottomuuteen ja asumispalveluihin*, pp.15-24. (Helsinki: Diaconia University of Applied Sciences).

Kertesz, S.G., Crouch, K., Milby, J.B., Cusimano, R.E. and Schumacher, J.E. (2009) Housing First for Homeless Persons with Active Addiction: Are We Overreaching?, *Milbank Quarterly* 87(2) pp.495-534.

Kettunen, M. (2013) Asunto ensin –malli Yhdysvalloista ja sen soveltaminen Suomessa [Housing First from US and Applying it in Finland]. *Yhteiskuntapolitiikka* 78(5) pp.562-570.

Kettunen, M. and Granfelt, R. (2011) *Observations from the First Year of the Finnish Name on the Door Project: Recommendations for the Long-Term Homelessness Reduction Programme for Years 2012-2015.* [On-line] Available from: www.housingfirst.fi/en/housing_first/reading_room/general_reading/observations_and_conclusions [28.05.2015].

Kirst, M., Zerger, S., Harris, D.W., Plenert, E. and Stergiopoulos, W. (2014) The Promise of Recovery: Narratives of Hope among Homeless Individuals with Mental Illness Participating in a Housing First Randomised Controlled Trial in Toronto, Canada, *BMJ Open* 4 doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2013-004379.

Knutagård, M. and Kristiansen, A. (2013) Not by the Book: The Emergence and Translation of Housing First in Sweden, *European Journal of Homelessness* 7(1) pp.93-115.

Kristiansen, A. and Espmarker, A. (2012) *Sen är det ju mycket det här att man får vara ärlig också och det är man ju inte van vid… Bostad först ur de boendes perspektiv* ['Then there's this about being honest as well, which of course one is not used to': Housing First from the Perspective of the Residents (Lund: Socialhögskolan, Lunds Universitet).

Lanzerotti, L. (2004) *Housing First For Families. Research to Support the Development of Housing First for Families Training Curriculum* (San Francisco: The National Alliance to End Homelessness).

Larimer, M.E., Malone, D.K., Garner, M.D., Atkins, D.C., Burlingham B., Tanzer, K., Ginzler, J., Clifasefi, S.L., Hobson, W.G. and Marlatt, G.A. (2009) Health Care and Public Service Use and Costs Before and After Provision of Housing for Chronically Homeless Persons with Severe Alcohol Problems, *JAMA* 301(13) pp.1349-1357.

Latimer, E., Rabouin, D., Méthot, C., McAll, C., Ly, A., Dorvil, H., Crocker, A., Roy, L., Poremski, D., Bonin, J-P., Fleury, M-J. and Braithwaite, E. (2014) *At Home / Chez Soi Project: Montréal Site Final Report* (Calgary: Mental Health Commission of Canada).

McManus, D. (2011) *Breaking Down the Myths: Providing and Managing Housing Services for Homeless People* (Brussels: FEANTSA).

McNaughton, N.C. and Atherton, I. (2011) Housing First: Considering Components for Successful Resettlement of Homeless People with Multiple Needs, *Housing Studies* 26(5) pp.767-777.

Macnaughton, E., Stefancic, A., Nelson, G., Caplan, R., Townley, G., Aubry, T., McCullough, S., Patterson, M., Stergiopoulos, V., Valle´e, C., Tsemberis, S., Fleury, M-J., Piat, M. and Goering, P. (2015) Implementing Housing First Across Sites and Over Time: Later Fidelity and Implementation Evaluation of a Pan-Canadian Multisite Housing First Program for Homeless People with Mental Illness, *American Journal of Community Psychology* 55(3-4) pp. 279-291.

Nelson, G. (2010) Housing for People with Serious Mental Health Illness: Approaches, Evidence, and Transformative Change, *Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare* 37(4) pp.123-146.

Nelson, G. and MacLeod, T. (in progress) Theory and Research on Housing Programs for People with Serious Mental Illness, In: J. Sylvestre, G. Nelson and T. Aubry. (Eds.) *Housing, Citizenship, and Communities for People with Serious Mental Illness: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy Perspectives* (Society for Community Research and Action book series) (New York: Oxford University Press).

Nelson, G., Macnaughton, E., Caplan, R., Macleod, T., Townley, G., Piat, M., Stefancic, A., Tsemberis, S. and Goering, P. (2013a) *Follow-up Implementation and Fidelity Evaluation of the Mental Health Commission of Canada's At Home / Chez Soi Project: Cross-site Report* (Calgary: Mental Health Commission of Canada).

Nelson**,** G., Macnaughton, E., Curwood, S.E., Egalité, N., Voronka, J., Fleury, M.-J., Kirst, M., Flowers, L., Patterson, M., Dudley, M., Piat, M. and Goering, P. (2015) Community Collaboration and Involvement of Persons with Lived Experience in Planning Canada's At Home / Chez Soi Project: A Multi-site Housing First Initiative for Homeless People with Mental Illness, *Health and Social Care in the Community* Feb 17. doi: 10.1111/hsc.12197. [Epub ahead of print].

Nelson, G., Macnaughton, E., Goering, P., Dudley, M., O'Campo, P., Patterson, M., Piat, M., Prévost, N., Strehlau, V. and Vallée, C. (2013b) Planning a Multi-site, Complex Intervention for Homeless People with Mental Illness: The Relationships Between the National Team and Local Sites in Canada's At Home / Chez Soi Project, *American Journal of Community Psychology* 51(3/4) pp.347-358.

Nelson, G., Patterson, M., Kirst, M., Macnaughton, E., Isaac, C., Nolin, D., McAll, C., Steriopoulos, V., Townley, G., MacLeod, T., Piat, M. and Goering, P. (2015) Life Changes of Homeless Persons with Mental Illness: A Longitudinal Comparison of Housing First and Treatment as Usual, *Psychiatric Services* Feb 17: appips201400201. [Epub ahead of print].

Nelson, G., Stefancic, A., Rae, J., Townley, G., Tsemberis, S., Macnaughton, E., Aubry, T., Distasio, J., Hurtubise, R., Patterson, M., Stergiopolous, V., Piat, M. and Goering, P. (2014) Early Implementation Evaluation of a Multi-site Housing First Intervention for Homeless People with Mental Illness: A Mixed Methods Approach, *Evaluation and Program Planning* 43 pp.16-26*.*

Padgett, D.K. (2007) There's No Place Like (A) Home: Ontological Security in the Third Decade of the 'Homelessness Crisis' in the United States, *Social Science and Medicine* 64(9) pp.1925-1936

Padgett, D.K. (2013) Choices, Consequences and Context: Housing First and its Critics, *European Journal of Homelessness* 7(2) pp.341-347.

Padgett, D., Gulcur, L. and Tsemberis, S. (2006) Housing First Services for People Who are Homelessness with Co-Occurring Serious Mental Illness and Substance Abuse, *Research on Social Work Practice* 16(1) pp.74-83.

Padgett, D.K. and Henwood, B.F. (2012) Qualitative Research for and in Practice: Findings from Studies with Homeless Adults Who have Serious Mental Illness and Co-Occurring Substance Abuse, *Clinical Social Work Journal* 40(2) pp.187-193.

Padgett, D.K., Stanhope, V., Henwood, B.F. and Stefancic, A. (2011) Substance Use Outcomes among Homeless Clients with Serious Mental Illness: Comparing Housing First with Treatment First Programs, *Community Mental Health Journal* 47(2) pp.227-232.

Palepu, A., Patterson, M.L, Moniruzzam, A., Frankish, J. and Somers, J. (2013a) Housing First Improves Residential Stability in Homeless Adults With Concurrent Substance Dependence and Mental Disorders, *American Journal of Public Health* (103)5 Supplement 2 pp.e30-e36.

Palepu, A., Patterson, M., Strehlau, V., Moniruzzamen, A., Bibiana, J., Frankish, J. Krausz, M. and Somers, J. (2013b) Daily Substance Use and Mental Health Symptoms among a Cohort of Homeless Adults in Vancouver, British Columbia, *Journal of Urban Health* 90(4) pp.740-746.

Patterson, M., Moniruzzaman, A., Palepu, A., Zabkiewicz, D., Frankish, C., Krausz, M. and Somers, J. (2013) Housing First Improves Subjective Quality of Life among Homeless Adults with Mental Illness: 12-month Findings from a Randomized Controlled Trial in Vancouver, British Columbia, *Social Psychiatry & Psychiatric Epidemiology* 48(8) pp.1245-1259.

Patterson, M., Moniruzzaman, A., Somers, J. (2014) Community Participation and Belonging Among Formerly Homeless Adults with Mental Illness After 12 Months of Housing First in Vancouver, British Columbia: A Randomized Controlled Trial, *Community Mental Health Journal* (50)5 pp.604-611.

Patterson, M., Rezansoff, S., Currie, L. and Somers, J. (2013) Trajectories of Recovery among Homeless Adults with Mental Illness Who Participated in a Randomized Controlled Trial of Housing First: A Longitudinal, Narrative Analysis, *BMJ Open* 3 doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2013-003442.

Pearson, C.L., Locke, G., Montgomery, A.E. and Buron, L. (2007) *The Applicability of Housing First Models to Homeless Persons with Serious Mental Illness. Final Report* (Washington, D.C.: US Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research).

Perlman, J. and Parvensky, J. (2006) *Denver Housing First Collaborative Cost Benefit Analysis and Program Outcomes Report* (Denver: Colorado Coalition for the Homeless).

Piat, M., Polvere, L., Townley, G., Nelson, G. Macnaughton, E., Egalité, N. and Goering, P. (2012) *Baseline Consumer Narratives of Lived Experience of the Mental Health Commission of Canada's At Home / Chez Soi Project: Cross-Site Report* (Calgary: Mental Health Commission of Canada).

Pleace, N. (2011) The Ambiguities, Limits and Risks of Housing First From a European Perspective, *European Journal of Homelessness* 5(2) pp.113-122.

Pleace, N. (2012) *Housing First* (Belgium: FEANTSA).

Pleace, N. (2013) Consumer Choice in Housing First, *European Journal of Homelessness* 7(2) pp.329-339.

Pleace, N. and Bretherton, J. (2012a) *Will Paradigm Drift Stop Housing First from Ending Homelessness? Categorising and Critically Assessing the Housing First Movement from a Social Policy Perspective. Social Policy in an Unequal World* (York, UK: Joint Conference of the East Asian Social Policy Research Network).

Pleace, N. and Bretherton, J. (2012b) *What Do We Mean by Housing First? Categorising and Critically Assessing the Housing First Movement from a European Perspective* (Lillehammer: ENHR Conference).

Pleace, N. and Bretherton J. (2013) The Case for Housing First in the European Union: A Critical Evaluation of Concerns about Effectiveness, *European Journal of Homelessness* 7(2) pp.21-41.

Pleace, N., Culhane, D., Granfelt, R. and Knutagård, M. (2015) *The Finnish Homelessness Strategy – An International Review* (Helsinki: Ministry of the Environment).

Polvere, L., MacLeod, T., Macnaughton, E., Caplan, R., Piat, M., Nelson, G., Gaetz, S. and Goering, P. (2014) *Canadian Housing First Toolkit: The At Home / Chez Soi Experience* (Calgary and Toronto: Mental Health Commission of Canada and the Homeless Hub).

Polvere, L., Piat, E. and Mcnaughton, M. (2013) Participant Perspectives on Housing First and Recovery: Early Findings from the At Home / Chez Soi Project, *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal* 36(2) pp.110-112.

Publication Characteristics (2014) Publication Characteristics (Publication Types) – Scope Notes (U.S. National Library of Medicine). [On-line] available from: http://www.nlm.nih.gov/mesh/pubtypes.html [28.05.2015].

Raitakari, S., Haahtela, R. and Juhila, K. (2015) Tackling Community Integration in Mental Health Home Visit Integration in Finland, *Health and Social Care in the Community* May 5. doi: 10.1111/hsc.12246. [Epub ahead of print].

Raitakari, S. and Juhila, K. (2012) Asunto ensin -mallin ja portaikkomallin jännitteet mielenterveys- ja päihdekuntoutujien asumisratkaisuissa [The Tensions between the Housing First Model and the Staircase Model in the Housing of People Suffering from Mental Health and Substance Use Problems]. *Suuntaaja* 2 pp.18-22.

Raitakari, S. and Juhila, K. (2014) Asunto ensin -julkaisujen suuntaukset, pääargumentit ja käytännöllis-poliittiset tavoitteet [Housing First Literature: Different Orientations and Political-practical Arguments]. *Yhteiskuntapolitiikka* 79(2) pp.185-196.

Raphael-Greenfield, E. (2012) Assessing Executive and Community Functioning among Homeless Persons with Substance Use Disorders Using the Executive Function Performance Test, *Occupational Therapy International* 19(3) pp.135-143.

Robbins, P.C., Callahan, L. and Monahan, J. (2009) Perceived Coercion to Treatment and Housing Satisfaction in Housing-First and Supportive Housing Programs, *Psychiatric Services* 60(9) pp.1251-1253.

Russolillo, A, Patterson, M., McCandless, L., Moniruzzaman, A. and Somers, J. (2014) Emergency Department Utilisation among Formerly Homeless Adults with Mental Disorders After One Year of Housing First Interventions: a Randomised Controlled Trial, *International Journal of Housing Policy* 14(1) pp.79-97.

Somers, J.M., Patterson, M.L., Moniruzzaman, A., Currie, L., Rezansoff, S.N., Palepu, A. and Fryer, K. (2013) Vancouver At Home: Pragmatic Randomized Trials Investigating Housing First for Homeless and Mentally Ill Adults, *Trials* (14)1 pp.1-26.

Srebnik, D., Connor, T. and Sylla, L. (2013) A Pilot Study of the Impact of Housing First Supported Housing for Intensive Users of Medical Hospitalization and Sobering Services, *American Journal of Public Health* 103(2) pp.316-321.

Stanhope, V. and Dunn, K. (2011) The Curious Case of Housing First: the Limits of Evidence-based Policy, *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry* 34(4) pp.275-282.

Stefancic, A. and Tsemberis, S. (2007) Housing First for Long-Term Shelter Dwellers with Psychiatric Disabilities in a Suburban County: Four Year study of Housing Access and Retention, *The Journal of Primary Prevention* 28(3-4) pp.265-279.

Stefancic, A., Tsemberis, S., Messeri, P., Drake, R. and Goering, P. (2013) The Pathways Housing First Fidelity Scale for Individuals With Psychiatric Disabilities, *American Journal of Psychiatric Rehabilitation* 16(4) pp.240-261.

Stergiopoulos, V., O'Campo, P., Hwang, S., Gozdzik, A., Jeyaratnam, J., Misir, V., Nisenbaum, R., Zerger, S. and Kirst, M. (2014) *At Home / Chez Soi Project: Toronto Site Final Report* (Calgary: Mental Health Commission of Canada).

Stergiopoulos, V., Hwang, S.W., Gozdzik, A., Nisenbaum, R., Latimer, E., Rabouin, D., Adair, C.E., Bourque, J., Connelly, J., Frankish, J., Katz, L.Y., Mason, K., Misir, V., O'Brien, K., Sareen, J., Schütz, C.G., Singer, A., Streiner, D.L., Vasiliadis, H.M. and Goering, P.N. (2015) Effect of Scattered-Site Housing Using Rent Supplements and Intensive Case Management on Housing Stability Among Homeless Adults With Mental Illness. A Randomized Trial, *The Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA)* 313(9), 905-915.

Tainio, H. and Fredriksson, P. (2009) The Finnish Homelessness Strategy: from a 'Staircase' Model to a 'Housing First' Approach to Tackling Long-term Homelessness, *European Journal of Homelessness* 3 pp.181-199.

Tiderington, E., Stanhope, V. and Henwood, B.F. (2013) A Qualitative Analysis of Case Managers' Use of Harm Reduction in Practice, *Journal of Substance Abuse Treatment* 44(1) pp.71-77.

Toronto Shelter Support & Housing Administration (2007) *What Housing First Means for People: Results of Streets to Homes 2007 Post-Occupancy Research* (Toronto: Toronto Shelter, Support & Housing Administration).

Tsai, J. and Rosenheck, R.A. (2012) Considering Alternatives to the Housing First Model, *European Journal of Homelessness* 6(2) pp.201-208.

Tsemberis, S. (1999) From Street to Home: An Innovative Approach to Supported Housing for Homeless Adults with Psychiatric Disabilities, *Journal of Community Psychology* 27(2) pp.225-241.

Tsemberis, S. (2010a) Housing First: Ending Homelessness, Promoting Recovery and Reducing Costs, in: I.E. Gould and B. O'Flaherty (Eds.) *How to House the Homeless*, pp.37-56. (New York: Russell Sage Foundation).

Tsemberis, S. (2010b) *Housing First. The Pathways Model to End Homelessness for People With Mental Illness and Addiction* (Minnesota: Hazelden).

Tsemberis, S. (2013) Introduction. Housing First: Implementation, Dissemination, and Program Fidelity, *American Journal of Psychiatric Rehabilitation* 16(4) pp.235-239.

Tsemberis, S. and Asmussen, S. (1999) From Street to Homes: The Pathways to Housing Consumer Preference Supported Housing Model, *Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly* 17(1-2) pp.113-131.

Tsemberis, S. and Eisenberg, R.F. (2000) Pathways to Housing: Supported Housing for Street-Dwelling Homeless Individuals with Psychiatric Disabilities, *Psychiatric Services* 51(4) pp.487-493.

Tsemberis, S., Gulcur, L. and Nakae, M. (2004): Housing First, Consumer Choice, and Harm Reduction for Homeless Individuals with a Dual Diagnosis, *American Journal of Public Health* 94(4) pp.651-656.

Tsemberis, S. and Henwood, B. (2011) Pathways' Housing First: A Consumer-driven Approach to Ending Homelessness and Promoting Recovery, in: S.A. Estrine, R.T. Hettenbach, H. Arthur and M. Messina (Eds.) *Service Delivery for Vulnerable Populations: New Directions in Behavioral Health*, pp.183-203. (New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company).

Tsemberis, S., Moran, L., Shinn, M.B., Asmussen, S.M. and Shern, D.L. (2003) Consumer Preference Programs for Individuals Who Are Homeless and Have Psychiatric Disabilities: A Drop-In Center and a Supported Housing Program, *American Journal of Community Psychology* 32(3-4) pp.305-317.

Yanos, P.T., Felton, B.J., Tsemberis, S. and Frye, V.A. (2007) Exploring the Role of Housing Type, Neighborhood Characteristics, and Lifestyle Factors in the Community Integration of Formerly Homeless Persons Diagnosed with Mental Illness, *Journal of Mental Health* 16(6) pp.703-717.

van Wormer, R. and van Wormer, K. (2009) Non-Abstinence-Based Supportive Housing for Persons with Co-Occurring Disorders: A Human Rights Perspective, *Journal of Progressive Human Services* 20(2) pp.152-165.

Waegemakers-Schiff, J. and Rook, J. (2012) *Housing First: Where is the Evidence?* (Toronto: Homeless Hub).

Watson, D.P. (2012) From Structural Chaos to a Model of Consumer Support: Understanding the Roles of Structure and Agency in Mental Health Recovery for the Formerly Homeless, *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice* 12(4) pp.325-348.

Watson, D.P., Orwat, J., Wagner, D.E., Shuman, V. and Tolliver, R. (2013) The Housing First Model (HFM) Fidelity Index: Designing and Testing a Tool for Measuring Integrity of Housing Programs That Serve Active Substance Users, *Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention & Policy* 8(16).

Watson, D., Wagner, D. and Rivers, M. (2013) Understanding the Critical Ingredients for Facilitating Consumer Change in Housing First Programming: A Case Study Approach, *Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research* 40(2) pp.169-179.

Wewerinke, D., al Shamma, S., Dries, L. and Wolf, J. (2013) *Housing First Europe Local Evaluation Report Amsterdam* (Nijmegen: Netherlands Centre for Social Care Research and EU).

Whittaker, E., Swift, W., Flatau, P., Dobbins, T. and Schollar-Root, O.B. (2015) A Place to Call Home: Study Protocol for A Longitudinal, Mixed Methods Evaluation of Two Housing First Adaptations in Sydney, Australia*, BMC Public Health* 15(1) pp.1-9.

Willse, C. (2010) Neo-liberal Biopolitics and the Invention of Chronic Homelessness, *Economy and Society* 39(2) pp.155-184.

Zabkiewicz, D.M., Patterson, M., Frankish, J. and Somers, J.M. (2012) The Vancouver At Home Study: Overview and Methods of a Housing First Trial Among Individuals Who are Homeless and Living with Mental Illness, *Clinical Trials* 2(4) 1000123.