



**Karolinska
Institutet**

The effect of Housing First on recovery. A comparison with the Staircase model

Leo Bothen, Mats Blid, Ulla Beijer and Håkan Källmén

Aim

- The aim of this study was to test the hypothesis if Housing First (HF) is a superior alternative to the Staircase Model (SM) in terms of recovery.

Based on non-published previous data we made the assumption that HF would have a positive effect on recovery and that the SM would have a negative effect. This study also investigated social support and alcohol and drug consumption to further compare the two models.

Participants

The two populations were selected through five different SM and one HF (Bostad Först Stockholm).

The SM housings were instructed to select people who might qualify for HF, and in HF Stockholm all residents were asked to participate.

At the first measurement, most of the participants asked filled out a questionnaire.

At the second measurement, there was a substantial non-response, with about 50% of HF and 83% of SM failing to fill out the outcome questionnaires. In total, the study included both pre- and post-measures from 11 individuals in HF, and 7 individuals in SM.

Design

- This was a modified quasi-experimental controlled pretest-posttest design with two populations for comparison, one primary outcome and three secondary. HF is our exposure group and SM our control.
 - The outcomes were assessed with self-reported questionnaires.
 - Baseline was established in September- October of 2016. Approximately 18 months passed between the two measurements
-

Instuments

- Recovery Assessment Scale (RAS) for estimating the participants perception of active citizenship,
 - Social Support for Recovery (SSR) to estimate the role of social support,
 - Alcohol Use Disorder Identification Test (AUDIT) to record alcohol habits and
 - Drug Use Disorder Identification Test (DUDIT) to record the drug habits.
-

Statistics

Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilks test showed that a both RAS and AUDIT scores from autumn -16 was non-normal distributed.

We tested HF and SM separate with Wilcoxon Signed Ranks Test, checking for significance in change of mean score over time. One-tailed, because of our assumption, for RAS and two-tailed for SSR, AUDIT and DUDIT. Significance levels were set to $p < 0.05$ for all analyses.

The drop-out analysis was made by Mann-Whitney U-test.

Result

Table 1. Mean age and number of participating men and women.

	HF	SM	Tot
Mean Age (years)	54.4	49.6	52.5
Participants	11	7	18
Men	9	6	15
Women	2	1	3

Continued Results

Table 2. Mean Recovery Assessment Scale scores for both measurements in both interventions. The p- values were obtained from Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test, * indicates statistical significance.

		Autumn -16	Spring -18	p
Recovery Assessment Scale	HF	38.27	48.55	0.041*
Recovery Assessment Scale	SM	50.67	47.67	0.042*

Continued Results

- No other significant differences across time could be shown either in alcohol habits, drug habits or social support.
 - The drop-out analysis showed that compared to those who responded to the follow-up, those who did not respond had heavier drug habits at the baseline.
-

Discussion

- The purpose of this study was to test the hypothesis that Housing First (HF) is superior to Staircase Model (SM) in terms of recovery (active citizenship). The result showed that HF improved their reports on active citizenship but SM decreased. This can be interpreted as HF is a better method than SM when it comes to active citizenship. However, there was a large drop-out in the follow-up due to the fact that people in active drug abuse did not respond. If people in drug abuse have a worse active citizenship this could affect the outcome. Another potential factor that influences the result is the statistical regression effect that causes convergence in the dependent variable.
-

Thanks for listening!

Leo.bothen@stud.ki

Mats.blid@ki.se

Ulla.beijer@ki.se

Hakan.kallmen@ki.se