

04

What has Fulfilling Lives achieved: method notes



**Evaluation of
Fulfilling Lives:**
Supporting
people with
multiple needs

August 2019
Hayley Lamb
Rachel Moreton
Sarah Leonardi
Dr Joanna Welford
Jennifer O'Donnell
Peter Howe

About the Fulfilling Lives programme

The Fulfilling Lives programme funds voluntary-sector led partnerships in 12 areas across England. The partnerships were awarded funding in February 2014 and began working with beneficiaries between May and December 2014. They are:

- Birmingham Changing Futures Together
- Fulfilling Lives Blackpool
- Fulfilling Lives South East Partnership (Brighton and Hove, Eastbourne and Hastings)
- Golden Key (Bristol)
- FLIC (Fulfilling Lives Islington and Camden)
- Liverpool Waves of Hope
- Inspiring Change Manchester
- Fulfilling Lives Newcastle and Gateshead
- Opportunity Nottingham
- Fulfilling Lives Lambeth, Southwark and Lewisham
- VOICES (Stoke on Trent)
- West Yorkshire – Finding Independence (WY-FI)

The National Lottery Community Fund commissioned CFE Research and the University of Sheffield to carry out a national evaluation of the programme.

About the data sources

A Common Data Framework (CDF) was developed at the start of the Fulfilling Lives programme to ensure consistent data is collected by all 12 partnership areas. The CDF comprises:

- demographic information on beneficiaries and their engagement with the programme
- six monthly assessments of need and risk (Homelessness Outcomes Star and New Directions Team assessment) – see page 4–6 for further information
- data on frequency of interactions with 18 different public services.

Local partnerships collect data in line with the CDF and submit this to the national evaluation team quarterly. Beneficiaries are recruited to the programme on a rolling basis.

This briefing draws on data about beneficiary characteristics, their engagement with the programme and other support, and the progress they make over the first two years. The data covers the period from the start of the programme (May 2014) until September 2018.

All beneficiaries are asked to provide informed consent for their data to be collected by partnerships and shared with the national evaluation team. This is refreshed every two years. Where beneficiaries do not agree to share their data we know only their start and end dates (so that we can count them as beneficiaries of the programme). In total, 3,480 beneficiaries have engaged with the programme and of these 2,913 consented to sharing their data with us.

Collecting information from people with multiple needs can be challenging. Data sets are not always complete; where data is missing we have excluded the case from our analysis. **As a result, base numbers vary.**

Comparison group

To help assess the impact of the investment, comparable data is being gathered from other parts of the country not receiving funding as part of the Fulfilling Lives programme. These areas are Bolton, Bournemouth, Sheffield and Southend on Sea. To date we have baseline data from 569 beneficiaries of these projects. This has enabled us to compare their demographic characteristics, needs and behaviours with the Fulfilling Lives beneficiaries. We have only used data from those comparison group beneficiaries who have experience of at least two of the four needs.

Homelessness Outcomes Star™

The Homelessness Outcomes Star™ is a tool for supporting and measuring change in people with multiple needs and is completed by beneficiaries with support from key workers. People agree a score from 1–10 on each area according to whether they are stuck (1–2), accepting help (3–4), believing (5–6), learning (7–8) or self-reliant (9–10). An increase in the score indicates progress towards self-reliance (so high scores are good). It covers the following ten outcome areas:

1. Motivation and taking responsibility
2. Self-care and living skills
3. Managing money
4. Social networks and relationships
5. Substance misuse
6. Physical health
7. Emotional and mental health
8. Meaningful use of time
9. Managing tenancy and accommodation
10. Offending

A total score is also calculated.

The Outcomes Star was developed by Triangle and St Mungo's as part of the London Housing Foundation Impact through Outcomes programme. The Outcomes Star is used under Licence from Triangle. Training was provided to Fulfilling Lives partnerships by Homeless Link and use of the Star is supported by a detailed user guide and other resources. For more information see www.outcomesstar.org.uk/homelessness/

For the purposes of the national evaluation, the Star should be completed by beneficiaries with support from key workers within two months of them engaging with projects, and then at six monthly intervals thereafter.

New Directions Team Assessment

The New Directions Team assessment or NDT assessment is a tool for assessing beneficiary need. It focuses on behaviour across a range of areas to build up a holistic picture of need rather than the traditional demonstration of serious need in a specific area only (for example, mental health). It also explicitly measures involvement with other services, which is not routinely used as a measure of service eligibility otherwise. The result is an index which identifies chaotic people with multiple needs who, despite being ineligible for a range of services, require targeted support.

The NDT assessment covers ten areas as follows:

1. Engagement
2. Intentional Self Harm
3. Unintentional Self Harm
4. Risk to Others
5. Risk from Others
6. Stress and Anxiety
7. Social Effectiveness
8. Alcohol or Drug Abuse
9. Impulse Control
10. Housing

Each item in the assessment is rated on a 5-point scale with 0 being the lowest possible score and 4 being the highest. Risk to others and risk from others are double weighted, with a high score of 8. The highest possible NDT score is 48 and the lowest 0. Low scores denote lower needs (so low NDT assessment scores are good).

The NDT assessment was originally devised by the New Directions Team in Merton as part of the Adults Facing Chronic Exclusion pilots. It was designed to identify people who would benefit from the programme.

For the purposes of the national evaluation, the NDT assessment should be completed by key workers as soon as possible after the service user engages with the Fulfilling Lives programme and then at six monthly intervals.

For more information see: <http://www.meam.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2010/05/NDT-Assessment-process-summary-April-2008.pdf>

Analysis

Data provided by Fulfilling Lives partnerships is collated in an SQL database then exported to SPSS for analysis.

Descriptive statistics

Descriptive statistics were used to summarise trends in the dataset using measures of central tendency (means), measures of dispersion in the data (standard deviation), proportions and frequencies. Only statistically significant results are reported, using the 95 per cent confidence level ($p < .05$). This means we can be reasonably confident that the results would be found in the wider population of Fulfilling Lives beneficiaries and not just in our sample. Column proportion tests and chi square tests were calculated to explore significant associations for a range of variables. Paired samples t tests were calculated to assess mean difference in values between baseline and other time points e.g. six month follow-up, twelve month follow-up.

Change over time

Ideally, NDT and Outcomes Star assessments should be undertaken within the first two months of engagement and then six monthly. However, not all readings submitted follow this pattern. Some first readings are not completed until several months after engagement, some projects undertake readings more frequently, and in some cases there are large gaps between readings. To ensure we are assessing change over roughly the same period of time, we only select readings that are undertaken at regular intervals. Only baseline

readings with a date between -1 and +3 months of the beneficiary's start date are included. We include readings undertaken up to a month before the start date as initial readings are sometimes undertaken as part of assessing someone's eligibility to participate in the programme. Ongoing readings are only included in the analysis where they have been completed between 4 and 8 months after the preceding reading. This allows some tolerance either side of the target 6 months.

Regression

Multiple linear regression analysis (22 models) was carried out to look at the association between beneficiary characteristics and change in Homelessness Outcomes Star and NDT scores (total scores and individual domains) between baseline and 12-month follow-up. Predictor variables included in the regression models include age (in years), sex (male/female), ethnicity (white British/other ethnicity), disability (disabled/not disabled) experience of each of the four needs (homelessness, reoffending, substance misuse, mental ill-health), total number of needs and membership of the six beneficiary groups (see briefing paper 2 and accompanying method notes for further information on these). Due to partial data, the regression models were computed using NDT data from 331 beneficiaries and Homelessness Outcomes Star data for 310 beneficiaries.

Regression analysis in this context provides a useful tool to identify the individual characteristics that are associated with levels of need and risk as measured by the Homelessness Outcomes Star and NDT scales, and whether characteristics are associated with higher or lower levels of need and risk. The regression models should not be used as evidence of a causal relationship or of the direction of influence. For example, high levels of need in relation to alcohol and substance abuse may lead to homelessness as well as the reverse. Further, there are likely to be unobserved factors that influence both the explanatory variables and the outcome.

Results

Fulfilling Lives and comparison group beneficiaries

Table 1: Number of total needs

Number of needs	Fulfilling Lives		Comparison group		P value
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	
Two*	158	5.5	132	33.5	<.0001
Three*	1,211	42.5	143	36.5	<.0001
Four*	1,481	52	119	30	<.0001
Total	2,850	100	434	100	–

* Column proportion tests indicating a statistically significant difference between Fulfilling Lives and the comparison group.

Table 2: Prevalence of the four needs

Needs	Fulfilling Lives		Comparison group		P value
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	
Homelessness	2,091	74	278	71	NS
Offending*	2,352	83	292	74	<.0001
Substance misuse*	2,744	97	322	82	<.0001
Mental health*	2,664	94	277	70	<.0001
Substance misuse and mental health*	2,564	90	216	55	<.0001
Mean number of needs*	3.5	N/A	3	N/A	<.0001

* Chi-squared tests and between groups ANOVA indicating a statistically significant difference between Fulfilling Lives and the comparison group.

Table 3: Disability

Disability	Fulfilling Lives		Comparison group		P value
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	
Disabled*	925	41	49	13	<.0001
Not disabled*	1,325	59	319	87	<.0001
Total	2,250	100	368	100	–

* Chi-squared test indicating a statistically significant difference between Fulfilling Lives and the comparison group.

Table 4: Economic status

Economic status	Fulfilling Lives		Comparison group		P value
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	
In employment/self-employed*	36	2	25	8	<.0001
Unemployed and seeking work*	237	12	97	30	<.0001
Student/on training scheme	2	0.1	2	0.5	.043
Carer	0	0	2	0.5	Numbers too small
Retired	15	0.9	3	1	NS
Unable to work*	1,374	70	193	59	<.0001
Other*	287	15	7	2	<.0001
Total	1,951	100	329	100	–

* Column proportion tests indicating a statistically significant difference between Fulfilling Lives and the comparison group.

Table 5: Level of highest qualification

Level of highest qualification	Fulfilling Lives		Comparison group		P value
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	
No qualifications*	611	63	48	39	<.0001
Entry level	88	9	13	11	NS
GCSE*	207	21	46	37	<.0001
A Level*	45	5	11	9	.042
University/equivalent	18	2	5	4	NS
Total	969	100	123	100	–

* Column proportion tests indicating a statistically significant difference between Fulfilling Lives and the comparison group.

Table 6: Literacy

Is literacy a problem	Fulfilling Lives		Comparison group		P value
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	
No*	1,121	66	200	76	.002
Yes*	569	34	64	24	.002
Total	1,690	100	264	100	–

* Chi-squared test indicating a statistically significant difference between Fulfilling Lives and the comparison group.

Table 7: Destination

Destination	Fulfilling Lives		Comparison group		P value
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	
Moved to other support*	242	12	9	6	<.0001
No longer requires support	500	24.5	35	24	NS
Disengaged from project*	652	32	66	45	<.0001
Prison	138	7	7	5	NS
Hospital	20	1	2	1	NS
Deceased*	168	8	6	4	<.0001
Moved out of area*	226	11	2	1	<.0001
Excluded from the project	37	2	0	0	NS
Unknown*	55	2.5	20	14	.003
Other	3	0	0	0	NS
Total	2,041	100	147	100	–

* Column proportion tests indicating a statistically significant difference between Fulfilling Lives and the comparison group.

Table 8: Baseline NDT scores

NDT components	Fulfilling Lives Mean score	Comparison group Mean score	P value
NDT Total*	31.01	13.93	<.0001
Engagement*	2.85	1.26	<.0001
Intentional self-harm*	1.99	0.75	<.0001
Unintentional self-harm*	2.92	1.08	<.0001
Risk to others*	4.27	1.49	<.0001
Risk from others*	4.93	1.98	<.0001

* Between groups ANOVA indicates a statistically significant difference between Fulfilling Lives and the comparison group.

Table 8: Baseline NDT scores (continued)

NDT components	Fulfilling Lives Mean score	Comparison group Mean score	P value
Stress and anxiety*	3.08	1.93	<.0001
Social effectiveness*	2.21	1.03	<.0001
Alcohol or drug abuse*	3.38	1.79	<.0001
Impulse control*	2.55	1.11	<.0001
Housing*	2.83	1.52	<.0001
n	2,345	246	–

* Between groups ANOVA indicates a statistically significant difference between Fulfilling Lives and the comparison group.

Table 9: Baseline Homelessness Outcomes Star scores

HOS components	Fulfilling Lives Mean score	Comparison group Mean score	P value
HOS Total*	33.41	57.79	<.0001
Motivation and taking responsibility*	3.32	5.57	<.0001
Self-care and living skills*	3.70	6.43	<.0001
Managing money*	3.14	5.22	<.0001
Social networks and relationships*	3.04	5.50	<.0001
Substance misuse*	3.09	5.97	<.0001
Physical health*	3.71	6.21	<.0001
Emotional and mental health*	2.87	4.78	<.0001
Meaningful use of time*	2.71	5.16	<.0001
Managing tenancy and accommodation*	3.17	5.85	<.0001
Offending*	4.66	7.10	<.0001
n	2,133	222	–

* Between groups ANOVA indicates a statistically significant difference between Fulfilling Lives and the comparison group.

Fulfilling Lives beneficiaries change over time

Table 10: Mean NDT score change over time

NDT components	Baseline to 12 month change			Baseline to 18 month change		
	Baseline	12 month follow-up	P value	Baseline	18 month follow-up	P value
NDT Total*	31.5	23.6	<.0001	32.1	22.9	<.0001
Engagement*	2.9	2.1	<.0001	2.9	2	<.0001
Intentional self-harm*	2	1.5	<.0001	2.1	1.4	<.0001
Unintentional self-harm*	3	2.3	<.0001	3.1	2.2	<.0001
Risk to others*	4.3	2.9	<.0001	4.4	2.9	<.0001
Risk from others*	5.1	3.9	<.0001	5.2	3.7	<.0001
Stress and anxiety*	3.2	2.6	<.0001	3.2	2.5	<.0001
Social effectiveness*	2.2	1.7	<.0001	2.3	1.7	<.0001
Alcohol or drug abuse*	3.4	2.8	<.0001	3.4	2.8	<.0001
Impulse control*	2.6	1.9	<.0001	2.7	1.9	<.0001
Housing*	2.8	2	<.0001	2.9	1.9	<.0001
n	955	–	–	602	–	–

* Paired samples t tests indicating a significant change in NDT scores between baseline and 12 months, and between baseline and 18 months.

Table 11: Mean Homelessness Outcomes Star score change over time

HOS components	Baseline to 12 month change			Baseline to 18 month change		
	Baseline	12 month follow-up	P value	Baseline	18 month follow-up	P value
HOS Total*	33.4	43.4	<.0001	32.2	45	<.0001
Motivation and taking responsibility*	3.4	4.3	<.0001	3.2	4.4	<.0001
Self-care and living skills*	3.6	4.6	<.0001	3.5	4.7	<.0001
Managing money*	3.2	4.2	<.0001	3.1	4.4	<.0001
Social networks and relationships*	3	4	<.0001	2.9	4.1	<.0001
Substance misuse*	3.1	4.1	<.0001	2.9	4.2	<.0001
Physical health*	3.6	4.4	<.0001	3.5	4.5	<.0001
Emotional and mental health*	2.8	3.8	<.0001	2.7	4	<.0001
Meaningful use of time*	2.7	3.7	<.0001	2.6	3.9	<.0001
Managing tenancy and accommodation*	3.2	4.4	<.0001	3	4.5	<.0001
Offending*	3	4	<.0001	4.7	6.2	<.0001
n	829	–	–	390	–	–

* Paired samples t tests indicating a significant change in Outcomes Star scores between baseline and 12 months, and between baseline and 18 months.

Table 12: Proportion of beneficiaries who spend any time being homeless by quarter

Accommodation type	Quarter 1		Quarter 4		Quarter 8		P value	
	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Q1 & Q4	Q1 & Q8
Not homeless*	208	43	268	55	309	63	<.0001	<.0001
Time spent homeless*	280	57	220	45	179	37	<.0001	<.0001
n	488	100	488	100	488	100	–	–

* Significant change in the proportion of beneficiaries spending time being homeless between quarter 1 and quarter 4, and between quarter 1 and quarter 8.

Table 13: Proportion of beneficiaries who spend any time in each accommodation type by quarter

Accommodation type	Quarter 1		Quarter 4		Quarter 8		P value	
	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Q1 & Q4	Q1 & Q8
Rough sleeping*	131	27	90	18	67	14	<.0001	<.0001
Own tenancy*	122	25	154	32	184	38	.001	<.0001
Friends and family	111	23	111	23	98	20	NS	NS
Temporary accommodation*	130	27	94	19	61	13	.004	<.0001
Supported accommodation*	119	24	162	33	169	35	.001	<.0001
n	488	–	488	–	488	–	–	–

* Significant change in the proportion of beneficiaries spending time in each accommodation type between quarter 1 and quarter 4, and between quarter 1 and quarter 8.

Table 14: Mean number of interactions with public services by quarter

Public service	Mean number of interactions		% of beneficiaries with at least 1 interaction		N	P value
	Q1	Q4	Q1	Q4		
Convictions*	0.3	0.2	15%	13%	653	.009
Nights in prison	4.1	5.4	11%	11%	690	NS
Magistrates court proceedings	0.3	0.2	21%	18%	676	NS
Crown court proceedings	0.1	0.1	5%	4%	680	NS
Arrests*	0.5	0.4	28%	20%	701	.009
Nights in police custody	0.4	0.2	19%	13%	640	NS
Police cautions*	0.1	0.1	8%	5%	657	.031
Mental health service inpatient attendances	1.4	2.0	6%	6%	686	NS

* Paired samples t tests indicating a significant change in interactions with public services between quarter 1 and quarter 4.

* These figures differ slightly from Table 13 where figures are reported for those with data up to quarter 8 and are thus based on a slightly different sample of beneficiaries.

Table 14: Mean number of interactions with public services by quarter (continued)

Public service	Mean number of interactions		% of beneficiaries with at least 1 interaction		N	P value
	Q1	Q4	Q1	Q4		
Face to face contacts with CMHT	0.9	0.8	20%	20%	710	NS
Presentations at A&E*	0.8	0.5	27%	24%	678	.011
Counselling or psychotherapy sessions	0.4	0.4	9%	10%	703	NS
Inpatient episodes	0.4	0.5	16%	14%	676	NS
Outpatient appointments	0.4	0.5	17%	22%	659	NS
Mental health service outpatient attendances	0.2	0.2	8%	9%	687	NS
Nights in temporary accommodation**	15.1	10.4	25%	17%	488	.004
Nights rough sleeping**	12.4	6.0	25%	14%	488	<.0001
Face to face contacts with drug and alcohol services	3.0	3.4	52%	52%	734	NS
Days in in-patient detox	0.4	0.7	4%	4%	726	NS
Evictions from a tenancy*	0.2	0.1	14%	9%	776	.005
Weeks in residential rehabilitation	0.1	0.2	1%	2%	726	NS

* Paired samples t tests indicating a significant change in interactions with public services between quarter 1 and quarter 4.

** These figures differ slightly from Table 13 where figures are reported for those with data up to quarter 8 and are thus based on a slightly different sample of beneficiaries.

Table 15: Support service use in quarter 1, quarter 4 and quarter 8

Support accessed	Quarter 1		Quarter 4		Quarter 8		P value	
	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Q1 & Q4	Q1 & Q8
Personalised budget	69	21	115	36*	174	54*	<.0001	<.0001
Advice and information								
Legal/criminal justice	112	35	134	41*	124	38	.026	NS
Housing	210	65	238	74*	231	72	.005	NS
Advice and information – Money and debt	107	33	149	46*	157	49*	<.0001	<.0001
Welfare rights	67	21	90	28*	89	28*	.015	.028
Care and personal support	100	31	117	36	116	36	NS	NS
Addictions	181	56	225	70*	226	70*	<.0001	<.0001
Careers	17	5	21	7	26	8	NS	NS
Counselling/therapies								
Counselling	43	13	47	15	44	14	NS	Small no.
Cognitive Behavioural Therapy	10	3	25	8*	10	3	.008	Small no.
Psychotherapy	8	2	21	7*	12	4	.011	NS
Mentoring and befriending								
Befriending	13	4	20	6	18	6	NS	NS
Peer mentoring	27	8	47	15*	45	14*	.003	.020
Other mentoring	11	3	17	5	26	8*	NS	.004

* Paired samples t tests indicating a significant change in accessing support between quarter 1 and quarter 4, and quarter 1 and quarter 8.

Table 15: Support service use in quarter 1, quarter 4 and quarter 8 (continued)

Support accessed	Quarter 1		Quarter 4		Quarter 8		P value	
	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Q1 & Q4	Q1 & Q8
Education and training								
Literacy and numeracy	18	6	24	7	24	7	NS	NS
Life skills	53	16	74	23*	92	28*	.015	<.0001
Behavioural	20	6	29	9	40	12*	NS	.002
Course leading to qualification	12	4	22	7	26	8*	NS	.020
Work experience placement	7	2	11	3	8	2	NS	Small no.
Substance misuse support								
Rehabilitation	11	3	17	5	9	3	NS	NS
Detox	29	9	32	10	19	6	NS	NS
Contact with substance misuse support worker	173	54	205	63*	185	57	.001	NS
Activities								
Sports and fitness	14	4	33	10*	51	16*	.002	<.0001
Arts, culture and libraries	24	7	51	16*	66	20*	<.0001	<.0001
Worship and faith related	12	4	18	6	38	12*	NS	<.0001
Social care								
Social work	30	9	46	14*	65	20*	.029	<.0001
Day care	30	9	27	8	23	7	NS	NS
Occupational therapy	8	2	8	2	9	3	Small no.	Small no.
Residential or nursing care and home	9	3	6	2	14	4	Small no.	Small no.

* Paired samples t tests indicating a significant change in accessing support between quarter 1 and quarter 4, and quarter 1 and quarter 8.

Table 15: Support service use in quarter 1, quarter 4 and quarter 8 (continued)

Support accessed	Quarter 1		Quarter 4		Quarter 8		P value	
	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Q1 & Q4	Q1 & Q8
Health related								
GP	211	65	249	77*	258	80*	<.0001	<.0001
Community nursing	29	9	59	18*	45	14*	<.0001	.040
Out-patient treatment	56	17	79	24*	89	28*	.015	.001
In-patient treatment	36	11	45	14	35	11	NS	Small no.
Community mental health support	76	24	103	32*	93	29	.002	NS
Other								
Self-help and support group attendance	24	7	60	19*	65	20*	<.0001	<.0001
n	323	–	323	–	323	–	–	–

* Paired samples t tests indicating a significant change in accessing support between quarter 1 and quarter 4, and quarter 1 and quarter 8.

Table 16: Volunteering

Volunteering	Quarter 1		Quarter 4		Quarter 8		P value	
	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Q1 & Q4	Q1 & Q8
Volunteer*	7	2	40	9	39	8	<.0001	<.0001
Did not volunteer*	464	98	431	91	432	92	<.0001	<.0001
Total	471	100	471	100	471	100	–	–

* Chi-squared test indicating a statistically significant increase in the proportion of beneficiaries volunteering between quarter 1 and quarter 4, and between quarter 1 and quarter 8.

Table 17: Literacy

Literacy	Quarter 1		Quarter 4		Quarter 8		P value	
	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Freq.	Perc.	Q1 & Q4	Q1 & Q8
No literacy problems*	328	69	352	74	353	74	.004	.005
Literacy problems*	150	31	126	26	125	26	.004	.005
Total	478	100	478	100	478	100	–	–

* Chi-squared test indicating a statistically significant decrease in the proportion of beneficiaries with literacy problems between quarter 1 and quarter 4, and between quarter 1 and quarter 8.

Table 18: Multiple regression analyses for change in NDT scores between baseline and 12-month follow-up showing Beta coefficients and levels of significance

Type of support	NDT total	Engage-ment	Intentional self-harm	Uninten-tional self-harm	Risk to others	Risk from others	Stress and anxiety	Social effective-ness	Alcohol or drug abuse	Impulse control	Housing
Age	-0.033	-0.006	-0.002	-0.008	0.008	-0.013	-0.004	-0.002	0.001	-0.001	-0.006
Disability Ref group: Disabled	2.798**	0.381**	0.034	0.389**	0.485	0.263	0.201	0.335**	0.064	0.338*	0.309*
Ethnicity Ref group: Not British	1.008	0.167	0.279	0.039	-0.408	-0.172	0.235	0.276	0.056	0.151	0.384
Sex Ref group: Female	1.135	0.096	0.015	0.225	0.065	-0.089	0.316*	-0.025	0.410**	-0.067	0.188
Homelessness	Excluded due to collinearity										
Offending	-1.893	-0.307	-0.130	-0.212	-0.397	0.037	-0.235	-0.188	-0.135	-0.672**	0.348
Substance misuse	-3.403	-0.409	-0.433	-0.196	-1.398*	-0.500	-0.267	-0.127	-0.141	-0.217	0.285
Mental health	-0.721	-0.072	-0.452	-0.260	0.105	-0.163	0.056	-0.126	-0.255	0.028	0.418
Total needs	1.352	0.213	0.278	0.230	0.523	-0.011	0.085	0.132	0.076	0.201	-0.374*

Asterisks indicate significance level: ** p < 1%, * p < 5%.

Table 18: Multiple regression analyses for change in NDT scores between baseline and 12-month follow-up showing Beta coefficients and levels of significance (continued)

Type of support	NDT total	Engage-ment	Intentional self-harm	Uninten-tional self-harm	Risk to others	Risk from others	Stress and anxiety	Social effective-ness	Alcohol or drug abuse	Impulse control	Housing
Group 1	8.825**	0.815**	0.866**	0.911**	1.937**	1.278	0.635	0.458	0.704	0.887**	0.335
Group 2	0.989	-0.083	0.152	0.014	0.126	0.601	0.210	0.010	0.279	0.075	-0.395
Group 3	Not included in the model										
Group 4	-2.426	-0.418	-0.037	-0.300	0.404	0.217	-0.443	-0.506	-0.128	-0.406	-0.808**
Group 5	-0.743	-0.119	0.150	-0.134	-0.111	-0.554	0.157	-0.060	0.299	-0.309	-0.062
Group 6	-0.825	-0.040	0.145	-0.278	0.199	-0.404	-0.062	-0.238	-0.177	-0.030	0.060
n	331	331	331	331	331	331	331	331	331	331	331

Asterisks indicate significance level: ** p < 1%, * p < 5%.

Table 19: Multiple regression analyses for change in Homelessness Outcomes Star scores between baseline and 12-month follow-up showing and Beta coefficients statistics and levels of significance

Type of support	Outcomes Star total	Motivation & taking responsibility	Self-care & living skills	Managing money	Social networks & relationships	Substance misuse	Physical health	Emotional & mental health	Mean-ingful use of time	Managing tenancy & accommo-dation	Offending
Age	-0.019	-0.010	0.001	0.011	-0.026	-0.025	0.005	0.007	-0.005	0.020	0.002
Disability Ref group: Disabled	1.360	0.031	0.047	0.130	0.235	0.150	0.596*	-0.115	0.006	0.007	0.273
Ethnicity Ref group: Other ethnicity	-3.841	-0.438	-0.676	-0.387	-0.329	-0.837*	-0.335	-0.061	-0.720*	-0.449	0.392

Asterisks indicate significance level: ** p < 1%, * p < 5%.

Table 19: Multiple regression analyses for change in Homelessness Outcomes Star scores between baseline and 12-month follow-up showing and Beta coefficients statistics and levels of significance (continued)

Type of support	Outcomes Star total	Motivation & taking responsibility	Self-care & living skills	Managing money	Social networks & relationships	Substance misuse	Physical health	Emotional & mental health	Meaningful use of time	Managing tenancy & accommodation	Offending
Sex Ref group: Female	-4.701*	-0.433	-0.316	-0.438	-0.490	-0.584*	-0.283	-0.352	-0.516*	-0.322	-0.967**
Homelessness	Excluded due to collinearity										
Offending	-0.848	-0.024	-0.084	-0.242	-0.166	-0.256	0.093	-0.053	0.041	-0.652	0.495
Substance misuse	-0.365	-0.039	-0.440	0.093	-0.294	0.624	0.415	0.040	-0.216	-0.296	-0.251
Mental health	-2.330	-0.137	-0.219	-0.180	-0.545	0.086	-0.065	0.161	-0.134	-1.208	-0.088
Total needs	0.375	-0.138	0.151	0.046	0.119	0.041	-0.275	-0.048	-0.173	0.607	0.046
Group 1	-1.060	-0.259	-0.546	-0.564	0.036	-0.251	-0.102	-0.264	-0.046	0.159	0.777
Group 2	1.780	-0.555	-0.065	-0.250	0.217	0.056	-0.094	-0.030	0.226	0.857	1.418
Group 3	5.070	-0.195	0.601	-0.137	0.318	0.454	0.028	0.280	0.260	0.824	2.637**
Group 4	-10.010**	-1.898**	-1.470**	-1.709**	-0.931*	-1.460**	-1.186*	-0.571	-0.875*	-0.080	0.172
Group 5	8.443	-0.223	0.281	-0.018	1.108	0.638	0.625	0.936	0.960	1.436	2.699
Group 6	Not included in the model										
n	310	310	310	310	310	310	310	310	310	310	310

Asterisks indicate significance level: ** p < 1%, * p < 5%.

Evaluated by



The
University
Of
Sheffield.

