

03

What makes a difference: method notes



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

June 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.

This report provides further information on methods and data sources used to create the briefing: What makes a difference.

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 4–5 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 year. 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.**

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 <http://www.outcomesstar.org.uk/using-the-star/see-the-stars/homelessness-star/>

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 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.

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.

To understand broad patterns of beneficiary progress, we created three variables based on progress as measured by the NDT and Homelessness Outcomes Star as follows:

Improved

Increase of 11 points or more on the Outcomes Star total

Decrease of 7 points or more on the NDT total

Maintained

Increase/decrease of up to 10 points on the Outcomes Star total

Increase/decrease of up to 6 points on the NDT total

Worse

Decrease of 11 points or more on the Outcomes Star total

Increase of 7 points or more on the NDT total

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 6 and 12-month follow-up. Predictor variables included in the regression models included 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 method notes for further detail on how these were created). Due to partial data, the regression models were computed using NDT data from 389 beneficiaries for baseline to 6 months and 329 for baseline to 12 months and Homelessness Outcomes Star data for 414 beneficiaries for baseline to 6 months and 310 for baseline to 12 months.

Multiple logistic regression analyses were performed to explore the association between beneficiary characteristics and leaving the programme to a positive destination. The predictor variables used were: age, sex, ethnicity, disability, the four needs (homelessness, offending, substance misuse, mental health) and the six beneficiary groups. A positive destination combined two variables (moved to other support not funded through this programme, and no longer requires support). This was compared to beneficiaries who had left with negative destinations (disengaged, died, gone to prison, excluded from the project, or unknown).

Multiple linear regression analysis (66 models) was also carried out to look at the association between the accessing eight broad categories of support (including the continuity and volume of support received) and change in beneficiaries' Homelessness Outcomes Star and NDT scores (total and individual domain scores) between baseline and 6-month follow-up. For the purposes of the analysis, access was defined as having received any type of support from that category at any point over the first three quarters. Continuity was defined as having received support in that category in all of the first three quarters. Volume was defined as the number of different types of support in a category a beneficiary had accessed at any point across the first three quarters. The number of different types of support available

within a category ranged from three types (counselling and therapies, substance misuse support, mentoring and befriending, activities), four types (social care), five types (education and training), six types (health related support), and eight types (advice and information). Due to partial data the regression models were computed using NDT data from 665 beneficiaries for access to support, 506 for volume and 675 for continuity. To show associations with the Homelessness Outcomes Star score, data was used from 633 beneficiaries for access to support, 478 for volume and 640 for continuity.

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.

Table 1: Number of defining needs

Number of needs	Frequency	Percent
Two	158	6
Three	1,211	42
Four	1,481	52
Total	2,850	100

Table 2: Combination of defining needs

Combination of needs	Frequency	Percent
All four needs	1,481	52
Three needs offending, substance misuse, mental health	625	22
Three needs homelessness, substance misuse, mental health	378	13
Other combinations of three needs	208	7
All combinations of two needs	158	6
Total	2,850	100

Table 3: Exclusions from other services

Exclusion from services	Frequency	Percent
With one exclusion or more Q1	137	13
With one exclusion or more Q4	106	10
n	1,030	–

Table 4: Destinations/reasons for leaving the programme

First destination of beneficiaries	Frequency	Percent
Client disengaged from project	652	32
No longer requires support	500	24
Moved to other support	242	12
Moved out of area	226	11
Deceased	168	8
Prison	138	7
Unknown	55	3
Other	37	2
Hospital	20	1
Excluded from project	3	<1
Total	2,041	100

Table 5: Mean change in Homelessness Outcomes Star scores from baseline to 12 month follow-up

Beneficiary group	Baseline		12 month follow-up		Change			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean change	SD	n	P value
1	64.1	14.2	66.9	21.4	2.8	15.2	30	NS
2*	27.4	9.6	39	17.9	11.6	17.4	46	<.0001
3*	24.4	7	37.6	15.6	13.2	15.6	140	<.0001
4	58.4	9.3	55.3	18.5	-3.1	19.5	39	NS
5*	29.6	10.5	44.1	17.2	14.5	17.9	22	.001
6*	38.1	8.3	46.4	17.8	8.3	17.9	105	<.0001
Total					9.3	9.3	382	

* Paired samples t tests indicating a significant difference between baseline and 12 month follow-up.

Table 6: Mean change in NDT scores from baseline to 12 month follow-up

Beneficiary group	Baseline		12 month follow-up		Change			
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean change	SD	n	P value
1	11.2	6.2	11.9	9	0.8	7.5	33	NS
2*	33.5	5.7	25.6	8.2	-7.9	8.2	51	<.0001
3*	32.8	5.3	25.2	8.3	-7.6	9.5	139	<.0001
4*	31.7	5.8	19.9	9.7	-11.3	10.6	40	<.0001
5*	31	6.2	22.3	8.3	-8.7	10.3	28	<.0001
6*	30.3	5.9	21.9	9.1	-8.2	9.1	117	<.0001
Total					-7.6	9.6	408	

* Paired samples t tests indicating a significant difference between baseline and 12 month follow-up.

Table 7: Multiple linear regression for NDT score change showing Beta coefficients and levels of significance

Predictor variables	Baseline to 6 month follow-up	P value	Baseline to 12 month follow-up	P value
Age (years)	.014	NS	-.033	NS
Sex Ref group: Female	.108	NS	1.135	NS
Ethnicity Ref group: Non-white British	1.333	NS	1.008	NS
Disability Ref group: Disabled	-.841	NS	2.798*	.008
Homelessness	1.889*	.047	Excluded due to collinearity	N/A
Offending	-1.290	NS	-1.893	NS
Substance misuse	-3.947*	.028	-3.403	NS
Mental health	2.171	NS	-.721	NS
Total number of needs	Excluded due to collinearity	-	1.352	NS
Group 1	4.402*	.036	8.825*	<.0001
Group 2	.430	NS	0.989	NS
Group 3	Not included in the model	N/A	Not included in the model	N/A
Group 4	-6.317*	<.0001	-2.426	NS
Group 5	.233	NS	-.743	NS
Group 6	-1.796	NS	-.825	NS
n	389		331	
R-squared	.120		.108	

* Linear multiple regressions indicating significant predictors of NDT change from baseline to 6 month follow-up or baseline to 12 month follow-up

Table 8: Multiple linear regression for Homelessness Outcomes Star score change showing Beta coefficients and levels of significance

Predictor variables	Baseline to 6 month follow-up	P value	Baseline to 12 month follow-up	P value
Age (years)	.62	NS	-.019	NS
Sex Ref group: Female	.155	NS	-4.701*	.019
Ethnicity Ref group: Non-white British	-.910	NS	-3.841	NS
Disability Ref group: Disabled	-.841	NS	1.360	NS
Homelessness	-1.087	NS	Excluded due to collinearity	N/A
Offending	-.761	NS	-.848	NS
Substance misuse	1.786	NS	-.365	NS
Mental health	1.560	NS	-2.330	NS
Total number of needs	Excluded due to collinearity	N/A	.375	NS
Group 1	-13.473*	<.0001	-1.060	NS
Group 2	.006	NS	1.780	NS
Group 3	Not included in the model	N/A	Not included in the model	N/A
Group 4	-13.746*	<.0001	-10.010*	<.0001
Group 5	-1.312	NS	8.443	NS
Group 6	-2.871	NS	-5.070*	.041
n	414		310	
R-squared	0.91		.111	

* Linear multiple regressions indicating significant predictors of NDT change from baseline to 6 month follow-up or baseline to 12 month follow-up

Table 9: Average total Homelessness Outcome Star scores over time

Sample point	Mean (tracked to 18 month follow-up)	Mean (tracked to 12 month follow-up)
Baseline	32	33
6 month follow-up	40	41
12 month follow-up	43	44
18 month follow-up	46	–
n	342	726

Table 10: Average total NDT scores over time

Sample point	Mean (tracked to 18 month follow-up)	Mean (tracked to 12 month follow-up)
Baseline	32	31
6 month follow-up	26	26
12 month follow-up	24	23
18 month follow-up	23	–
n	425	816

Table 11: Support service use in quarter 1

Support accessed	Frequency	Percent
Advice and information - housing	1,113	68
Health related – GP	1,021	62
Advice and information – addictions	952	58
Substance misuse support – contact with substance misuse support worker	761	46
Advice and information – legal/criminal justice	617	38
Advice and information – money and debt	586	36
Advice and information – care and personal support	500	30
Personalised budget	442	27
Advice and information – welfare rights	379	23
Health related – community mental health support	334	20
Health related - out-patient treatment	238	15
Education and training – life skills (budgeting/cooking etc.)	232	14
Health related – in-patient treatment	198	12
Counselling/therapies – counselling	186	11
Social care – social work	165	10
Health related – community nursing	154	9
Advice and information – careers	126	8
Substance misuse support – detox	129	8
Health related – self-help and support group attendance	132	8
Activities – arts, culture and libraries	121	7
Mentoring and befriending – peer mentoring	93	6

Table 11: Support service use in quarter 1 (continued)

Support accessed	Frequency	Percent
Activities – sports and fitness	96	6
Social care – day centre	100	6
Education and training – literacy & numeracy	78	5
Education and training – behavioural (e.g. assertiveness)	87	5
Counselling/therapies – psychotherapy	63	4
Mentoring and befriending – befriending	72	4
Education and training – educational course leading to qualification	60	4
Substance misuse support – rehabilitation	58	4
Counselling/therapies – Cognitive Behavioural Therapy	53	3
Mentoring and befriending – other mentoring	55	3
Activities – worship and faith related	56	3
Social care – residential or nursing care and home	49	3
Advice and information – immigration	26	2
Education and training – work experience placement	32	2
Social care – occupational therapy	33	2
n	1,643	–

Table 12: Banded change in Homelessness Outcomes Star total score baseline to 6 month follow-up and by baseline to 12 month follow-up

Baseline to 12 month follow-up	Baseline to 6 month follow-up		
	Worse	Maintaining	Improving
Worse	55%	7%	4%
Maintaining	27%	60%	21%
Improving	18%	33%	75%
n	56	391	279

Table 13: Banded change in NDT total score baseline to 6 month follow-up and by baseline to 12 month follow-up

Baseline to 12 month follow-up	Baseline to 6 month follow-up		
	Worse	Maintaining	Improving
Worse	60%	6%	<1%
Maintaining	34%	59%	21%
Improving	6%	36%	79%
n	35	434	341

Table 14: Destination and groups

Groups	Positive move on		Still engaged		Negative destination		Total in groups	
	Freq	Perc	Freq	Perc	Freq	Perc	N	Perc
1	23	36	20	32	20	32	63	100
2	26	20	55	43	48	37	129	100
3*	70	23	99	33	130	44	299	100
4*	38	44	25	29	24	27	87	100
5	13	22	21	36	24	42	58	100
6	72	29	93	37	84	34	249	100

The column proportion test shows:

* Group 3 are significantly more likely to have a negative destination than a positive move on ($p=.028$).

* Group 4 are significantly more likely to have a positive move on than to still be engaged ($p=.013$) or have a negative destination ($p=.004$).

Table 15: Multiple logistic regression analyses showing the association between of different characteristics and a positive destination

Predictor	Odds ratio Group 1 removed	P value
Age (years)	.997	NS
Sex Ref group: Female	.527*	.023
Ethnicity Ref group: Non-white British	1.127	NS
Disability Ref group: Disabled	.606	NS
Homelessness	.833	NS
Offending	.524	NS
Substance misuse	.247	NS
Mental health	.684	NS
Total number of needs	Excluded due to collinearity	N/A

Table 15: Multiple logistic regression analyses showing the association between of different characteristics and a positive destination (continued)

Predictor	Odds ratio Group 1 removed	P value
Group 1	Not included in the model	N/A
Group 2	.526	NS
Group 3	.390	NS
Group 4	.649	NS
Group 5	.539	NS
Group 6	.670	NS
n	262	–
Positive destination n	124	–
Did not have positive destination n	138	–
Cox & Snell R-squared	.076	–

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

This analysis was performed six times with a different group removed from the analysis each time (only the group 1 removed statistics are reported here). In all repetitions males were found to be significantly more likely than females to have a positive move on.

Table 16: Those with a mental health need who accessed therapies at least once in Q1 and over the first year (by end of Q4)

Those with a mental health need who accessed relevant support	Frequency	Percent
Accessed support at Q1	205	17
Accessed support by Q4	448	38
n	1,193	–

Table 17: Those with a substance misuse need who accessed specialist support at least once in Q1 and over the first year (by end of Q4)

Those with a substance misuse need who accessed relevant support	Frequency	Percent
Accessed support at Q1	829	57
Accessed support by Q4	1,181	81
n	1,455	–

Table 18: Beneficiaries refused access to a service

Refused a service(s)	Frequency	Percent
Refused at Q1	137	9
Refused at Q4	106	6
n	1,060	–

Table 19: Those with reoffending need / recent contact with criminal justice system who accessed related advice and information at least once in Q1 and over the first year (by end of Q4)

Those with a reoffending need who accessed relevant support	Frequency	Percent
Accessed support at Q1	605	49
Accessed support by Q4	932	76
n	1,230	–

Table 20: Those who are homeless who accessed related advice and information at least once in Q1 and over the first year (by end of Q4)

Those who are homeless and who accessed relevant support	Frequency	Percent
Accessed support at Q1	1,193	69
Accessed support by Q4	1,533	89
n	1,721	–

Table 21: Multiple linear regression analyses showing support use and change in NDT assessment scores – Beta coefficients for baseline to six month follow-up

See pages 8–9 for explanation of accessing, volume and continuous support.

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
Advice and information											
Accessing (n=665)	-0.003	-0.046	-0.037	-0.039	-0.006	0.030	-0.015	0.020	-0.022	0.009	0.056
Volume (n=506)	0.114*	0.133*	0.127*	0.083*	0.033	0.027	0.090	0.111	0.036*	0.046	0.089
Continuous (n=675)	0.053*	0.106*	0.038	0.046	0.085	-0.031	0.049	0.071	0.003	0.046	0.43
Counselling/therapies											
Accessing (n=665)	-0.006	0.036	0.009	-0.020	0.037	-0.043	0.021	0.046	-0.097	-0.028	0.022
Volume (n=506)	-0.003	0.010	0.015	0.006	-0.020	-0.034	0.064	0.050	-0.078	-0.007	0.010
Continuous (n=675)	-0.009	-0.024	-0.003	-0.021	0.065	-0.030	-0.005	0.045	-0.044*	0.013	-0.008
Mentoring and befriending											
Accessing (n=665)	-0.015	-0.041	0.012	0.020	-0.045	-0.010	0.031	0.003	-0.004	-0.009	-0.003
Volume (n=506)	0.054	-0.003	0.044	0.055	0.025	0.025	0.089	0.053	0.025	0.010	0.033
Continuous (n=675)	0.052	0.001	0.052	0.022	0.320	0.058	0.028	0.041	0.049	-0.001	-0.008

Table 21: Multiple linear regression analyses showing support use and change in NDT assessment scores – Beta coefficients for baseline to six month follow-up (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
Education and training											
Accessing (n=665)	0.003	0.009	0.052	-0.030	-0.008	-0.012	0.035	0.055	-0.047	-0.021	0.024
Volume (n=506)	0.042	0.061	0.047	-0.013	-0.007	0.026	0.062	0.050	-0.026	-0.022	0.111
Continuous (n=675)	0.091*	0.032	0.093**	0.037	0.002	0.055	0.092**	0.090	0.047	0.048	0.055*
Substance misuse support											
Accessing (n=665)	-0.058	0.002	-0.006	-0.022	-0.004	-0.114**	-0.074*	-0.052	-0.022	-0.044	0.017
Volume (n=506)	-0.056*	0.000	-0.004	-0.060	-0.043	-0.054	-0.007	-0.031	-0.113**	-0.033	0.040
Continuous (n=675)	-0.010	0.038	0.001	-0.008	-0.243	-0.042	0.000	0.005	-0.017	0.025	0.039
Activities											
Accessing (n=665)	0.002	0.022	0.060	-0.049	-0.003	0.023	-0.012	0.027	-0.062	-0.032	0.032
Volume (n=506)	-0.001	0.019	0.024	-0.035	-0.012	0.027	-0.030	-0.007	-0.033	-0.055	0.072
Continuous (n=675)	0.008	0.016	-0.001	-0.044	-0.035	0.033	-0.001	0.008	0.032	-0.025	-0.009
Social care											
Accessing (n=665)	0.053	0.031	0.065	0.019	0.049	0.034	0.027	0.051	-0.009	-0.002	0.051
Volume (n=506)	0.049	0.052	0.016	-0.001	0.048	-0.005	0.038	0.057	0.073	0.020	0.019
Continuous (n=675)	0.063	0.045	0.036	-0.010	0.496	0.022	0.033	0.049	0.085*	0.021	0.003

Table 21: Multiple linear regression analyses showing support use and change in NDT assessment scores – Beta coefficients for baseline to six month follow-up (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
Health related											
Accessing (n=665)	-0.011	-0.080*	-0.027	-0.052	0.003	0.053	-0.019	0.033	-0.050	0.024	-0.012
Volume (n=506)	0.082	0.041	0.052	0.005	0.042	0.080*	0.106	0.070	-0.060	0.057	0.090
Continuous (n=675)	-0.004	-0.001	-0.011	-0.066*	0.236	-0.021	0.002	0.016	-0.036	0.029	-0.024

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

Table 22: Multiple linear regression analyses showing support use and change in Homelessness Outcomes Star scores – Beta coefficients for baseline to 6 month follow-up

See pages 8–9 for explanation of accessing, volume and continuous support.

Type of support	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
Advice and information support											
Accessing (n=633)	0.017	0.060	0.011	0.008	0.028	0.019	0.042	0.021	0.002	-0.025	-0.024
Volume (n=478)	0.061	0.085	-0.015	0.043	0.058	0.035	0.053	0.033	0.036	0.064	0.057
Continuous (n=640)	0.005	0.015	-0.054	-0.005	0.026	0.009	0.075	-0.009	0.012	-0.029	0.010
Counselling											
Accessing (n=633)	0.099	0.096	0.024	0.068	0.079	0.039	0.067	0.146**	0.133*	0.058	0.041
Volume (n=478)	0.104*	0.093	0.009	0.066*	0.058	0.027	0.057	0.134**	0.169**	0.068	0.096*
Continuous (n=640)	0.068	0.068	0.039	0.012	0.055	-0.012	0.039	0.053	0.156**	0.022	0.075**

Table 22: Multiple linear regression analyses showing support use and change in Homelessness Outcomes Star scores – Beta coefficients for baseline to 6 month follow-up (continued)

Type of support	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
Mentoring and befriending											
Accessing (n=633)	0.110	0.098	0.094	0.028	0.118	0.063	0.107	0.079	0.086	0.058	0.080
Volume (n=478)	0.012	0.029	0.024	-0.021	0.023	0.003	0.003	-0.003	0.046	-0.005	-0.004
Continuous (n=640)	-0.004	0.005	0.003	0.001	-0.014	-0.004	0.006	-0.031	0.062	-0.009	-0.041
Education and training											
Accessing (n=633)	0.088	0.061	0.061	0.038	0.091	0.067	0.089	0.069	0.083	0.024	0.067
Volume (n=478)	0.021	0.023	-0.005	-0.068*	0.040	0.007	0.047	0.052	0.074	-0.048*	0.044
Continuous (n=640)	0.020	0.030	0.033	-0.022	0.034	-0.013	0.027	0.020	0.104	-0.036	-0.007
Substance misuse support											
Accessing (n=633)	0.105*	0.057	0.057	0.107*	0.096*	0.112**	0.127**	0.073	0.045	0.100*	0.010
Volume (n=478)	0.212*	0.107*	0.094	0.226**	0.195**	0.198**	0.168**	0.172**	0.192**	0.164**	0.079
Continuous (n=640)	0.094*	0.058	0.040	0.089*	0.089*	0.080*	0.059	0.037	0.086*	0.095**	0.058
Activities support											
Accessing (n=633)	0.074	0.046	0.008	0.059	0.078	0.085	0.044	0.072	0.070	0.091	0.001
Volume (n=478)	0.020	0.002	-0.004	0.032	0.034	0.014	0.007	0.026	0.024	0.067	-0.042
Continuous (n=640)	0.010	0.027	0.004	0.010	-0.004	-0.054	0.013	0.029	0.013	0.063	-0.021

Table 22: Multiple linear regression analyses showing support use and change in Homelessness Outcomes Star scores – Beta coefficients for baseline to six month follow up (continued)

Type of support	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
Social care											
Accessing (n=633)	0.006	0.037	0.014	-0.005	0.026	0.011	0.023	-0.016	0.034	0.028	-0.084*
Volume (n=478)	0.041	0.029	0.009	0.017	0.056	0.012	0.058	-0.017	0.080	0.047	0.016
Continuous (n=640)	0.009	-0.008	-0.014	-0.006	0.026	-0.010	0.022	-0.002	0.071	0.003	-0.007
Health related											
Accessing (n=633)	0.010	0.037	0.019	-0.008	0.006	-0.026	0.004	0.016	-0.007	0.024	0.008
Volume (n=478)	0.052	0.026	0.049	0.037	0.074	0.042	0.042	0.056	0.065	0.009	0.003
Continuous (n=640)	-0.018	-0.021	0.003	-0.041	-0.007	-0.024	-0.015	0.033	0.025	-0.025	-0.045

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

Evaluated by



The
University
Of
Sheffield.

