Factors Affecting Exits From Homelessness Among Persons With Serious Mental Illness and Substance Use Disorders

Sonya Gabrielian, MD, MPH; Elizabeth Bromley, MD, PhD; Gerhard S. Hellemann, PhD;
Robert S. Kern, PhD; Nicholas I. Goldenson, BA; Megan E. Danley, BA;
and Alexander S. Young, MD, MSHS

ABSTRACT

Objective: We sought to understand the housing trajectories of homeless consumers with serious mental illness (SMI) and co-occurring substance use disorders (SUD) and to identify factors that best predicted achievement of independent housing.

Method: Using administrative data, we identified homeless persons with SMI and SUD admitted to a residential rehabilitation program from December 2008 to November 2011. Our primary outcome measure was independent housing status. On a random sample (N = 36), we assessed a range of potential predictors of housing outcomes, including symptoms, cognition, and social/community supports. We used the Residential Time-Line Follow-Back (TLFB) Inventory to gather housing histories since exiting rehabilitation and to identify housing outcomes. We used Recursive Partitioning (RP) to identify variables that best differentiated participants by these outcomes.

Results: We identified 3 housing trajectories: stable housing (n = 14), unstable housing (n = 15), and continuously engaged in housing services (n = 7). In RP analysis, 2 variables (Symbol Digit Modalities Test [SDMT], a neurocognitive speed of processing measure, and Behavior and Symptom Identification Scale [BASIS-24] Relationships subscale, which quantifies symptoms affecting relationships) were sufficient to capture information provided by 26 predictors to classify participants by housing outcome. Participants predicted to continuously engage in services had impaired processing speeds (SDMT score < 32.5). Among consumers with SDMT score ≥ 32.5, those predicted to achieve stable housing had fewer interpersonal symptoms (BASIS-24 Relationships subscale score < 0.81) than those predicted to have unstable housing. This model explains 57% of this sample's variability and 14% of this population's variability in housing outcomes.

Conclusions: Because cognition and symptoms influencing relationships predicted housing outcomes for homeless adults with SMI and SUD, cognitive and social skills training may be useful for this population.

Although substantial research explores pathways into homelessness,[1–3] few studies investigate factors influencing exits from homelessness. In particular, many homeless persons with serious mental illness (SMI) and co-occurring substance use disorders (SUD) struggle to obtain and sustain housing.[3–5] There is a dearth of knowledge about patient-level factors, eg, social supports or cognitive functioning, that may influence exits from homelessness. Moreover, the literature lacks longitudinal descriptions of housing trajectories for homeless adults.

To date, studies of social support among homeless persons focus primarily on relationships between social network members who engage in risky behaviors, eg, drug use, and these behaviors in homeless persons.[6–8] Even though social networks may influence risky activities, the impact of supports on exits from homelessness remains largely unexplored. Although Rosenheck and colleagues[9] evaluated the relationships between social capital and service integration on housing outcomes in homeless persons with SMI, analyses were performed at the community—not individual—level. That is, instead of measuring social supports of individual consumers, environmental variables and social service integration were evaluated in their communities. With these methods, higher social capital and service integration predicted better housing outcomes.[9]

In addition, although cognition—including attention, memory, executive functioning, and processing speed—is associated with social relationships and other functional outcomes among persons with SMI,[10–14] we know little about cognition among homeless adults.[14] Insofar as Schutt and colleagues found that neurocognition was related to functional outcomes among formerly homeless persons with SMI, this study was limited to individuals who had achieved stable housing.[13]

Moreover, exits from homelessness are often facilitated by clinical services. Traditionally, these services were offered along a continuum, with consumers progressing from shelters, to transitional housing, to residential treatment, and eventually to independent housing as they became adherent with mental health care.[15–17] In recent years, service paradigms grew to include "Housing First" approaches, ie, independent housing with community-based supportive services, including nonmandated treatment referrals.[18–21] Although services now span both models, we lack clinical guidelines to personalize care for consumers and appropriately allocate resources.

This article describes a study of homeless adults with SMI and SUD (N = 36) who participated in a residential rehabilitation program along the aforementioned continuum. We sought to understand the longitudinal housing trajectories of these patients and to identify modifiable patient- and environmental-level factors that best predicted achievement of independent housing, ie, successful exits

from homelessness. We use our results to suggest clinical interventions that may improve housing outcomes.

METHOD

Participants

Using the US Department of Veterans Affairs (VA), Veterans Health Administration (VHA) Medical SAS Data Set, an administrative dataset of VA health care utilization, we identified consumers admitted to the VA Greater Los Angeles' Domiciliary—a residential rehabilitation program for homeless adults—between December 1, 2008 and November 1, 2011. We restricted this dataset to individuals with ≥1 SMI diagnosis (*International Classification of Diseases* [*ICD*]-9 code for major depressive disorder, bipolar disorder, posttraumatic stress disorder [PTSD], schizophrenia, schizoaffective disorder, or psychotic disorder not otherwise specified) and ≥1 SUD diagnosis (*ICD*-9 code for alcohol or drug abuse or dependence) from an inpatient or outpatient mental health setting within a year of Domiciliary admission. Of note, individuals with cognitive disorders, eg, dementia, are not admitted to the Domiciliary.

We selected a random subsample (n = 114) of eligible participants (N = 701) to approach with letters and phone calls. Many (n = 38) could not be reached, others (n = 33) declined to participate, and a few (n = 7) expressed interest but never presented for data collection. We enrolled 36 participants. The VA Greater Los Angeles Institutional Review Board approved all study procedures.

Conceptual Framework

To study the influence of individual and environmental factors on independent housing achievement, we adapted Wilson and Cleary's conceptual framework for health-related quality of life (HRQoL) to our outcome of interest (independent housing).[22,23] Table 1 displays our model's interplay between biological and physiological factors, symptoms, functioning, and health perceptions to influence an outcome that, like HRQoL, is related to, but distinct from, health (ie, independent housing).[22]

Procedure

From November 2012 to July 2013, participants completed surveys and cognitive testing, as described below. Informed consent and data collection were performed in a single 60- to

90-minute session. Research staff also reviewed participants' electronic medical records (EMR). Diagnostic information from the EMR was also abstracted for consumers in the random subsample of eligible participants who did not enroll in the study (n = 78).

Measures

Potential predictors. Table 2 summarizes the measures used to assess potential predictors of housing outcomes. To assess demographics, participants were asked their age, gender, race/ethnicity, marital status, and highest level of education. The Domiciliary discharge summary in the EMR was used to abstract the primary SMI and SUD diagnoses for all participants and other eligible subjects in our random subsample.

Psychiatric symptoms were measured with the 24-item Behavior and Symptom Identification Scale (BASIS-24), a measure of self-reported difficulty in 6 domains (depression/functioning, interpersonal relations, psychotic symptoms, alcohol/drug use, emotional lability, and self-harm) that also provides a global symptom assessment.[24] As trauma may increase risk for homelessness,[25] we administered the 17-item PTSD Checklist-Military version (PCL-M).[26,27] Screening for alcohol and/or drug misuse was performed with the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test-Consumption Questions (AUDIT-C)[28] and the 20-item Drug Abuse Screening Test (DAST-20),[29] respectively.

In the domain of functional status, cognition was measured with 4 tests: the Hopkins Verbal Learning Test-Revised (HVLT-R),[30] Symbol Digit Modalities Test (SDMT),[31] category fluency,[32] and Trail Making Test B (TMT B).[33] These measures span a breadth of neurocognitive domains, eg, verbal fluency/learning/memory, motor/processing speeds, semantic organization, and executive functioning.

Domiciliary admission documentation in the EMR was used to identify participants who were chronically homeless,[34] ie, continuously homeless for ≥1 year or with ≥4 episodes of homelessness within the past 3 years. To assess legal history, participants reported if they had ever received a felony (yes/no) and estimated their lifetime duration of incarceration.

General health perceptions were captured with the Veterans RAND 12-item Health Survey (VR-12), which assesses perceived physical and mental health.[35,36] Perceived social support was measured with the Medical Outcomes Study-Social Support Survey (MOS-SSS),[37] and the Social Capital Resource Generator[38,39] was used to assess social network resources. As a surrogate for negative supports, stigma was measured with the Perceived Devaluation and Discrimination Scale (PDD).[40,41] Community involvement was captured with the Involvement in Community Activities Scale,[39,42] adapted from a larger Independent Living Skills Scale[42] to assess engagement in common community activities, and the Community Integration Measure,[43] which quantifies persons' sense of community belonging.

To capture use of mental health care in VA and community settings, we asked participants to estimate their number of

Table 1. Wilson and Cleary Conceptual Framework[a]

Characteristics	Factors, Status, and Perceptions	Housing Status

Individual:
    Demographics
 	
Environment:
    Social capital (positive and negative supports); community involvement; housing and mental health services
	Biological and physiological factors:
	    Diagnoses
	
	Symptom status:
	    Psychiatric symptoms; substance abuse
	
	Functional status:
	    Cognition; housing history; legal history
	
	General health perceptions:
	    Perceptions of physical health; perceptions of mental health
		• Continuously engaged in housing services;
		
		Or
		
		• With stable housing;
		
		Or
		
		• With unstable housing

[a]Based on Wilson and Cleary.[22]

Table 2. Potential Predictors of Housing Outcomes and Associated Measures

Potential Predictor	Measures
Demographics	Age; gender; race/ethnicity; marital status; highest level of education
Diagnoses	Primary serious mental illness (SMI) and substance use disorder (SUD) diagnoses were identified from the medical record.
Psychiatric symptoms	24-item Behavior and Symptom Identification Scale (BASIS-24); 17-item PTSD Checklist-Military version (PCL-M)
Substance abuse	Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test-Consumption Questions (AUDIT-C); 20-item Drug Abuse Screening Test (DAST-20)
Cognition	Hopkins Verbal Learning Test-Revised (HVLT-R); Symbol Digit Modalities Test (SDMT); category fluency; Trail Making Test B (TMT B)
Housing history	Acute vs chronic homelessness at the time of Domiciliary admission was identified from the medical record.
Legal history	Lifetime felony history (yes/no); estimated lifetime duration of incarceration
Perceptions of physical and mental health	Veterans RAND 12-item Health Survey (VR-12)
Positive social capital	Medical Outcomes Study-Social Support Survey (MOS-SSS); Social Capital Resource Generator
Negative social capital	Perceived Devaluation and Discrimination Scale (PDD)
Community involvement	Involvement in Community Activities Scale (ICAS); Community Integration Measure (CIM)
Housing and mental health services	Number of individual mental health appointments in the 6 months preceding assessment; participation in the Veteran Affairs' Housing First program (yes/no); participation in any other housing program (yes/no)

Abbreviation: PTSD = posttraumatic stress disorder.

individual mental health appointments during the preceding 6 months. To understand housing service utilization, we asked if participants engaged in the VA's Housing First initiative known as HUD-VASH, ie, the US Department of Housing and Urban Development-VA Supportive Housing program, or in any other housing program.[19]

Outcome variable. Housing trajectories from Domiciliary exit to the interview date were captured with the Residential Time-Line Follow-Back (TLFB) Inventory.[44] The TLFB gathers a retrospective event history of an individual's residences. Following Tsemberis and colleagues' protocol,[45] all residences were categorized into "stable" versus "unstable" settings.

We used the TLFB to categorize participants by their housing trajectories. We were interested in predictors of stable housing obtained outside the context of a formal housing program. That is, some participants completed the Domiciliary but required another residential rehabilitation program immediately thereafter; we viewed these successive efforts as a single, extended residential treatment program and started the event histories of these individuals at the day of discharge from the second residential program. For individuals who attempted independent housing

immediately after the Domiciliary, we started the event histories at the day of discharge.

We continued these housing trajectories to the day of data collection or, if applicable, to the date of entry into an apartment obtained through HUD-VASH. Again, we viewed HUD-VASH as a formal housing program that did not reflect a participant's ability to independently secure and maintain stable housing. Following this protocol, using the TLFB's definitions, we calculated the percentage of days that participants spent in stable housing without programmatic supports.

Analysis Plan

Using data from the TLFB, we looked for cutpoints that created mutually exclusive categories of housing outcomes. We decided to view this outcome as categorical, not continuous, given substantive differences in types of housing achieved, eg, independent housing versus chronic institutionalization, that are more clinically relevant than the percentage of days in stable housing. We used the χ^2 test and analysis of variance (ANOVA) to determine how demographic and diagnoses varied by housing outcome. Analyses were performed using Stata/SE software version 12.1.[46]

Table 3. Patient Demographics, Diagnoses, and Housing

Patient Characteristic	Stable Housing (n = 14)	Unstable Housing (n = 15)	Continuously Engaged in Housing Services (n = 7)	P Value	All Participants (N = 36)
Demographics					
Age, mean (SD), y	50.0 (8.1)	51.5 (9.3)	60.1 (7.7)	.04	52.6 (9.1)
Gender (male), n (%)	14 (100.0)	15 (100.0)	7 (100.0)	1.00	36 (100.0)
Marital status, n (%)				.04	
Single	6 (42.9)	3 (20.0)	1 (14.3)		10 (27.8)
Married	2 (14.3)	0 (0.0)	2 (28.6)		4 (11.1)
Separated	0 (0.0)	5 (33.3)	0 (0.0)		5 (13.9)
Divorced	6 (42.9)	5 (33.3)	4 (57.1)		15 (41.7)
Widowed	0 (0.0)	2 (13.3)	0 (0.0)		2 (5.6)
Race/ethnicity, n (%)				.62	
Non-Hispanic white	3 (21.4)	5 (33.3)	1 (14.3)		9 (25.0)
Non-Hispanic black	6 (42.9)	6 (40.0)	6 (85.7)		18 (50.0)
Hispanic, any race	3 (21.4)	2 (13.3)	0 (0.0)		5 (13.9)
Asian	0 (0.0)	1 (6.7)	0 (0.0)		1 (2.8)
Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander	1 (7.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)		1 (2.8)
Decline to state/other	1 (7.1)	1 (6.7)	0 (0.0)		2 (5.6)
Highest educational level, mean (SD), in grade level	13.3 (2.0)	12.0 (2.3)	12.0 (2.0)	.22	12.5 (2.2)
Diagnosis, n (%)					
Serious mental illness				.98	
Major depressive disorder	6 (42.9)	4 (26.7)	2 (28.6)		12 (33.3)
Bipolar disorder	2 (14.3)	0 (0.0)	2 (28.6)		4 (11.1)
Posttraumatic stress disorder	5 (35.7)	7 (46.7)	3 (42.9)		15 (41.7)
Psychotic disorder	1 (7.1)	2 (13.3)	1 (14.3)		4 (11.1)
Substance abuse or dependence				.06	
Alcohol	6 (42.9)	3 (20.0)	0 (0.0)		9 (25.0)
Amphetamine	0 (0.0)	2 (13.3)	0 (0.0)		2 (5.6)
Cannabis	1 (7.1)	1 (6.7)	0 (0.0)		2 (5.6)
Cocaine	2 (14.3)	2 (13.3)	0 (0.0)		4 (11.1)
Opioid	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (28.6)		2 (5.6)
Polysubstance	4 (28.6)	7 (46.7)	5 (71.4)		17 (47.2)
Housing, n (%)					
Chronically homeless at domiciliary admission	9 (64.3)	14 (93.3)	5 (71.4)	.23	28 (77.8)
HUD-VASH participation	3 (21.4)	11 (73.3)	7 (100.0)	.00	21 (58.3)
Community-based housing program participation	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1.00	0 (0.0)

Abbreviations: HUD-VASH = US Department of Housing and Urban Development-VA Supportive Housing, VA = US Department of Veterans Affairs.

We used recursive partitioning (RP) to identify which combination of potential predictors and corresponding scores best differentiated participants by these categorical housing outcomes. RP is a data mining technique that uses decision trees to predict outcomes from a group of predictor variables.[47,48] In particular, this nonparametric methodology facilitates exploration of complex and potentially overlapping predictor variables. For this analysis with 26 predictor variables, RP analysis began by independently evaluating each predictor on the categorical outcome variable. The variable and its corresponding cutpoint (or value) that best split the data into 2 subsamples of housing outcomes were selected as the first predictors, or the first 2 "branches" of a classification and regression tree (CART).[47,48]

Subsequently, this process was repeated on each of the 2 newly created subsamples, again identifying the variable and its value that best predicted the most homogeneous subsamples within each previously formed branch. Branching continued until there was no further improvement in correct differentiation of participants by housing outcome. Here, this approach aimed to simplify a complex set of 26 potential predictor variables into a few simple "if-then" rules that predicted outcomes.[47,48] These analyses were performed using the RP algorithm in the rpart package version 3.1–33 for the R language and environment.[49]

RESULTS

According to the TLFB, all participants clearly divided into 1 of 3 mutually exclusive longitudinal housing trajectories: (1) stable housing (70%–100% days in stable housing outside a housing program, n = 14), (2) unstable housing (0%–45% days in stable housing outside a housing program, n = 15), and (3) continuously engaged in housing programs (no days spent outside a housing program, n = 7). The TLFB captured participants' housing status between Domiciliary discharge and data collection, a period which averaged 2.5 years (range, 1.2–4.3 years).

Table 3 describes these groups across demographics, diagnoses, and housing histories. Participants continuously engaged in housing services were about a decade older than their peers in the other groups. All participants were men, and very few were married. Half of the participants self-identified as non-Hispanic black, and a quarter self-identified as white. Similar educational attainment was seen across groups.

Figure 1. Results of Recursive Partitioning Analyses for Classifying Consumers by Housing Trajectory[a,b]

[Figure content:]
Symbol Digit Modalities Test (SDMT)
→ Raw score < 32.5 → Continuously engaged in housing services — S: 1, U: 2, P: 6; C = 66.7%
→ Raw score ≥ 32.5 → BASIS-24 - Relationships Subscale
  → Raw score < 0.8 → Stable housing — S: 10, U: 2, P: 1; C = 76.9%
  → Raw score ≥ 0.8 → Unstable housing — S: 3, U: 11, P: 0; C = 78.6%

[a]Noted below each housing trajectory are the number of participants and their housing status. S = number of participants with stable housing. U = number of participants with unstable housing. P = number of participants with continuous engagement in housing programs. C = percentage of participants this model classified correctly.

[b]Estimation was based on 36 participants and 26 predictor variables, including: Lifetime jail/prison days; felony (yes/no); AUDIT-C (positive/negative); DAST-20 (positive/negative); BASIS-24 (overall score, depression and functioning, interpersonal problems, psychotic symptoms, alcohol or drug use, emotional lability, self-harm); PCL-M; HVLT-R; SDMT; category fluency; TMT B; VR-12 (physical health component score, mental health component score); ICAS (score out of 10 activities, overall involvement score); Social Capital Resource Generator (social network score, personal resources score); CIM; MOS-SSS; PDD; and number of outpatient mental health visits (in the 6 months preceding assessment).

Abbreviations: AUDIT-C = Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test-Consumption Questions; BASIS-24 = 24-item Behavior and Symptom Identification Scale; CIM = Community Integration Measure; DAST-20 = 20-item Drug Abuse Screening Test; HVLT-R = Hopkins Verbal Learning Test-Revised; ICAS = Involvement in Community Activities Scale; MOS-SSS = Medical Outcomes Study-Social Support Survey; PCL-M = PTSD Checklist-Military version; PDD = Perceived Devaluation and Discrimination Scale; PTSD = posttraumatic stress disorder; SDMT = Symbol Digit Modalities Test; TMT B = Trail Making Test B; VR-12 = RAND 12-item Health Survey.

Participants spanned a breadth of SMI diagnoses, similar across groups. Most participants were diagnosed with PTSD (41.7%), followed by major depressive disorder (33.3%). Among participants who achieved stable housing, most had concurrent alcohol abuse or dependence (42.9%). Among those with unstable housing and individuals continuously engaged in housing services, the most prevalent SUD diagnosis was polysubstance abuse or dependence (46.7% and 71.4%, respectively). Of note, the diagnoses of enrolled participants and other consumers approached to participate were not significantly different.

Most participants (77.8%) were chronically homeless at Domiciliary admission. Of note, most participants engaged in HUD-VASH at some point in their housing trajectory. As HUD-VASH is a housing program, time spent enrolled in this program was not included in the denominator of days spent seeking independent housing, without support. All participants continuously engaged in housing services were enrolled in HUD-VASH. No participants received housing services outside the VA.

Recursive Partitioning

In RP analyses, all measures except demographics, diagnoses, and HUD-VASH participation (viewed as nonmalleable, poor targets for intervention development) were used as potential predictors of housing trajectories. Figure 1 depicts the best possible model for these data, highlighting the 2 variables (SDMT, which measures neurocognitive speed of processing, and the BASIS-24 Relationships subscale which measures symptoms that influence interpersonal relationships) that were sufficient to capture information provided by all 26 predictors to classify participants by housing outcome.

In a normative sample of adults aged 45 to 54 years with 12 years of education, the mean SDMT raw score is 47.3 (standard deviation = 9.6).[31] In these analyses, the group predicted to remain continuously engaged in housing services had impaired processing speeds (SDMT raw score < 32.5). This cutoff score is more than 1 standard deviation below normative values and suggests marked cognitive impairment.

Among persons with SDMT scores above this cutoff (SDMT raw score ≥ 32.5), persons predicted to achieve stable housing had fewer symptoms influencing interpersonal difficulties (BASIS-24 Relationships raw score < 0.81) than those predicted to be unable to achieve stable housing (BASIS-24 Relationships raw score ≥ 0.81). In normative outpatient mental health samples (Domiciliary patients engage in outpatient mental health as they receive residential housing services), the mean and standard deviation of the

BASIS-24 Relationships score for patients are 1.2 and 0.9, respectively.[24] That is, this BASIS-24 Relationships cutoff score is better than that seen in the average outpatient consumer.

This decision tree correctly classifies 66.7% of participants continuously engaged in housing services, 76.9% of participants with stable housing, and 78.6% of participants with unstable housing (or 75% of participants overall). The model explains 57% of variance in this sample (relative error = 0.43). Based on cross-validation, it also explains 14% of variability in housing outcomes in the population at large (cross-classified standard error = 0.86).

DISCUSSION

To tailor interventions for homeless adults with SMI and SUD, we must identify predictors of achieving independent housing and factors that suggest some consumers' need for continuous housing supports. Although these findings are exploratory in light of our small sample size, this is one of the first studies of factors affecting exits from homelessness in this population. In predicting longitudinal housing trajectories among adults with SMI and SUD, these data show the potential influence of age, substance(s) misused, neurocognition, and psychiatric symptoms that affect relationships.

We found 3 key housing outcomes. A small proportion of participants simply moved sequentially from one housing program to another. Among the remaining participants, about half spent most (> 70%) of their days in independent, stable housing, while their peers struggled to achieve stable housing without support (< 45% of days in stable housing).

Participants continuously engaged in housing services were older than their peers. We query if this group had more age-related medical problems and favored more supportive settings. In addition, those with stable housing had more alcohol misuse while participants in the other groups had more polysubstance abuse/dependence. Of note, the latter diagnosis inherently includes the purchase and/or use of illicit substances, often tied with criminal-justice involvement and/or strained ties with family and friends that may influence one's ability to secure housing.

Using RP to identify malleable factors that best predicted housing outcomes, we elucidated interplay between SDMT scores and BASIS-24 Relationships subscale scores. Of note, though the SDMT reflects processing speed, it employs multiple processes, ie, perception, working memory, attention, and visuomotor coordination,[50] and is among the most sensitive tests for detecting cognitive dysfunction across a range of disorders.[48,51,52] These data suggest that, for homeless individuals with SMI and SUD, poor cognition as measured by the SDMT may be incompatible with independent housing without support.

These findings parallel other studies of functional outcomes for individuals with SMI, in which cognitive abilities are associated with employment outcomes and success in rehabilitation programs.[48,53–55] Upon the enrollment of participants into homeless programs, screening

with measures like the SDMT may help guide resource allocation. Consumers with markedly impaired processing speed may be best suited to Housing First approaches that provide long-term, community-based supports. Cognitive remediation—shown to improve response to vocational training among persons with SMI[56–58]—may have a role in homeless programs.

Although individuals with better cognition may attempt independent housing, those with symptoms that negatively affect relationships (measured by the BASIS-24 Relationships subscale score and quite likely worsened by illicit substance use in persons with polysubstance abuse/dependence) may struggle to obtain stable housing without support. To address these symptoms and potentially improve housing outcomes, these findings suggest the utility of social skills training within residential programs for homeless persons.

This study has limitations. These data are from a small, cross-sectional sample of male veterans in Los Angeles who receive VA care and may not extrapolate well to other populations. Veterans often have experiences that differ from those of civilians (eg, combat exposure), and women may have unique factors affecting exits from homelessness. Even though enrolled consumers were diagnostically similar to those who refused to participate, our sample may preferentially include persons with higher rates of institutionalization, eg, those who lived on VA grounds. Moreover, with cross-sectional data collection, participants' current housing status may cloud self-reported scores (eg, social capital, psychiatric symptoms affecting interpersonal relationships, and/or perceived health may be worsened in the context of unstable housing). To improve external validity, this study would benefit from replication in a larger, prospective study, with potential predictors of housing outcomes collected at baseline.

Although the TLFB is a valid and reliable method to assess housing outcomes among persons with SMI and SUD, its test-retest reliability for the duration of time at any given residence decreases as the time between occupancy and recall increases.[44] Housing data from shortly after Domiciliary discharge may be less reliable than more recent housing data.

In addition, given our findings on cognition as a potential predictor of housing outcomes, our assessments were limited in that we used an abbreviated neuropsychological battery.[59] We did not explore several domains that have implications for functional outcomes among individuals with SMI, such as social cognition, or the mental operations that underlie interpersonal interactions.[60,61] Future work would also benefit from inclusion of more environmental-level measures that may influence housing outcome, including low-income housing availability and the prevalence of community resources for homeless persons.

CONCLUSIONS

These data suggest that cognition—particularly speed of processing—and mental health symptoms that cause interpersonal problems are interrelated factors that affect

the attainment and retention of independent housing. As we develop and adapt services for homeless persons, cognitive remediation and social skills training may be useful considerations. Given the limited supply of Housing First resources, these data may speak to the best use of these services for cognitively impaired consumers who may be less likely to achieve stable housing without robust longitudinal supports. Future studies are needed on a prospective cohort of homeless adults to explore the relationships between specific cognitive domains and housing outcomes.

REFERENCES

1. Hamilton AB, Poza I, Washington DL. "Homelessness and trauma go hand-in-hand": pathways to homelessness among women veterans. *Womens Health Issues*. 2011;21(suppl):S203–S209.
2. Eyrich K, Pollio D. An exploration of alienation and replacement theories of social support in homelessness. *Soc Work Res*. 2003;27(4):222–231.
3. Padgett DK, Smith BT, Henwood BF, et al. Life course adversity in the lives of formerly homeless persons with serious mental illness: context and meaning. *Am J Orthopsychiatry*. 2012;82(3):421–430.
4. Kuno E, Rothbard AB, Averyt J, et al. Homelessness among persons with serious mental illness in an enhanced community-based mental health system. *Psychiatr Serv*. 2000;51(8):1012–1016.
5. Patterson M, Somers J, Moniruzzaman A. Sealing the cracks: preliminary findings from an inter-ministry initiative to address chronic homelessness in British Columbia. *J Interprof Care*. 2012;26(5):426–428.
6. Nyamathi A, Leake B, Keenan C, et al. Type of social support among homeless women: its impact on psychosocial resources, health and health behaviors, and use of health services. *Nurs Res*. 2000;49(6):318–326.
7. Rhoades H, Wenzel SL, Golinelli D, et al. The social context of homeless men's substance use. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2011;118(2–3):320–325.
8. Tucker JS, Kennedy D, Ryan G, et al. Homeless women's personal networks: implications for understanding risk behavior. *Hum Organ*. 2009;68(2):129–140.
9. Rosenheck R, Morrissey J, Lam J, et al. Service delivery and community: social capital, service systems integration, and outcomes among homeless persons with severe mental illness. *Health Serv Res*. 2001;36(4):691–710.
10. Dickerson F, Boronow JJ, Ringel N, et al. Social functioning and neurocognitive deficits in outpatients with schizophrenia: a 2-year follow-up. *Schizophr Res*. 1999;37(1):13–20.
11. Meyer MB, Kurtz MM. Elementary neurocognitive function, facial affect recognition and social-skills in schizophrenia. *Schizophr Res*. 2009;110(1–3):173–179.
12. Gold JM, Queern C, Iannone VN, et al. Repeatable battery for the assessment of neuropsychological status as a screening test in schizophrenia, 1: sensitivity, reliability, and validity. *Am J Psychiatry*. 1999;156(12):1944–1950.
13. Schutt RK, Seidman LJ, Caplan B, et al. The role of neurocognition and social context in predicting community functioning among formerly homeless seriously mentally ill persons. *Schizophr Bull*. 2007;33(6):1388–1396.
14. Cuesta MJ, Pino O, Guilera G, et al. Brief cognitive assessment instruments in schizophrenia and bipolar patients, and healthy control subjects: a comparison study between the Brief Cognitive Assessment Tool for Schizophrenia (B-CATS) and the Screen for Cognitive Impairment in Psychiatry (SCIP). *Schizophr Res*. 2011;130(1–3):137–142.
15. Desai MM, Rosenheck RA, Kasprow WJ. Determinants of receipt of ambulatory medical care in a national sample of mentally ill homeless veterans. *Med Care*. 2003;41(2):275–287.
16. McGuire J, Rosenheck R. The quality of preventive medical care for homeless veterans with mental illness. *J Healthc Qual*. 2005;27(6):26–32.
17. O'Toole TP, Conde-Martel A, Gibbon JL, et al. Health care of homeless veterans. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2003;18(11):929–933.
18. Bostic RW, Thornton RLJ, Rudd EC, et al. Health in all policies: the role of the US Department of Housing and Urban Development and present and future challenges. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2012;31(9):2130–2137.
19. O'Connell MJ, Kasprow WJ, Rosenheck RA. Differential impact of supported housing on selected subgroups of homeless veterans with substance abuse histories. *Psychiatr Serv*. 2012;63(12):1195–1205.
20. Greenwood RM, Schaefer-McDaniel NJ, Winkel G, et al. Decreasing psychiatric symptoms by increasing choice in services for adults with histories of homelessness. *Am J Community Psychol*. 2005;36(3–4):223–238.
21. Lamb HR, Bachrach LL. Some perspectives on deinstitutionalization. *Psychiatr Serv*. 2001;52(8):1039–1045.
22. Wilson IB, Cleary PD. Linking clinical variables with health-related quality of life: a conceptual model of patient outcomes. *JAMA*. 1995;273(1):59–65.
23. Zubritsky C, Abbott KM, Hirschman KB, et al. Health-related quality of life: expanding a conceptual framework to include older adults who receive long-term services and supports. *Gerontologist*. 2013;53(2):205–210.
24. Idiculla T, Speredelozzi A, Miller A. *BASIS-24 Comparison Group Report. Department of Mental Health Services Evaluation*. Boston, MA: McLean Hospital; 2005:1–14.
25. Balshem H, Christensen V, Tuepker A, et al. A critical review of the literature regarding homelessness among veterans. *VA-Evidence-based Synthesis Program Reports*. 2011;1–64. http://www.hsrd.research.va.gov/publications/esp/homelessness.cfm. Accessed November 7, 2014.
26. Blanchard EB, Jones-Alexander J, Buckley TC, et al. Psychometric properties of the PTSD Checklist (PCL). *Behav Res Ther*. 1996;34(8):669–673.
27. McDonald SD, Calhoun PS. The diagnostic accuracy of the PTSD checklist: a critical review. *Clin Psychol Rev*. 2010;30(8):976–987.
28. Bush K, Kivlahan DR, McDonell MB, et al. The AUDIT alcohol consumption questions (AUDIT-C): an effective brief screening test for problem drinking. Ambulatory Care Quality Improvement Project (ACQUIP). Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test. *Arch Intern Med*. 1998;158(16):1789–1795.
29. Yudko E, Lozhkina O, Fouts A. A comprehensive review of the psychometric properties of the Drug Abuse Screening Test. *J Subst Abuse Treat*. 2007;32(2):189–198.
30. Brandt J, Benedict RHB. *Hopkins Verbal Learning Test–Revised: Professional Manual*. Lutz, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc; 2001.
31. Smith A. *Symbol Digits Modalities Test*. Los Angeles, CA: Western Psychological Services; 1982.
32. Benton AL, Hamsher K, Sivan AB. *Multilingual Aphasia Examination*. Iowa City, IA: AJA; 1976.
33. TMT-B. *Army Individual Test Battery*. Washington, DC: War Department,

Adjutant General's Office; 1944.

34. Cortes A, Henry M, de la Cruz RJ, et al. The 2012 point-in-time estimates of homelessness: volume I of the 2012 annual homeless assessment report. 2012;1–24. https://www.hudexchange.info/resources/documents/2012ahar_pitestimates.pdf. Accessed November 7, 2014.

35. Iqbal SU, Robgers W, Selim AJ, et al. *The Veterans RAND 12-Item Health Survey (VR-12): What It Is and How It Is Used. CHQOERs VA Medical Center*. Bedford, MA: CAPP Boston University School of Public Health; 2007:1–12.

36. Selim AJ, Rogers W, Fleishman JA, et al. Updated US population standard for the Veterans RAND 12-item Health Survey (VR-12). *Qual Life Res*. 2009;18(1):43–52.

37. Sherbourne CD, Stewart AL. The MOS social support survey. *Soc Sci Med*. 1991;32(6):705–714.

38. Webber MP, Huxley PJ. Measuring access to social capital: the validity and reliability of the Resource Generator-UK and its association with common mental disorder. *Soc Sci Med*. 2007;65(3):481–492.

39. Pahwa R, Bromley E, Brekke B, et al. Relationship of community integration of persons with severe mental illness and mental health service intensity. *Psychiatr Serv*. 2014;65(6):822–825.

40. Link BG. Understanding labeling effects in the area of mental disorders: an assessment of the effects of expectations of rejection. *am sociol rev*. 1987;52(1):96–112.

41. Brohan E, Elgie R, Sartorius N, et al; GAMIAN-Europe Study Group. Self-stigma, empowerment and perceived discrimination among people with schizophrenia in 14 European countries: the GAMIAN-Europe study. *Schizophr Res*. 2010;122(1–3):232–238.

42. Wallace CJ, Liberman RP, Tauber R, et al. The independent living skills survey: a comprehensive measure of the community functioning of severely and persistently mentally ill individuals. *Schizophr Bull*. 2000;26(3):631–658.

43. McColl MA, Davies D, Carlson P, et al. The community integration measure: development and preliminary validation. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2001;82(4):429–434.

44. Tsemberis S, McHugo G, Williams V, et al. Measuring homelessness and residential stability: the Residential Time-Line Follow-Back Inventory. *J Community Psychol*. 2006;35(1):29–42.

45. Tsemberis S, Gulcur L, Nakae M. Housing First, consumer choice, and harm reduction for homeless individuals with a dual diagnosis. *Am J Public Health*. 2004;94(4):651–656.

46. Stata Statistical Software: Release 12 [computer program]. College Station, TX: Stata Corp; 2011.

47. Hellemann G, Conner BT, Anglin MD, et al. Seeing the trees despite the forest: applying recursive partitioning to the evaluation of drug treatment retention. *J Subst Abuse Treat*. 2009;36(1):59–64.

48. Kern RS, Gold JM, Dickinson D, et al. The MCCB impairment profile for schizophrenia outpatients: results from the MATRICS psychometric and standardization study. *Schizophr Res*. 2011;126(1–3):124–131.

49. Therneau TM, Atkinson B. The rpart package [internet]. http://cran.stat.ucla.edu. Accessed November 12, 2014.

50. van Hoof JJ, Jogems-Kosterman BJ, Sabbe BG, et al. Differentiation of cognitive and motor slowing in the Digit Symbol Test (DST): differences between depression and schizophrenia. *J Psychiatr Res*. 1998;32(2):99–103.

51. Dickinson D, Ramsey ME, Gold JM. Overlooking the obvious: a meta-analytic comparison of digit symbol coding tasks and other cognitive measures in schizophrenia. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2007;64(5):532–542.

52. Joy S, Fein D, Kaplan E, et al. Speed and memory in WAIS-R-NI Digit Symbol performance among healthy older adults. *J Int Neuropsychol Soc*. 2000;6(7):770–780.

53. Evans JD, Bond GR, Meyer PS, et al. Cognitive and clinical predictors of success in vocational rehabilitation in schizophrenia. *Schizophr Res*. 2004;70(2–3):331–342.

54. Bell MD, Tsang HWH, Greig T, et al. Cognitive predictors of symptom change for participants in vocational rehabilitation. *Schizophr Res*. 2007;96 (1–3):162–168.

55. McGurk SR, Mueser KT. Cognitive functioning, symptoms, and work in supported employment: a review and heuristic model. *Schizophr Res*. 2004;70(2–3):147–173.

56. Wexler BE, Bell MD. Cognitive remediation and vocational rehabilitation for schizophrenia. *Schizophr Bull*. 2005;31(4):931–941.

57. Galletly C, Rigby A. An overview of cognitive remediation therapy for people with severe mental illness. *ISRN Rehabilitation*. 2013;2013(6956):1–6.

58. McGurk SR, Mueser KT, DeRosa TJ, et al. Work, recovery, and comorbidity in schizophrenia: a randomized controlled trial of cognitive remediation. *Schizophr Bull*. 2009;35(2):319–335.

59. Hurford IM, Marder SR, Keefe RSE, et al. A brief cognitive assessment tool for schizophrenia: construction of a tool for clinicians. *Schizophr Bull*. 2011;37(3):538–545.

60. Green MF, Bearden CE, Cannon TD, et al. Social cognition in schizophrenia, part 1: performance across phase of illness. *Schizophr Bull*. 2012;38(4):854–864.

61. Horan WP, Green MF, DeGroot M, et al. Social cognition in schizophrenia, part 2: 12-month stability and prediction of functional outcome in first-episode patients. *Schizophr Bull*. 2012;38(4):865–872.

Editor's Note: We encourage authors to submit papers for consideration as a part of our Early Career Psychiatrists section. Please contact Erika F. H. Saunders, MD, at esaunders@psychiatrist.com.