Final Report

Peer Reviewed

Supportive housing to address homelessness

authored by

Cameron Parsell, Ornella Moutou, Eduardo Lucio and Sharon Parkinson

for the

Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute

at The University of Queensland

May 2015

AHURI Final Report No. 240

ISSN: 1834-7223

ISBN: 978-1-922075-87-1

AHURI

Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute

Authors	Parsell, Cameron	The University of Queensland
	Moutou, Ornella	The University of Queensland
	Lucio, Eduardo	The University of Queensland
	Parkinson, Sharon	Swinburne University of Technology
Title	Supportive housing to address homelessness	
ISBN	978-1-922075-87-1	
Format	PDF	
Key words	Supportive housing, single-site housing with onsite support, homelessness, safety, individual change	
Editor	Anne Badenhorst	AHURI National Office
Publisher	Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute Melbourne, Australia	
Series	AHURI Final Report; no. 240	
ISSN	1834-7223	
Preferred citation	Parsell, C., Moutou, O., Lucio, E. and Parkinson, S. (2015) *Supportive housing to address homelessness,* AHURI Final Report No.240. Melbourne: Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute. Available from: <http://www.ahuri.edu.au/publications/projects/21024>. [*Add the date that you accessed this report*: DD MM YYYY].	

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This material was produced with funding from the Australian Government and the Australian state and territory governments. AHURI Limited gratefully acknowledges the financial and other support it has received from these governments, without which this work would not have been possible.

AHURI comprises a network of university Research Centres across Australia. Research Centre contributions, both financial and in-kind, have made the completion of this report possible.

The research team is profoundly grateful for the significant support provided by the three housing organisations to enable this research, these three housing organisations are: Common Ground Tasmania, Yarra Community Housing, and 4walls. All three organisations facilitated access to tenants and providers of supportive housing. The three supportive housing organisations contributed to this research out of a desire to assist in the development of evidence to inform supportive housing models and to enhance the experiences of tenants. This research would not have been possible without their support.

We are also grateful for the assistance provided by Dr Rebecca Coates and Elizabeth Shaw for work provided in the initial stages of this project. Thank you also to the assistance provided by Professor Michele Haynes.

AHURI FINAL REPORT SERIES

AHURI Final Reports is a refereed series presenting the results of original research to a diverse readership of policy-makers, researchers and practitioners.

PEER REVIEW STATEMENT

An objective assessment of all reports published in the AHURI Final Report Series by carefully selected experts in the field ensures that material of the highest quality is published. The AHURI Final Report Series employs a double-blind peer review of the full Final Report where anonymity is strictly observed between authors and referees.

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES ..... **V**
ACRONYMS ..... **VI**
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY **1**
1 INTRODUCTION **5**
1.1 Policy and practice context 7
1.1.1 Support and homelessness 7
1.1.2 Support and social housing 8
1.1.3 Support into and sustaining private rental tenancies 10
1.1.4 Policy and practice overview 10
1.2 Supportive housing and the research evidence 11
1.3 Research design 12
1.3.1 Tenant qualitative interviews 12
1.3.2 Supportive housing provider qualitative interviews 13
1.3.3 Tenant surveys 14
1.3.4 Survey design 14
1.3.5 Logistic regression analysis 16
1.3.6 Survey respondents 16
2 WHAT CONSTITUTES SUPPORTIVE HOUSING? **18**
2.1 Introduction 18
2.1.1 Purposeful housing for the most vulnerable 18
2.2 Support 20
2.2.1 Support to address need 21
2.2.2 Support to be a good tenant 23
2.2.3 Support towards independence and self-determination 24
2.2.4 Support, disengaging and self-determination 29
2.2.5 A mechanism for positive life change: life beyond and after supportive housing 33
2.2.6 A theory of human change 37
2.3 Conclusion 38
3 TENANTS' RATINGS AND OUTCOMES IN SUPPORTIVE HOUSING **39**
3.1 Satisfaction with housing 39
3.2 Housing preferences 43
3.3 Social support, socialising with neighbours and social participation 45
3.4 Health and life satisfaction 51
3.5 Regression discussion 54
3.6 Satisfaction with Quality of Life (SWLS) 54
3.6.1 Social support from neighbours 55
3.6.2 Satisfaction with housing 55
3.6.3 Life satisfaction 56
3.7 Conclusion 56

4 TENANT EXPERIENCES IN SUPPORTIVE HOUSING 58
4.1 Introduction 58
4.2 Community 58
4.2.1 Positive communities 59
4.2.2 Negative communities 63
4.3 The role of support 65
4.3.1 Support to enable supportive housing to function 66
4.3.2 Supportive housing to achieve positive life changes 70
4.3.3 Supportive housing as a stepping stone to beyond 74
4.4 Conclusion 77
5 CONCLUSION 79
5.1 Supportive housing located within, and a response to, existing options 79
5.1.1 Security and safety 80
5.1.2 Security and scrutiny 80
5.1.3 Support as interactional 81
5.1.4 Single-site supportive housing to transform lives 81
5.2 Policy implications 83
REFERENCES 85
APPENDICES 92
Appendix 1: Social participation preferences 92
Appendix 2: Logistic regression tables 93
Appendix 3: Survey 97

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Housing preferences 15
Table 2: Survey respondents 17
Table 3: Pleased, settled and satisfied with overall housing 41
Table 4: Design, privacy, security, affordability and size 42
Table 5: Housing preferences 44
Table 6: Social support and socialising with neighbours 46
Table 7: Social participation frequencies 49
Table 8: General health 51
Table 9: Perceived impact of housing 52
Table 10: Housing and quality of life 53
Table 11: Satisfaction with Life Scale: guidelines for interpreting scores 54
Table 12: Tenants' satisfaction with life scores compared to Australian adults 55

ACRONYMS

AHURI	Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute Limited
AH	Affordable Housing tenants
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
SAAP	Supported Accommodation Assistance Program
SH	Supported Housing tenants
SWLS	Satisfaction with Life Scale
VI	Vulnerability Index

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction and background

Initially originating in the field of mental health and disability, supportive housing has come to represent an important component in contemporary efforts to end homelessness in Australia and abroad. With its eclectic evolution across disciplinary boundaries, supportive housing encompasses an array of service models that seek to integrate the provision of affordable ongoing housing and support to different target groups with varying strengths and vulnerabilities.

We conceptualise supportive housing as any package of assistance that aims to assist tenants with a broad range of health and other aspects of their lives including access to and sustaining of affordable tenancies. Affordable tenancies can be in social housing or the private rental sector, although in the contemporary Australian context most approaches to supportive housing rely on social housing. This definition includes supportive housing in either scattered-site housing with outreach support or single-site housing with onsite support. The support provided can vary from low through to high intensity, but extends beyond one off, short-term or time-determined transitional engagement. The level and intensity of support is voluntary and determined by the tenant; the provision of tenancy and support services are integrated, but decoupled in that accessing housing is not contingent upon accessing support or complying with the requirements of support providers.

Both the majority of the evidence generated about the effectiveness of support housing and the research advocating for the critical features of supportive housing are predominantly based on literature from North America. The international literature demonstrates that normality and permanence of housing, together with tenant autonomy and self-determination, are critical features of supportive housing (Parsell & Moutou 2014). There is a critical need to advance our understanding of whether supportive housing in Australia is based on similar philosophical premises (more or less autonomy, normality, permanence) and whether it is directed toward different groups of people.

Aim and research questions

This research makes a significant conceptual and empirical contribution to the broader debate and scholarship on supportive housing by examining the contemporary Australian response to the needs of people with experiences of, and particularly those exiting from, homelessness. Informed directly by the emergence of supportive housing as a response to homelessness, on the one hand, and ambiguity and debate about what constitutes supportive housing, on the other, this project aims to examine the nature of supportive housing for people with experiences of homelessness. Specifically the project addresses five research questions:

1. What characterises single-site supportive housing with onsite support, what are the problems that it intends to address, what does it intend to achieve, and what are the underlying assumptions?
2. How is single-site supportive housing with onsite support operationalised in practice, particularly in terms of the integration of support/social assistance and housing?
3. From the perspectives of tenants and service providers, what are the critical factors or program elements contributing to or mediating success in single-site supportive housing with onsite support?
4. What types of housing do people prefer, and how do they rate different types of supportive housing?

5. What housing, wellbeing and social connections/engagement outcomes do residents of different models report, and for what types of households are the different forms of supportive housing effective?

In addressing the research questions, this research first demonstrates how key principles and practices of supportive housing are not entirely new to Australia. We demonstrate how the contemporary approaches to supportive housing as a response to homelessness build on, are similar to, and different from, other initiatives to link support to housing and accommodation. Past policies have been influenced by numerous but often consistent drivers, such as the right to housing, deinstitutionalisation, tenancy sustainment, the need to manage anti-social behaviour, and to achieve 'joined up' responses across social housing and human service providers.

More recently, a key influence on both policy and practice has been the cumulative evidence base on the social and economic effectiveness of supportive housing models over crisis and transitional responses in the context of international goals to end homelessness (Hannigan & Wagner 2003; Johnson et al. 2012; Parsell et al. 2013). Although Australia's move toward supportive housing is not on the scale experienced in the United States, in both countries supportive housing is firmly embedded within a policy and practice framework of targeting people deemed most vulnerable in the homeless population and achieving permanent housing and support solutions.

The study

The research project is informed by a mixed methods approach to data collection. A quantitative survey was completed by tenants of scattered-site and single-site supportive housing (n=102). Qualitative interviews were also conducted with both tenants (n=28) and tenancy and support providers (n=22). The qualitative component of the study focused exclusively on single-site supportive housing with onsite support. The research design aimed to gather a broad perspective on different approaches to supportive housing; based on emerging data from the survey and the contemporary policy importance of single-site supportive housing, the qualitative component of the study involved a more in-depth examination of single-site supportive housing with onsite support.

Key findings

- Tenants of single-site supportive housing with onsite support are deemed to be highly vulnerable because of life experiences, such as trauma and dysfunctional families. Supportive housing is a mechanism to address and assist tenants overcome the disadvantages, often life-long, that had made them eligible for supportive housing in the first place.
- Supportive housing, as characterised by supportive housing providers, is more than helping tenants successfully make the transition into housing after exiting homelessness. Support is a deliberate means to help tenants become *good tenants*. Being a good tenant meant being a good neighbour, keeping one's property clean, paying rent, and in the context of single-site supportive housing or other forms of high density living, being a good tenant meant behaving pro-socially in communal areas.
- Support is delivered in supportive housing to not only modify tenant behaviour to ensure the day-to-day function of supportive housing buildings, but also as an end toward creating positive changes that would last and benefit people outside and beyond supportive housing. Support, in all the forms it assumed, was not fundamentally about support providers doing practical things for the tenant. Rather, support was unanimously presented as a practice mechanism for tenants to take greater control over the day-to-day functioning of their own lives. Support aimed to assist tenants to develop independent living skills.

- Support as an intervention to enable disadvantaged people to become independent from support services (ultimately) can be seen as a form of empowerment and normalisation. Support and supportive housing are seen as aspirational and optimistic interventions whereby they will enact change so that tenants no longer require the specialised support and housing. Thus, even though intervention is initially premised on tenant dysfunction and limited capacity, the intention of the intervention is to enable tenants to become functional and then to access normal housing. The transformation that is intended after supportive housing is premised on people having a right to live positively and to flourish.
- Tenants of supportive housing are active participants who express agency; through their actions and the dynamic relationships with neighbours and support and housing workers, tenants play determining roles in constructing the nature of supportive housing. Supportive housing is not a passive resource, but rather it is shaped and constituted by the experiences of the people who live in and deliver the supportive housing services.
- Consistent with formal intentions and the assertions of professionals delivering supportive housing services, tenants both desired socialising and activities-based communities in supportive housing and for many, they experienced supportive housing as positive communities they desired.
- Supportive housing, and specifically, the support provided by supportive housing staff, coincided with positive life changes. Tenants not only described making a diverse range of life improvements in supportive housing, they also attributed their positive life changes to supportive housing.
- For some tenants, the life changes enabled through supportive housing were envisioned as part of a project of further progression. Tenants, consistent with supportive housing service providers, saw the stable and secure supportive housing as a stepping stone to life beyond supportive housing.
- The security and stability afforded to tenants because of the long-term nature of the housing provided was central to their progression to a state where they could think about subsequent life improvements.

Policy implications

Based on the evidence generated in this research, there are six key policy implications that follow:

1. Single-site supportive housing with onsite support is one form of supportive housing. It works well for people who have experienced chronic homelessness and negative housing and other outcomes in dominant forms of housing and homeless accommodation. From the perspective of those who live and work in single-site supportive housing with onsite support, it is effective and desirable because it was safe. Tenants who identified the significance of safety invariably identified the threats or experiences of violence, intimidation and danger living outside single-site supportive housing with onsite support. Single-site supportive housing with onsite support thus represented a means for people to achieve safety, because other modes of housing or accommodation have not provided them safety.
2. The single-site supportive housing with onsite support was successful in enabling people with chronic experiences of homelessness and support needs to immediately access housing, and to sustain housing for at least 18 months. People who self-reported having experienced long exclusions from housing and limited capacities to sustain housing, identified the coupling of support with affordable housing as important for them to keep housing.
3. People with chronic experiences of homelessness, who also have needs for support, can access and sustain housing, without the need for interventions to prepare them for housing.

4. If the provision of housing is intended to help people with chronic experiences of homelessness to both overcome non-housing problems and to develop communities and informal networks of support, the allocation of housing and the dynamics of neighbours is important to consider. Tenants desire to socialise, support and be supported by their neighbours. These networks are important to contribute to sustainable housing. On the other hand, networks and socialising among neighbours can also undermine recovery efforts and contribute to or exacerbate personal problems.
5. The provision of supportive housing, be it single-site supportive housing with onsite support or scattered-site supportive housing with support provided through outreach, must be premised on the acknowledgment that tenants actively constituted the nature of supportive housing, including whether it works well or does not work well. The evidence in this research indicates that support is effective when it is a practical resource to address problems, when barriers to access support are removed, and when support is sufficiently broad to make opportunities available for tenants to exercise choices.
6. Supportive housing is an important and justified means to purposefully improve the lives of tenants, and it has the potential of success, when:
    - → Tenure arrangements are provided so tenants feel they have the opportunity to feel secure. There is no evidence to suggest that limiting housing provision based on time will help tenants achieve positive change. If state housing authorities are interested in tenants moving on from social housing (supportive housing as a form of social housing), then this objective will arguably be best achieved if tenants are provided with opportunities to improve their lives, and then to leave of their own volition.
    - → Tenants determine the nature of the changes they want to make. Although we could reach consensus that chronic homelessness and the material and social exclusion associated with it are negative, there is and there ought not to be a consensus on what constitutes a positive life, or the improvements that tenants ought to aspire. Supportive housing has a significant role to play when it provides the resources and opportunities for tenants to reach a stage where they can identify the life trajectories and life changes they want to achieve.
    - → If supportive housing does intend to play a role in realising the positive life changing aspirations articulated by both tenants and supportive housing providers, the qualitative data in this research, consistent with longitudinal research literature, indicates that many changes will take significant time to realise. More importantly, realisation of positive life changes for people allocated housing because of high vulnerability among a population of already vulnerable people, will require significant resources and skilled practitioners. Overcoming trauma, cumulative disadvantage, or even access to the labour market for people who have been excluded for multiple years, is complex.

1 INTRODUCTION

Initially originating in the field of mental health and disability, supportive housing has come to represent an important component in contemporary efforts to end homelessness in Australia and abroad. With its eclectic evolution across disciplinary boundaries, supportive housing encompasses an array of service models that seek to integrate the provision of affordable ongoing housing and support to different target groups with varying strengths and vulnerabilities. From this simple definition, however, we can discern little about how and under what conditions integrating housing and support is achieved, what contributes to its success, and indeed what successful supportive housing is intended to achieve.

In part, the limitations in our knowledge base are a product of the conflation between the terms 'supportive housing', 'supported housing', 'permanent supportive housing' or 'housing first', to name but a few. Within the literature it is difficult to discern how the distinction in terms relate to different forms of practice (Tabol et al. 2010). Moreover, although the sentiments underpinning the service model labels of 'permanent supportive housing' and 'housing first' are intuitively appealing, they remain problematic in practice given the distinct institutional arrangements that shape opportunities for ongoing security of tenure in Australia. As most rental properties, including social housing, have time-limited leases, permanent housing is somewhat of a misnomer.

Further, given the delays in being able to access housing, it is likely that individuals will move through some form of temporary accommodation or living arrangement prior to being housed so housing first in its literal definition is rarely achievable (Johnson et al. 2012). In addition to the institutional and housing supply challenges of immediate access to long-term housing, apart from specialised programs for people with psychiatric disabilities such as the Housing and Accommodation Support Initiative (Bruce et al. 2012), there is insufficient connection between housing, health and community organisations to deliver ongoing support services to tenants.

In this report our preferred term is supportive housing. We conceptualise supportive housing as any package of assistance that aims to assist tenants with a broad range of health and other aspects of their lives including access to and sustaining of affordable tenancies. Affordable tenancies can be in social housing or the private rental sector, although in the contemporary Australian context most approaches to supportive housing rely on social housing. This definition includes supportive housing in either scattered-site housing with outreach support or single-site housing with onsite support. The support provided can vary from low through to high intensity but extends beyond one off, short-term or time-determined transitional engagement. The level and intensity of support is voluntary and determined by the tenant. The provision of tenancy and support services are integrated into a model (of supportive housing), but decoupled in that accessing housing is not contingent upon accessing support or complying with the requirements of support providers.

To advance theoretical and practical development of supportive housing as a model and to build collective practice wisdom, authors such as Tabol, Drebing and Rosenheck (2010) argue for greater clarity on the unifying elements that distinguish supportive housing models from other service responses. The body of existing peer reviewed literature on supportive housing is based on empirical research conducted in the United States and to a lesser extent the United Kingdom and Europe.

The existing literature canvassed in the positioning paper revealed ongoing debates about the form of housing, type of support, and degree of integration that characterises supportive housing (Parsell & Moutou 2014). Support closely linked to housing can be, for example, a response to the needs of older people, young people, people with physical disabilities, people with intellectual disabilities, people with psychiatric illnesses (Bleasdale 2007), and people with

experiences of homelessness. The latter group, notwithstanding recognition of the non-discrete nature of these categories, has recently been identified in Australia as requiring supportive housing. The international literature demonstrates that normality and permanence of housing, together with tenant autonomy and self-determination, are critical features of supportive housing (Parsell & Moutou 2014). There is a critical need to advance our understanding of whether supportive housing in Australia is based on similar philosophical premises (more or less autonomy, normality, permanence) and whether it is directed toward different groups of people.

This research makes a significant conceptual and empirical contribution to the broader debate and scholarship on supportive housing models by examining the contemporary Australian response to the needs of people with experiences of, and particularly those exiting from, homelessness. Informed directly by the emergence of supportive housing as a response to homelessness, on the one hand, and ambiguity and debate about what constitutes supportive housing, on the other, this project aims to examine the nature of supportive housing for people with experiences of homelessness. Specifically the project addresses five research questions:

1. What characterises single-site supportive housing with onsite support, what are the problems that it intends to address, what does it intend to achieve, and what are the underlying assumptions?
2. How is single-site supportive housing with onsite support operationalised in practice, particularly in terms of the integration of support/social assistance and housing?
3. From the perspectives of tenants and service providers, what are the critical factors or program elements contributing to or mediating success in single-site supportive housing with onsite support?
4. What types of housing do people prefer, and how do they rate different types of supportive housing?
5. What housing, wellbeing and social connections/engagement outcomes do residents of different models report, and for what types of households are the different forms of supportive housing effective?

As described later in the chapter, the research questions are addressed through a quantitative survey with tenants and qualitative interviews with both tenants and supportive housing providers. The survey was informed by tenants who resided in scattered-site supportive housing with support provided through outreach, and tenants living in single-site supportive housing with onsite support. With significant Commonwealth and state government funding along with philanthropic financial support, single-site supportive housing with onsite support has recently been embraced across Australia (Parsell et al. 2014). At the time of fieldwork, single-site supportive housing with onsite support was developing as a significant policy response to homelessness.

The increasing policy and practice importance of single-site supportive housing with onsite support coincided with and influenced the qualitative phases of fieldwork for this research. Despite the increased funding and activity in developing single-site supportive housing with onsite support, Parsell, Fitzpatrick and Busch-Geertsema (2014) point out that there is no empirical research demonstrating the effectiveness or describing the practices of single-site supportive housing with onsite support. Further, and importantly, they argue that the move toward single-site supportive housing with onsite support in Australia is not informed by the experiences of tenants or the vulnerable population that this has been developed for (Parsell et al. 2014).

With new models of single-site supportive housing with onsite support developing in Australia, and with the absence of research documenting the perspectives of tenants or the model as prescribed by supportive housing providers, we took the opportunity to conduct extensive

qualitative fieldwork in this type of housing. We saw the opportunity to provide an in-depth analysis of single-site supportive housing with onsite support as particularly important for Australian policy and practice because this form of supportive housing has been critiqued for the extent of tenant surveillance or even a regressive move toward institutionalisation (Busch-Geertsema 2012; Padgett 2007; Parsell et al. 2014).

The research questions above have thus been modified since the research was originally conceived. Reflecting the opportunities to develop new knowledge about single-site supportive housing with onsite support, research questions one, two and three above have been refined to enable a greater focus on this new model of supportive housing to Australia.

1.1 Policy and practice context

If we work from a premise that supportive housing consists of the integrated delivery of housing that is affordable and support services that are voluntary and directed by the tenant, than we must likewise accept that key principles and practices of supportive housing are not entirely new to Australia. In this section we demonstrate how contemporary approaches to supportive housing as a response to homelessness build on, are similar to, and are different from, other initiatives to link support to housing and accommodation. Past policies have been influenced by numerous but often consistent drivers, such as the right to housing, deinstitutionalisation, tenancy sustainment, the need to manage anti-social behaviour, and to achieve 'joined-up' responses across social housing and human service providers.

More recently, a key influence on both policy and practice has been the cumulative evidence base on the social and economic effectiveness of supportive housing models over crisis and transitional responses in the context of international goals to end homelessness (Hannigan & Wagner 2003; Johnson et al. 2012; Parsell et al. 2013). Although Australia's move toward supportive housing is not on the scale experienced in the United States, in both countries supportive housing is firmly embedded within a policy and practice framework of targeting people deemed most vulnerable in the homeless population and achieving permanent housing and support solutions.

In this policy and practice context, the broad phases of contemporary supportive housing in Australia can be viewed as a component of an interventionist state. The three key overlapping phases of policy and service development include:

- → Support into and exiting crisis/transitional accommodation.
- → Support into and sustaining social housing tenancies.
- → Support into and sustaining private rental tenancies.

All three phases now co-exist, but the latter two are most representative of a supportive housing approach in a definitional sense of the term because they seek to provide support into long-term housing.

1.1.1 Support and homelessness

Various forms of support have long been linked to the provision of crisis and transitional accommodation for people experiencing homelessness in Australia. Throughout the iterations of the former Supported Accommodation Assistance Program (SAAP), linked support assumed central functions. Bullen (2010) argues that in the late 1980s support in SAAP consisted of assisting clients to transition to independent living. She takes the view that SAAP, consistent with other functions of social policy and administration, located the problem of homelessness—and poverty—within the individual (Bullen 2010). From a lens that constructed homelessness in terms of individual pathologies and choices (Parsell & Parsell 2012), both Bullen (2010) and Fopp (1996) have demonstrated how SAAP provided support through case management as a means to assist clients to redress their problems. Case management was intended to activate people as self-reliant instead of being dependent on the state.

Fopp went further with a critical analysis of the function of support in SAAP. For him, the case management provided through SAAP, in the context of limited available housing and thus exit points from SAAP, served the function of dividing, segregating and scrutinising homeless subjects (Fopp 1996). Bullen (2010, p.73) takes the view that the progression of the 1990s saw a 'shift in emphasis from homelessness as predominantly an issue of accommodation, to an emphasis on homelessness as a need for support'. Thus, at a formal level, since at least the mid to late-1980s, support has assumed a significant and active role in Australian homelessness policy and program formation.

Despite the linking of support to accommodation, support in SAAP was fundamentally different from the contemporary focus of supportive housing. First, and most importantly, support was intended as crisis-based and transitional. In line with the crisis and transitional nature of accommodation provided through SAAP, support in SAAP was provided on a time-limited basis and for the purposes of resolving crisis (*Supported Accommodation Assistance Act 1994*). Support was predominantly provided in a crisis or transitional setting and the crisis nature of support sought to address short-term problems. Second, the delivery of support in SAAP, particularly compliance with case management, was contingent and dictated by service providers. In some SAAP programs, the provision of crisis and transitional accommodation was contingent on accepting and engaging with support providers. Bullen (2010, p.196–97) cites a report from the New South Wales Ombudsman which shows some SAAP providers either made engagement with case management a condition of accessing accommodation or that accommodation could be terminated if clients did not continue with case management. Further, even when receipt of accommodation was not contingent upon complying with services, the time-limited nature of support and accommodation was determined by the service provider, not the service user.

1.1.2 Support and social housing

In addition to the history of linking temporary forms of support to crisis and transitional accommodation, there are numerous examples of linking support to long-term housing. Some of the earliest Australian examples of linking support services to housing occurred at the time when social housing policy explicitly prioritised applicants on the basis of need. In one of the first cases in Australia, the Victorian Government during the mid-1990s introduced a segmented allocations process for social housing (Department of Human Services n.d.). Under the segmented allocations process, applicants experiencing homelessness assume priority status thereby dictating their expedited access to housing. The move initiated by the Victorian Government was later extended nationally, with the 1999 Commonwealth State Housing Agreement outlining a guiding principle that applicants with the highest need would be prioritised for social housing (Report on Government Services 2000).

Scholars have examined the normative basis (Atkinson & Jacobs 2008) and the economic implications (Hall & Berry 2007) to a residualised social housing system targeting housing to people with extreme needs, such as those with experiences of homelessness and additional social and health problems. Allocating social housing to people on the basis of extreme need and highest priority has similarly meant that social housing providers are required to take into account how the high needs that deem people priority for housing can be supported. The Victorian Government, for instance, identified moving the Office of Housing into the Department of Human Services in 1996 as a strategy to integrate housing more closely to other community welfare services (Department of Human Services n.d.).

In addition to organisationally locating social housing within a human services agency, social housing authorities have sought to link housing provision to support services in numerous ways. Strategies to link, or at the least to conceptualise housing allocation to support services, include social housing providers requiring applicants to demonstrate that they have an agency or individual that will support them post-tenancy allocation. It is in this context that applicants and their support providers/advocates are required to present a nuanced argument. On the one

hand, applicants must demonstrate their high needs status and inability to access housing outside of the social housing sector. On the other hand, they must show that their high needs are not so great that prevent them from living independently in social housing. In New South Wales, applicants need to prove how they can live independently and, if necessary, identify how they are supported by a service provider to enable independence (Family and Community Services 2014). Other examples include staff employed within social housing authorities who assess the needs of applicants and then work to ensure (through referral) that highly vulnerable applicants receive appropriate support services at the time of allocation. This role is delivered by a Senior Client Service Officer Specialist employed by the New South Wales Department of Housing. In the contemporary Queensland context, identifying and responding to the housing and support needs of applicants with 'multiple needs' is intended to be met with an integrated triage system (Department of Housing and Public Works n.d.).

These examples of the allocation and ongoing provision of social housing to tenants in ways that social housing providers play a role in brokering—but not directly providing—support services have been directed toward a number of objectives. As noted, linking support to social housing allocation is a consequence of targeting housing to people in highest priority. Linking support to social housing is promoted to achieve tenancy sustainment or to prevent the revolving door of homelessness (Gale 2003). Seelig and Jones (2004) see tenancy sustainment as the delivery of supportive landlord practices to avoid eviction or forced exit and that ideally promote positive tenant experiences. Flatau and colleagues conducted an extensive examination of tenancy support programs across Australia for both Indigenous and non-Indigenous tenants. They described tenancy support programs as case management interventions to prevent evictions for tenants at risk of homelessness (Flatau et al. 2009). Moreover, and consistent with the practice of housing providers brokering rather than delivering support services, Flatau et al. (2009) observed that services are provided by non-government agencies rather than by housing providers. The linking of social housing and support, through tenancy sustainment programs, has been directed toward both preventing evictions and as an early intervention strategy.

Further, and in a manner inseparable to promoting tenancy sustainment, linking support to social housing in Australia has been identified as a strategy to manage disruptive, demanding and antisocial behaviour. The combined research of Atkinson et al. (2007) and Habibis et al. (2007) examined disruptive and demanding behaviours that are problematic but which lie outside of statutory responses, whereas Jacobs and Arthurson (2003) examined antisocial behaviour in social housing. The role of social housing as a provider of accommodation of last resort has meant that social housing providers must manage tenants' difficult behaviours for a range of social, business and broader neighbourhood objectives (Atkinson et al. 2007). The literature about disruptive, demanding and antisocial behaviour has identified a range of strategies required to assist tenants to address their challenging behaviour for the purposes of sustaining their tenancy. A consensus is emerging that recognises the importance of state housing authorities having at their disposal a range of early intervention, supportive, rehabilitation, sanction and preventative strategies to address problematic behaviours in social housing and to achieve tenancy sustainment (Jacobs & Arthurson 2003; Jones et al. 2014; Seelig & Jones 2004). In terms of the latter, Atkinson et al. (2007) highlight the importance of housing design, community development, and the thoughtful allocation of properties as strategies that can prevent disruptive, demanding and antisocial behaviour.

The ideas about and policy to achieve sustainable tenancies also draw on parallel discussions in Australian housing scholarship referred to as integration. The integration of social housing and human services would not only promote tenancy sustainment, but also would contribute to the achievement of beyond shelter outcomes (Phillips et al. 2009). Indeed, as long ago as the 2003, the Commonwealth State Housing Agreement integrating social housing with community and non-government organisations was identified as necessary to achieve non-shelter objectives (for tenants with complex needs) such as access to employment and greater social

and economic participation (Report on Government Services 2008). Moreover, and as we have canvassed earlier (Parsell & Moutou 2014), for at least a decade there are significant examples of social housing tightly integrated with health and community service providers through supportive housing initiatives such as the Housing and Accommodation Support Initiative and the Housing and Support Program. These are examples of housing and health providers integrating services for the purposes of achieving housing and recovery objectives for people with diagnosable psychiatric disabilities, often as those individuals are discharged from hospital.

1.1.3 Support into and sustaining private rental tenancies

With limited supply of social housing stock and procedural barriers for immediate access to the available stock, the private rental sector is increasingly seen as a site for delivering models of supportive housing. In contemporary Australian policy, Sydney's Platform 70 initiative and the Victorian Doorway Housing and Support Project are examples. Both initiatives draw on private rental housing stock with funding from government. Platform 70 targets people with chronic experiences of homelessness whereas the Doorway Housing and Support Project requires service users to have a diagnosable psychiatric illness. Both initiatives, however, involve funding to support tenants, although as a one off or trial initiative, it is unknown how long support services, or funding to continued subsidised access to the private rental sector, will last.

In an evaluation of the Way2Home program, the Platform 70 initiative was identified as successful in addressing barriers to accessing social housing and thus the initiative removed the fundamental barrier to exiting homelessness (Parsell et al. 2013). Although not fitting our definition of supportive housing because of their short-term nature, there are a range of private rental support initiatives to assist tenant's access and sustain housing in the private rental sector (see e.g. AIHW 2014). The Australian initiatives relying on the private rental sector have similarities with the highly successful Pathways to Housing program in the United States that accesses private rental dwellings which are funded through government housing vouchers (for people with diagnosed psychiatric and other disabilities).

1.1.4 Policy and practice overview

The contemporary focus on supportive housing to address homelessness, and to meet the housing and recovery needs of people with mental illnesses, builds on and is influenced by past policy and discussions that have linked housing and support. The policy discourse has, however, moved beyond linking housing and support; the link is now conceptualised as so close that the term *supportive housing* is widely used. In the vast majority of cases, support is linked to social housing. As we canvassed above, however, there are models of supportive housing in both Australia and internationally that draw on housing stock from the private sector. Notwithstanding previous recognition that addressing disruptive behaviours would promote tenancy sustainment and in turn reduce the risk of homelessness (Atkinson et al. 2007; Habibis et al. 2007; Jones et al. 2014), supportive housing is explicitly positioned as a strategy to achieve homelessness reduction objectives. The provision of support in supportive housing is likewise fundamentally different from the role support assumed in the former SAAP. Whereas the duration of support in SAAP reflected the crisis and transitional nature of accommodation provision, support in supportive housing is frequently described as long-term and ongoing.

Consistent with the ongoing provision of support, rather than *just* playing a role in a system to reduce homelessness, supportive housing is intended to enable long-term community, social inclusion, participatory and wellbeing outcomes for people who have exited homelessness. As will be demonstrated in Chapter 2, contemporary supportive housing in Australia is a component of an interventionist state. Supportive housing, although drawing on long understood principles of linking housing and support, has come to represent a model to

promote significant and positive life transformations that extend well beyond sustaining tenancies and managing and preventing problematic behaviour.

1.2 Supportive housing and the research evidence

The central debates and historical background to supportive housing are canvassed in the positioning paper (Parsell & Moutou 2014). Here we briefly distil some of the key themes from the literature about the effectiveness of supportive housing.

Extensive research, particularly over the past two decades, has been undertaken on programs that fall under the umbrella term of supportive housing. A challenge in assessing the effectiveness of supportive housing, and hence the need for greater clarity of the approach, is that each model varies from the next in some major or minor way. How the individual program elements, the intensity and duration of support, and type of housing provided all interact to contribute to the move out of homelessness and the maintenance of housing over time is difficult to isolate both within and between models. However, what is repeatedly demonstrated across studies is that it is the combination of support and permanent housing delivered within the one program, rather than in isolation, that contributes to increased effectiveness of both housing and non-housing outcomes. In a study of families exiting homelessness into various forms of supportive housing, Nolan et al. (2005, p.v) concluded that:

> No single program model appears to be significantly better than any other at helping tenants achieve the primary goal of housing stability, as long as the model succeeds in creating an environment of respect and trust among tenants and staff and is able to provide the resources that tenants need.

Consistent evidence has shown that supportive housing is effective at meeting the housing needs of people who have experienced homelessness with mental health and drug and alcohol problems, and is congruent with their needs and preferences. In a systematic review of the research evidence, Rog and colleagues conclude that:

> Permanent supportive housing for individuals with mental and substance use disorders, compared with treatment as usual, reduced homelessness, increased housing tenure over time, and resulted in fewer emergency room visits and hospitalizations. Moreover, consumers consistently rated permanent supportive housing more positively than other housing models and preferred it over other more restrictive forms of care. (Rog et al. 2014, p.293)

Rog's review does not include Australian research, but the recent literature from Australia examining models of housing and linked support services, such as Street to Home, Journey to Social Inclusion, and the Housing and Support Initiative, is broadly consistent with international evidence. The Australian research has found that people with chronic experiences of homelessness and additional health and social problems can access and sustain housing when housing is affordable and support is available (Bruce et al. 2012; Johnson et al. 2011; Parsell et al. 2013). There is, however, an emerging consensus of what non-housing outcomes people exiting chronic homelessness achieve. Tsemberis reflected upon the non-housing outcomes reported by people who had exited chronic homelessness and observed that:

> Housing and other supportive housing interventions may end homelessness but do not cure psychiatric disability, addiction, or poverty. These programs, it might be said, help individuals graduate from the trauma of homelessness into the normal everyday misery of extreme poverty, stigma, and unemployment. (Tsemberis 2010, p.52)

The comments of Tsemberis are particularly powerful as his reflection includes a critique of the Pathways to Housing model of supportive housing that he developed. Tsemberis does evoke pertinent questions about the practices and objectives that supportive housing 'ought' to assume. Should, for example, supportive housing actively work toward assisting vulnerable

tenants achieve non-housing outcomes, such as addressing poverty, stigma and unemployment?

Kirsh et al. (2009) analysis of the literature endorses the proposition that permanency in housing is central to the outcomes achieved by supportive housing, but with Greenwood, Schaefer-McDanie and Winkel (2005) and Nelson, Sylvestre and Aubry (2007), they argue that consumer choice over housing and support are critical factors to the success of supportive housing. Consumer choice is arguably the defining trait of the Pathways to Housing model of supportive housing (Johnson et al. 2012), but Stefancic and Tsemberis (2007) extend this by asserting that a key element of supportive housing for the promotion of recovery is that the housing is indistinguishable. This assertion about the indistinguishable nature of housing stock in the Pathways to Housing supportive housing model is a response to institutionalised and segregated forms of psychiatric accommodation. Indistinguishable housing is intended to promote normality, community integration and thus to foster recovery. Questions have been asked about supportive housing in congregate or single-site models and how the built and social form, with support services located onsite, may be inconsistent with normal and indistinguishable housing (Parsell et al. 2014).

These normative questions about the form housing should assume are significant. In a practical example taking into account Australia's social housing stock, if one is to raise questions about congregate forms of supportive housing, similar questions could be raised about the bulk of studio, one and two-bedroom social housing stock which is predominantly located in medium and high density social housing buildings in area of high concentrations of social housing. The overwhelming majority of Australia's studio and one and two-bedroom social housing stock would not likely meet the criteria of indistinguishable housing in the way it is interpreted in the United States (Stefancic & Tsemberis 2007).

1.3 Research design

Complementing the review of published literature presented in the Positioning Paper (Parsell & Moutou 2014), this research project is informed by a mixed methods approach to data collection. A quantitative survey was completed by tenants of supportive housing. Qualitative interviews were conducted with both tenants and tenancy and support providers. The research design aimed to gather a broad perspective on different approaches to supportive housing. Based on emerging data from the survey and the increasing significance of single-site supportive housing with onsite support (discussed above), the qualitative component of the study involved a more in-depth examination of single-site supportive housing with onsite support.

1.3.1 Tenant qualitative interviews

In order to understand the experiences of living in single-site supportive housing with onsite support, we conducted one-off qualitative interviews with tenants (n=28). Tenants were purposefully selected from a provider of single-site supportive housing with onsite support in Hobart. The tenants resided in two single-site supportive housing buildings with onsite support. The two buildings allocated tenancies on the basis of an explicit social mix. Approximately half of the tenants are allocated properties on the basis of working, low wage earner status. The other half of tenancies are allocated to people with histories of chronic homelessness and who require support to sustain their housing (Common Ground Tasmania n.d.). Our 28 qualitative interview participants were all allocated tenancies because of histories of chronic homelessness and a requirement for support. The participants were 22 males and six females. The gender imbalance in the sample reflects the disproportionately high number of males allocated housing because of chronic homelessness.

There are 97 tenancies across the two Hobart supportive housing buildings (50 in one building and 47 in the other). When we conducted our tenant qualitative interviews in February 2014, the building was almost fully tenanted and there was slightly fewer than 50 per cent of

tenancies allocated to people because of chronic homelessness. Our sample of 28 tenants thus represents approximately 60 per cent of the tenants who resided in the two buildings who were allocated housing because of chronic homelessness. We invited all of the tenants who were allocated tenancies because of chronic homelessness to participate in a qualitative interview and the 28 participants represent all of those who consented to the invitation.

Unlike the survey participants who resided in both supportive housing with outreach support and onsite support, we purposefully recruited people for qualitative interviews who lived exclusively in single-site supportive housing with onsite support because of the gaps in the literature. Parsell, Fitzpatrick and Busch-Geertsema (2014) observe that philanthropist and politicians favour single-site supportive housing, consistent with the experience in the United States (Padgett 2012)—but the move toward single-site supportive housing with onsite support in Australia is not informed by the experiences of tenants or the vulnerable population that single-site supportive housing has been developed for. Extending the data obtained in the survey, qualitative interviews sought to identify and examine the day-to-day experiences of living in single-site supportive housing with onsite support. Because theoretical questions have been raised about the scrutiny and surveillance of single-site supportive housing with onsite support (Parsell et al. 2014; Padgett 2007), qualitative interviews were a means to identify the perspectives of tenants.

Qualitative interviews were semi-structured. Interviews with tenants were structured with a qualitative interview schedule that focused on exploring people's firsthand experiences (Parsell et al. 2014). In particular, the qualitative interviews focused on what tenants perceived as desirable and undesirable about single-site supportive housing with onsite support, how it compared with previous housing, what contributed to housing sustainment or what threatened it, how much autonomy and freedom they experienced, their experiences working with onsite staff, perceptions of community, activities they participate in and about any socialising with other tenants. The semi-structured interviews were sufficiently flexible to enable tenants to discuss and pursue areas of interest significant to them (Padgett 2008). As an important example, many participants wanted to highlight what supportive housing meant for them as part of a broader life strategy beyond supportive housing. This tenant-initiated area of enquiry was pursued during interviews and the data is presented in Chapter 4.

All qualitative interviews were digitally recorded, and then professionally transcribed. Interviews lasted for between 20 and 60 minutes. The interview transcripts were analysed thematically. We did not rely on qualitative data analysis software, but rather the first author who conducted the interviews read and re-read the interview transcripts and identified the concepts and the developed themes (Desmond 2012). The analysis was structured around the questions and topics in the interview schedule, but as noted above, the analysis was inductive in that the concepts and themes emerged in an unexpected way grounded in the data. In developing the inductive themes, we drew on relevant empirical research and theoretical constructs to develop tentative explanations of our data (Ritchie et al. 2003).

1.3.2 Supportive housing provider qualitative interviews

We conducted one-off semi-structured qualitative interviews with supportive housing providers (n=22). The supportive housing providers included: support workers/coordinators; tenancy providers; tenancy providers who also provide support services to tenants in their housing portfolio; allied health workers; and managers of supportive housing models. Each of the 22 participants provided services (including managing) in single-site supportive housing in onsite support settings, although seven of these professionals also delivered tenancy and support, including health services outside of single-site supportive housing. The participants provided services in supportive housing in Hobart (n=6) and Melbourne (n=16).

Qualitative interviews with supportive housing providers sought to identify and examine the nature of single-site supportive housing with onsite support. Guided by a qualitative interview

schedule, we conducted interviews to first understand what constituted the practices of supportive housing. Informed directly by the limited Australian literature about what supportive housing is (Parsell & Moutou 2014), and the ambiguities in the international literature about the support practices that comprise supportive housing (Tabol et al. 2010), we asked participants to explain in detail what single-site supportive housing with onsite support entailed from a practice perspective. During qualitative interviews with supportive housing providers we also explored their views on what supportive housing aims to achieve, as well as identifying their perspectives on both the barriers and enablers to achieving successful outcomes in supportive housing.

For the same justification for generating new evidence about single-site supportive housing with onsite supports because of gaps in the literature that influenced our sampling of tenants for qualitative interviews (above), we also sampled supportive housing providers with direct experiences in single-site supportive housing with onsite support. We wanted to understand the unique practice realities, as well as identify the challenges and opportunities that single-site supportive housing represents, from the perspective of those with professional experiences. Although the professional boundaries were not completely clear cut in all cases, the participants worked across four supportive housing approaches, three in Melbourne and one in Hobart. The single-site supportive housing with onsite support in Hobart was also the site where the tenants participating in qualitative interviews (n=28) and survey (single-site, n=61) resided.

As with tenant qualitative interviews, all qualitative interviews with supportive housing providers were digitally recorded and then professionally transcribed. We adopted a similar thematic analysis process with the supportive housing providers' interviews as we did with the tenant qualitative interviews.

Throughout the report we use pseudonyms to refer to both tenants and supportive housing providers. As a means to ensure participant confidentiality, we do not provide specific details about the participant's role or location if we believe it is likely to lead to inferred identification. The research project received full ethical approval from the University of Queensland.

1.3.3 Tenant surveys

We conducted a survey with tenants (n=102) in different forms of supportive housing. The survey had three interrelated aims. First, it aimed to provide a descriptive analysis of the housing circumstances, demographics and self-reported satisfaction with the life of tenants. Second, based on the housing that tenants resided in, the survey aimed to identify their rates of satisfaction and housing preferences, as well as their levels of socialisation, participation and support. Third, the survey provided data to be used in a logistic regression to identify which tenants, and tenants living in different forms of supportive housing, were more or less likely to report higher or lower on life satisfaction, housing satisfaction, socialisation, and receipt of support.

1.3.4 Survey design

The survey consisted of five sections, these sections are: (1) demographics and housing characteristics; (2) housing satisfaction; (3) housing preferences; (4) social support, socialising with neighbours and social participation; and (5) health and quality of life. The survey questions were a collaboration of questions from the World Values Survey (Wave 4, 1999–2002); the Redfern and Waterloo Benchmark survey (2011); and the Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener et al. 1985).

Additional information about the five components of the survey include:

1. *Demographics and housing characteristics*

This section asked tenants quantitative questions about their housing provider, number of bedrooms in their dwelling, and the type of dwelling. Quantitative questions were also asked to determine the tenants' country of birth, lifetime experience of homelessness, age, gender, and Indigenous status.

2. Housing satisfaction

Housing satisfaction was measured with several questions, these included: Are you pleased with your housing? Are you settled in your housing? How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the overall suitability of your housing to your household's needs? These questions could be responded to with four response options or five point Likert scale, and the analysis is presented in the binary 'pleased or not pleased', 'settled or not settled', and 'satisfied or not satisfied'.

Housing satisfaction was also examined with specific questions about aspects of housing, such as design and layout of dwelling, privacy, security, size, and affordability. Responses are analysed as 'satisfied or not satisfied', or 'meeting needs or not meeting needs'.

Tenants were also asked whether they felt that their current housing was their home, with a 'yes or no' binary response available.

3. Housing preferences

Respondents were asked to indicate their housing preferences from four options. The four options sought to identify their ideal housing, and in doing so it enabled respondents to distinguish between housing and neighbourhood (Table 1).

Table 1: Housing preferences

	Current housing	
Different housing	Current housing and Current neighbourhood	Current housing and Different neighbourhood
	Different housing and Current neighbourhood	Different housing and Different neighbourhood

4. Social support, socialising with neighbours, and social participation

This section contained questions about social support that participants received from their neighbours. These questions covered support and socialising with neighbours in terms of visiting, helping, friendships, confiding in neighbours, leaning on neighbours in times of trouble, cheering up when feeling down, feel lonely, enjoy time spent with neighbours, talking to neighbours when something is on their mind and when they need help, can usually find someone in the neighbourhood. Tenants were asked to measure the different aspects of socialising and support they receive from their neighbours using a 7-point Likert like scale ranging from 'strongly agree' to 'strongly disagree'. For the ease of interpretation, these variables were collapsed into two categories whereby ratings of agreement and disagreement were accordingly combined.

We also asked tenants about how often they participated in five types of activities. These activities were spending time with family, spending time with friends, spending time with neighbours, spending time socially with people at sporting activities or clubs, and spending time with people at social service or community organisations. They were then asked questions to identify whether they preferred to participate in the activities more often, less often, or the same amount.

5. Health and life satisfaction

This section contained questions to measure respondents' life satisfaction, health, and to identify their perceptions of the impact of housing on them and their household. Questions included general health: coded as 'good or not good'. Respondents were asked whether they had experienced a change in health problems since living in current housing, they could respond with 'increased, decreased or not changed'. They were also asked how living in their current housing changed their household's overall quality of life. Responses were coded as either 'improved or not improved'.

More specifically, questions in this section asked respondents to report the impact of living in current housing in terms of four outcomes: these were better health, finding a job, starting or continuing education/training, and having better access to services needed.

1.3.5 Logistic regression analysis

We fitted statistical models to a number of variables of interests in the dataset to analyse how the various housing provisions and demographic variables relate to the different measures of satisfaction, life improvement, and time spent with other people. Depending on the nature of the dependent variable in each model, either a logistic or an ordered logistic regression was used.

The logistic regression is fitted for all variables with values of 1 for 'Yes' and 0 for 'No' to assess the probability of each respondent in Yes to each outcome variable. The logistic regression model is specified as:

$$E(Y|X) = Pr(Y = 1|X) \rightarrow \ log\left\{\frac{Pr(Y = 1|X)}{1 - Pr(Y = 1|X)}\right\} = \beta X + e$$

where Y is the set of 'Yes-No' responses of each housing satisfaction and life improvement questions, while X and e are the set of the different demographic variables and other covariates used, and the residual term, respectively.

The derivation of the index will be discussed in Chapter 3.

1.3.6 Survey respondents

We sampled tenants residing in different forms of supportive housing. There are three groups of survey respondents according to their housing situation. The three groups of survey participants included supported tenants, allocated and residing in single-site supportive housing with onsite support because of chronic homelessness and a requirement of support to sustain housing (n=26, Hobart); tenants residing in single-site supportive housing who were allocated housing because of working, low wage earner status[1] (n=35, Hobart); and tenants residing in scattered-site supportive housing with support provided through outreach services (n=41, Brisbane). The latter group was diverse both in terms of their housing stock and support received. We do not have complete and extensive data about the exact nature of the support received by the tenants in supportive housing with outreach support. There are a range of not-for-profit and community organisations that have memorandums of understanding (MoU) with the housing provider, and the MoUs are drawn upon to provide support services to tenants.

In terms of the housing stock of tenants residing in supportive housing with outreach support, all survey participants in this group resided in units. The units were located across numerous suburbs in Brisbane. Some of the units were located in small blocks of six units, whereas others were located in larger groupings of units in either the one building or in a collective of buildings in the one development on the one parcel of land consisting of up to 50 units.

[1] The presence of working, low wage earning tenants served the purpose of creating a social mix (Common Ground Tasmania n.d.).

We recruited the survey sample with the assistance of two housing providers. The two housing providers advised their tenants of the research project and the opportunity to participate in a survey. The housing providers also displayed in their offices information about participating in the survey. Each of the three forms of supportive housing were social housing in that they were properties managed by community and not-for-profit organisations, but the housing stock was owned by the state.

Table 2: Survey respondents

		Proportion of sample N (%)
Housing form	Onsite support	61 (59.8)
	Affordable housing tenants	35 (57.4)
	Supported housing tenants	26 (42.6)
	Outreach support	41 (40.2)
Reported homeless status experience	Previously homeless	59 (57.8)
	Never previously been homeless	43 (42.2)
Gender	Female	47 (46.1)
	Male	55 (53.9)
Age range (by group)	18–31 years old	30 (29.4)
	31–40 years old	21 (20.6)
	41–50 years old	22 (21.6)
	51–60 years old	16 (15.7)
	61–70 years old	9 (8.8)
	70+ years old	4 (3.9)
Country of birth	Australia	78 (76.5)
	Country other than Australia	24 (23.5)
Identify as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander	Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander	10 (9.8)
	Does not identify	92 (90.2)
Income source	Wages/salary	23 (22.5)
	Disability Support Pension (DSP)	46 (45.1)
	Aged Pension	6 (5.9)
	Unemployment benefit	15 (14.7)
	Parenting Payment	3 (2.9)
	Youth Allowance	3 (2.9)
	Austudy or Abstudy	6 (5.9)
Incidence of disability	Has a disability	53 (52.0)
	Doesn't have a disability	49 (48.0)

All of the tenants who reported an income source from wages salary (n=23) or Austudy or Abstudy (n=6) resided in single-site supportive housing and were allocated tenancies on the basis of working, low wage earner status. Thus, despite the 35 tenants in this group being allocated housing because of employment (to create a social mix), six of them reported an income source other than from employment or education/training (Table 2).

2 WHAT CONSTITUTES SUPPORTIVE HOUSING?

2.1 Introduction

How do the people responsible for providing housing and supportive services characterise supportive housing? What are the features and practices of supportive housing? What are the problems that supportive housing addresses and what does it intend to achieve? From the perspectives of those with professional experiences, what contributes to supportive housing achieving its intended objectives?

In addressing these questions we draw on scholarship that demonstrates the central role that direct service practitioners—or street level bureaucrats—play in enacting and shaping the day-to-day form of policies and social programs (Lipsky 1980). We look to Carr's (2011) work to extend the idea of practitioners making policy and constituting the practical form of social programs. Carr's (2011) analysis helps us to understand how, and through what processes, direct practitioners shape the nature of the problem of chronic homelessness. From this problem construction, we show how providers of housing and support services cast the nature of supportive housing to address chronic homelessness. We return to Carr's work in Chapter 4 and consider how the self-assertions expressed by tenants can be understood in a context of the prevailing ideas and norms emphasised by supportive housing providers.

As described in Chapter 1 we draw on qualitative interviews conducted with 22 supportive housing providers across Hobart (n=6) and Melbourne (n=16). The supportive housing providers reported here, consistent with the tenants reported in Chapter 4, are drawn from single-site supportive housing with support services provided onsite. The chapter first considers the role of supportive housing as a response to the most vulnerable of the homeless population. Next, the multiple roles of support are examined, these include: (1) support to address need; (2) support to be a good tenant; (3) support to enable independence and self-determination; and (4) the function and role of support when tenants self-determine to not engage with support. The chapter concludes by conceptualising supportive housing as a mechanism of change.

2.1.1 Purposeful housing for the most vulnerable

Supportive housing was presented as a deliberate strategy to provide housing and support services to not only people experiencing homelessness, but also to people deemed to be the most vulnerable section of the homeless population. The framing of the vulnerable tenant group was central to all characterisations of the function and purpose of supportive housing. Vulnerability was described in numerous ways, but primarily it encapsulated people with psychiatric, primary health and addiction diagnoses. A support worker of a single-site supportive housing program explained that tenants were characterised by a 'mixture of people with disabilities, different types of disabilities, I suppose, whether that be mental health, or addictive behaviours, mobility issues, health issues'. (Lorraine)

In a different form of supportive housing with dispersed properties and support provided by a diverse range of outreach services, a participant noted that the tenant cohort were overwhelmingly people with significant health problems. He described the supportive housing tenants as people:

> Who are quite complex, presenting with multiple mobility needs with perhaps histories of recurring homelessness and multiple admissions to psychiatric wards and then within that perhaps with histories of substance dependency, borderline personality disorder, maybe ABIs [acquired brain injuries]. (Peter)

Peter and Lorraine's depictions of the people residing in supportive housing are consistent with the assertions of all supportive housing providers. Identifying tenants on the basis of both previous experiences of homelessness and diagnosable psychiatric illness or brain injury

highlights the complexity of the needs of tenants. The picture presented of the tenant group resonates with long-held ideas of people who experience chronic homelessness and rough sleeping as complex (City of Sydney 2009; Thomson Goodall Associates 2003); contemporary policy discourse suggests that their complex needs are intended to be addressed through 'wrap around' support services (Australian Government 2008). Parsell (2010) argues that categorising people as a complex needs cohort or a category based on chronic experiences of homelessness can obscure an understanding of people's identities and strengths beyond their complexity and homelessness. Drawing on the work of critical social scientists (Bacchi 2009; Fraser 1997; Marston 2004), he highlights how a conflation of 'homeless people' with complexity and their state of homelessness reifies their distinctiveness. Thus their assumed distinctiveness—their differences from us—supports policy and social programs that perpetuate their difference, such as case management and temporary accommodation rather than secure housing (Parsell 2010).

A service provider from a single-site supportive housing program recognised the 'complexity of mental health issues, addiction issues, physical and intellectual disabilities', but she added complexity to the straightforward notion of 'complex needs' by forcing us to critically examine what a complex tenant means. She asked whether:

> Somebody who's highly delusional most of the time and clearly mentally unwell—is that complex? or somebody who's been completely reclusive and not engaging in any services of any kind—is that complex? (Christine)

In addition to the literature which highlights the importance of conceptualising a person's complex needs in a manner that is not all-encompassing and is de-coupled from their identity (Parsell 2010), Christine reflects on practice in supportive housing to illustrate the many forms that complexity assumes, for example, being reclusive and not engaging with support and neighbours. She alludes to the way that observable forms of disability and overt behaviour are positioned as signifying complexity; she brings to attention the challenges of providing supportive housing to people not engaging with services and living a reclusive life.

Complexity of tenant need, or tenant vulnerability, are central to the Common Ground approach of single-site supportive housing with onsite support. The Common Ground single-site supportive housing approach seeks to assess the complexity of tenant need in an objective way to determine access to supportive housing. Lorraine described the VI (Vulnerability Index) assessment process routinely used by Common Ground supportive housing in Australia.

> The VI identifies people at risk of early mortality based on health needs, so we take that into account quite strongly, biological and medical factors. (Lorraine)

The VI is thus used as a means to identify and allocate supportive housing properties. Mark said that the VI identifies who will likely experience a premature death without secure housing; the premature death data in turn, helps determine a practice 'pathway' into supportive housing. The Australian Common Ground Alliance says that the VI is based on research from the United States, and consistent with the descriptions put forward by Lorraine and Mark, the VI is said to be used as a practice mechanism to allocate housing to people identified as highly vulnerable (Australian Common Ground Alliance n.d.). The VI forms the basis to collect and assess information about an individual's housing, homelessness, institutional, employment, service history, as well as key health indicators.

According to the function of the VI described by both advocates (Australian Common Ground Alliance n.d.) and supportive housing providers interviewed, the VI serves as a mechanism to not only allocate housing on the basis of high vulnerability, but to also allocate housing to people who have otherwise been excluded from housing. Indeed, a criteria of the VI is that 'individuals have been homeless for six months or more' (Australian Common Ground Alliance n.d.). In this way, the VI complements the provision of supportive housing as part of a broader strategy of permanently addressing homelessness. One participant from single-site supportive

housing was explicit. Supportive housing sat within a wider objective of the 'vision that we had, it's ending the crisis of homelessness in Tasmania'. In research with advocates who were instrumental in establishing Common Ground in Australia, Parsell, Fitzpatrick and Busch-Geertsema (2014) found that they promoted Common Ground on the basis of the model being a permanent solution to homelessness for people who had historically been excluded from housing.

As a means to end homelessness, the intended focus on the most vulnerable of the homeless population can be seen as a contrast to the former Supported Accommodation Assistance Program where, in some situations, clients with complex needs were unable to access homelessness services (Erebus Consulting Partners 2004). Rather than people being excluded from housing because of complex needs, through the VI it is intended that people are prioritised for housing because of complexity. Likewise, using the VI to prioritise supportive housing to those assessed as most vulnerable runs parallel to the delivery of social housing more broadly where properties are now almost exclusively allocated to high and very high need applicants (Jones et al. 2014; Report on Government Services 2000).

Allocating single-site supportive housing with onsite support to people with high vulnerabilities had unintended consequences. Even in the presence of onsite support workers and 24-hour concierge (discussed below), participants explained that allocating housing to the most vulnerable of the homeless population compromised the function of single-site supportive housing. Amy, a participant representing an external health service provider to a single-site supportive housing program, described the situation in single-site supportive housing in Melbourne:

> I think, originally, they put in the 64 most marginalised people in Melbourne in that building. (Amy)

Amy went on to say that housing the most marginalised people in the one building 'wasn't the smartest move'. She argued for more thought to be given to assessing which individuals, among the highly vulnerable homeless population, could live together in the one building. Like Amy, other participants reported that if single-site supportive housing is to house the most vulnerable of the homeless population, the dynamics of supportive housing buildings need to be considered. Jodie was responsible for tenancies in single-site supportive housing. She reflected on this challenge providing practical examples of a single-site supportive housing program where initially the allocation of tenancies to highly vulnerable people in the one building were not assessed at a building level. Consistent with Amy's assessment, Jodie stated that the single-site supportive housing building tried to house the '65 most complex people in Victoria' in the one building. The result of 65 of the most complex people almost simultaneously being allocated properties in the one building was described dramatically:

> Everybody's here and it was difficult times, difficult times. I could certainly use other words in that. It was chaotic, it was hell, hell on wheels at times for the first two years. (Jodie)

Jodie stated that the single-site supportive housing program had learnt from the lessons of allocating tenancies to the most vulnerable individuals without thought given to the dynamics of the building. She described current practices as still continuing to focus on the most vulnerable people in the homeless population. Jodie added that: 'I support individuals and look to sustain their tenancies, but I have to also step back in any issues and uphold the rights of [all tenants in the building] at any time'.

2.2 Support

Alongside the use of formal assessment processes to identify and allocate housing to people with the highest vulnerabilities as part of a broader strategy to end homelessness, the provision of support is the critical and distinctive ingredient of supportive housing. Here we describe the

key practices and functions of support. We demonstrate the broad forms and practices through which support is delivered, these include onsite services, including onsite support workers delivering direct services and acting as referrers or brokers for tenants to access services outside of supportive housing, support in the form of 24-hour onsite concierge; and informal support among tenants, although as we will demonstrate, informal support among tenants that is actively encouraged by formal support workers.

2.2.1 Support to address need

The provision of support was directly linked to the needs of the specifically selected tenants. As described above, supportive housing was purposefully targeted toward people with chronic experiences of homelessness, and for the Common Ground models, a vulnerability assessment tool (VI) was used to identify those at greatest risk of premature death. The high vulnerabilities and high needs of the tenant group were evoked when the provision of support was described. The high vulnerabilities of tenants were explained by their lifelong disadvantage and diminished opportunities and experiences. The two participants reported below, May and Jodie, portray the disadvantaged and diminished opportunities of people accessing supportive housing after exiting from homelessness.

> A number of people I see here, so many of them, have come from such dysfunctional beginnings that they haven't had the opportunity to go through life, going through all the normal attachments with a significant carer to having gone through just simple, basic developmental milestones, socialisation, social skills. They have learned, in fact, in a very haphazard way how to survive … and for many of them trauma is basically a given because they come from dysfunctional homes. So they haven't got the skills to go out there to navigate and negotiate what we call a society. (May)

> The notion for some people due to family circumstances, long periods of homelessness, they literally don't know that they need to use hot water and soap to get grease out of your oven. So it's really, for some people, understanding this and going right back to the basics with people and understanding that a lot of people don't have really basic living skills. (Jodie)

Below we demonstrate the numerous forms that support assumed. Despite the diversity of support, however, and as May and Jodie powerfully convey, the provision of support and supportive housing more broadly was premised on the view that tenants had limitations in their functioning because of life experiences. Rather than simply exhibiting high rates of vulnerabilities at the time of assessment and allocation of housing, tenants were thought to experience enduring problems. Supportive housing providers explained that the high vulnerability of tenants were accumulated through previous and problematic life experiences, such as trauma and dysfunctional families. From this positioning of tenants with limited functioning, support was a mechanism to address and assist them overcome the disadvantages, often life long, that had made them eligible for supportive housing in the first place.

The period initially after an individual commenced their tenancy was an important time for the delivery and mode of support. Being conscious of and providing the opportunities to settle into housing was stressed as significant. Exiting what for many was chronic homelessness, accessing supportive housing was described as a difficult transition. As Lorraine put it:

> Because if people have been homeless for a long time they don't know where to go, what their needs are. Assertive engagement, they've quite often lived in a fight or flight sort of mentality, and it can be quite confronting to finally be housed and settled and safe and secure. (Lorraine)

Charles was also conscious of the difficult transition from homelessness into housing; he evoked the importance of support to mitigate the challenges of successfully making the

transition. As an onsite support worker, Charles identified the importance of actively observing people in the first periods of their tenancy. He says that active observations served two purposes: first, to assess how the tenant responds to being housed; second, to build rapport. Charles explained:

> So after that we are looking at them in the first four weeks, which is a period where we see them struggling a lot. We try to understand them, we try to know who they are within that period of four weeks but, as you know, we are not dealing with machines; we are dealing with human beings. It is a period where we are trying by all our means to gain their trust so that they will share and we will explore with them what are the issues and how can we have a plan or how can we set some goals with them. (Charles)

Charles portrays the initial observations of tenants as the first stage in working toward a formal process of service provision and case management. Alan extended these comments. He evoked the voluntary nature of support when describing the importance of support workers' 'assertive engagement' with tenants in the initial stages of tenancy. Assertive engagement in the initial period of tenancy commencement was presented as instrumental because it located support as not something that was simply available. Rather, through assertive engagement accessing support was also something that was expected:

> For support to have a quite high profile during that four weeks helps to minimise some of those risks, but it also helps to set a tone for what support can actually do with a tenant, so what the tenant can expect from support and also to help put a bit of matrix in place for what will then become the tenant's care plan. (Alan)

Like Charles and Lorraine, Alan draws attention to a proactive initial period of assessment which feeds into the development of a case plan and program of support. By referencing the necessity of raising support as 'high profile' and to setting a 'tone', Alan emphasises the need for the support worker to actively demonstrate the benefits of support to a tenant cohort who may be reluctant to actively engage. Alan summarises that he needs to highlight 'what support can actually do with a tenant'.

The assertions of Alan, Charles, Lorraine and other participants interviewed about their direct service practices and their perspectives on the importance of assertive and high profile support in the initial period of tenancy to promote positive outcomes are broadly supported by the research literature. Drawing on national and international published research as well as original empirical research in Australia, authors have observed that (1) social housing tenancy failure is often attributed to antisocial and demanding behaviour among people with complex needs without support, and (2) that a broad range of support services are effective in promoting tenancy sustainment (Atkinson et al. 2007; Habibis et al. 2007; Jones et al. 2014; Seelig & Jones 2004).

We can see that the way supportive housing providers framed the need to build rapport and to be assertive with tenant engagement is consistent with some of the practice ideas recommended to housing and support workers to sustain tenancies for people displaying demanding behaviour (Habibis et al. 2007). Moreover, the participants described the provision of support, especially the importance of support early on, in a way that highlighted their structured practice frameworks. Even though Charles noted the need for flexibility because tenants are human beings not machines, consistent with other participants who advocated for the importance of individually tailored support, he presented a notion of support that was clearly based on planning and his own practice theories about how to achieve positive outcomes vis-à-vis tenant vulnerabilities. The initial stages were important to not only transition into housing, but as Charles and others depicted it, the initial period was a process where the tenant and the support workers could develop rapport and trust. Then, through the process of building trust, the support worker could learn about the problems of the tenant so that over the long-term, support could be tailored to address and overcome those problems. Throughout this

chapter we further examine and illustrate the structured mode of support which was envisaged as enabling tenants to achieve a progressive staged development, whereby in the final and ideal stages, supportive housing would be superfluous to tenant need.

2.2.2 Support to be a good tenant

Support was more than helping a new tenant successfully make the transition into housing after exiting homelessness. Support was a deliberate means to help tenants become good tenants. Being a good tenant meant being a good neighbour, keeping one's property clean, paying rent and, in the context of single-site supportive housing or other forms of high density living, being a good tenant meant behaving pro-socially in communal areas. Like the coupling of support to the initial period of tenancy, support to be a good tenant was explained by evoking the deprived life experiences of tenants: prior to supportive housing they had not learnt how to be a good tenant. Teaching people to be good tenants rested on professional observations that because of chronic homelessness and other vulnerabilities that impair functioning, people have never learnt how to be, or what is expected from, a good tenant.

Sinead provides both onsite and outreach tenancy support. She explained how her service provision role contributed to people learning to be good tenants:

> Letting them know that certain behaviours in a household where other people live are just not acceptable and going to jeopardise their tenancy, like playing your music too loud; but you and I don't necessarily need to learn because it's a skill we don't realise we have. (Sinead)

Charles also explains the role of support in assisting people to become good tenants. Like Sinead, Charles explicitly couches the necessity to teach people to be good tenants as a product of the limited opportunities they have experienced prior to supportive housing:

> Another thing is we cannot maintain that accommodation without abiding by the rules and regulations. As every normal Australian, we know that there is always a lease agreement and we are dealing with people who have spent nearly eight years of their lives without a house or a permanent accommodation it would be very hard for them to know the rules and regulations about living in accommodation that you are renting. So we work together with a tenancy manager and with the tenant; like, there'll always be inspections every three months or every two months and this is what you have to do, this is how you should prepare for the inspections, like paying your rent on time. (Charles)

By evoking years of homelessness and the associated missed opportunities that homelessness represents, Charles is able to frame support as an intervention to teach people the rules and norms they may not be familiar with. This familiarity with normal tenancy rules, as Sinead and Charles depict it, is a skill that we have; a skill moreover, that we are not even conscious of. Thus we, unlike supportive housing tenants, do not need to learn it. From this perspective, the support in supportive housing assumes the role of socialising tenants. Through direct practice, the support and tenancy workers are even positioned in a role of social mentor.

The importance of teaching tenants the rules of living in housing was described as especially important in forms of high density supportive housing. As opposed to standalone dwellings where people are physically removed from their neighbours, the need to actively intervene to teach people how to be a good tenant was heightened in high density living because people shared walls with their neighbours, they entered in and out of the one building together, and they shared communal space.

Speaking with reference to experiences in single-site supportive housing, Lorraine said that onsite support workers 'help [tenants] around being cooperative, maybe modifying their behaviours to accommodate the needs of other people'. Here Lorraine brings attention to the

role of support in modifying people's behaviour not only for their own good, but also for the benefit of other people, namely their neighbours. The intervention to modify behaviour to be a good tenant but also for the purposes of 'accommodating the needs of other people' is consistent with the assertions in the section above about the need to focus on the [single-site supportive housing] building and the dynamics of tenants. In addition to thoughtful allocation, the onsite support workers thus present themselves with an active responsibility to ensure that individual tenants' behaviour does not negatively impact upon their neighbours. Through their direct service provision and strategies to modify behaviour, support workers position themselves with an active role to socialise tenants; support workers aim to transform people with deprived histories into good tenants.

Jodie spoke about how in the first years of single-site supportive housing with onsite support, tenants would engage in chaotic behaviour in the foyer that would threaten other tenants as they moved in and out of the building. She explained that the tenancy and onsite support provider developed a strategy to ensure that tenants displayed appropriate behaviour in the building that was consistent with the expectations of anyone outside of the supportive housing context. Jodie described how working to ensure that tenants display appropriate behaviour is central to the supportive housing model. She did, moreover, provide a detailed analysis of the support practices required to actually bring about the intended and positive behaviour changes. Based on her long practice experiences first in social housing and more recently in single-site supportive housing, Jodie strongly argued that breaching tenants for bad behaviour 'doesn't work'. She went on to say that:

> That's where support's got to come in. It's about doing what they do best, is supporting people to understand it, trying to shift some entrenched behaviours and explaining to [tenants] why. It's not just about punitive approaches. (Jodie)

Jodie contrasted normal housing to supportive housing and argued that the latter was characterised by not simply breaching tenants and exercising punitive responses to transgressive behaviour. Instead, Jodie saw the function of supportive housing as building a 'culture' where tenants are supported to 'understand what's appropriate in a community'. Moreover, and providing an indication of the fundamental objectives of supportive housing (discussed below), supporting people to be good tenants and to behave in appropriate pro-social ways served the function of 'enabling people to deal with some of the issues that they have externally, outside' [supportive housing] (Jodie).

From this perspective, support is delivered to not only modify tenant behaviour to ensure the day-to-day function of supportive housing buildings, but also as an end toward creating positive changes that would last and benefit people outside and beyond supportive housing. Supportive housing providers were able to frame the appropriateness of assisting to create enduring positive changes on the basis that tenants were allocated tenancies because of chronic homelessness and deprived life opportunities. Thus, if people were allocated tenancies because they constituted a highly vulnerable section of the homeless population, support sought to redress lifelong problems that made people eligible for supportive housing.

2.2.3 Support towards independence and self-determination

So far, the discussion has detailed the way that support is done to tenants. We have described support, and the role of supportive housing providers delivering services in particular, in a way that implicitly frames tenants as a passive service recipient. Support, as articulated by participants involved in delivering support and housing, served the function to promote a smooth transition into housing and then as a mechanism to assist—to teach—people to become good tenants. The role of support in the transition into housing and the process of learning to be a good tenant was framed with specific reference to previous experiences of homelessness.

Support, however, was also framed as a dynamic intervention that aimed to promote independence and enable tenant self-determination. Independence and self-determination were not only ultimate outcomes of support, but tenants expressing independence and self-determination by choosing not to engage with support raised fundamental questions about the function and form of supportive housing. In this section of the chapter we demonstrate how supportive housing providers presented support in supportive housing as a relational intervention that placed emphasis on an independent and self-determining tenant. The progression toward and realisation of the independent and self-determining tenant was a subsequent stage in the process of change that would inevitably lead people beyond supportive housing. Participants articulated the necessity of housing and support being delivered in a way that avoided tenant dependency. The discussion here will be extended in Chapter 4 where we examine the perspective of tenants themselves.

Significant among depictions of support was support as a means to achieve tenant independence. Support, in all the forms it assumed, was not ultimately about support providers doing practical things for the tenant. Rather, support was unanimously presented as a practice mechanism for tenants to take greater control over the day-to-day functioning of their own lives. Support aimed to assist tenants to develop independent living skills.

Peter described the role of support workers as preventing tenants from becoming homeless again. He said that support workers provided day-to-day assistance with maintaining tenancies, but their focus was always on developing tenants 'life skills and their independence'. Peter went on to describe the role and objectives of the support workers:

> But it can start at the basic level of just keeping a room clean to begin with. Then beyond that, it's perhaps about just getting people around what they need to do to maintain their tenancy, to do their laundry, to look after themselves, to get to their appointments. And then beyond that you're looking at what interests they might have in building on their strengths really and trying to help them to become more independent. (Peter)

Peter frames independence as a goal and long-term outcome of support. Annette highlights the importance of tenancy managers having close collaborative relationships with support workers to enable tenancy sustainment. Referring to a tenancy worker conducting a property inspection where the tenant is receiving support from a service provider with nomination rights to the property that she manages, she observes:

> If we go and do an inspection and we find that perhaps the place isn't in the best state or there's no food in the fridge or it doesn't look like they're washing their clothes, we can report back to the nominated agency who is supporting that person and say: 'He's doing great here, his rents paid, he's going to work every day, but the stuff he is struggling with is he's not sure about grocery shopping and washing the clothes,' and that type of thing and then they can come in and do some more work with their client around that independent stuff. So, previously, if that support wasn't there, that person technically would not be fulfilling their independent living and predominantly could just fall backwards and end up either back in a hospital somewhere or back in prison. (Annette)

The above comments from Peter and Annette are based on their practice experiences as providers of support and tenancies services. Annette explained how the function of support to help tenants to develop independent living skills was necessary for tenants to comply with the conditions of their tenancy. Indeed, she later went on to note that when support is not available or if tenants disengage with support, their limited capacity to live independently often leads to tenancy failure. She linked the need for tenants to learn independent living skills to their past experiences—'back in a hospital or back in prison'—that have not prepared them for independent living. Jodie likewise presents support as a mechanism for tenants to learn

independent life skills in the context of not having learnt to be independent because of their life experiences. Because tenants need to learn independent living skills, it is important that the support providers do not conduct the required day-to-day activities for the tenant. She described support in single-site support housing as:

> Moving towards developing independent living skills, that it's not so much as going in there, 'I'll scrub your floors. I'll clean your toilet,' etcetera. It is about trying to work alongside people. Some people, due to family circumstances, long periods of homelessness they literally don't know that they need to use hot water and soap to get grease out of your oven. So it's really, for some people, understanding this and going right back to the basics and understanding that a lot of people don't have really basic living skills. (Jodie)

The positioning of support as a function to teach people independent skills is consistent with the idea of supportive housing presented thus far. On a practical level, teaching tenants the skills to become independent is likely to achieve a more efficient and sustainable outcome than what would be achieved if tenants continued to need services to maintain a tenancy. Support to promote growth so that people become independent is congruent with the assumptions about tenants not having benefited from their previous life experiences to have attained the necessities for independence themselves. The explanation that tenants do not possess independent living skills because of disadvantaged life trajectories represents a positive frame of their individual problems that moves beyond and is distinct from a deviant and problematic characterisation of the homeless individual.

Shane, a provider of home and community care services to tenants in supportive housing, highlights the normative depiction of tenants not having learnt life skills in a way that is not of their choosing or fault. He explains that supportive housing tenants need support to learn living skills and independence because: 'their parents have died or husband or wife or whatever, they're coming off the streets'. Although the supportive housing tenant cohort is described as people with addictions, the framing of tenant dysfunction—and thus the need to support them—draws attention to problematic life experiences that the tenant is not held responsible for.

From a positioning of tenants as not responsible for their limitations because of diminished life experiences, supportive housing providers presented support as an intervention to enable disadvantaged people to become independent from support services, and consequentially, support was cast as a means to realise tenant empowerment and normalisation. As we will demonstrate in the latter half of this chapter, support and supportive housing are seen as aspirational and optimistic interventions whereby tenants will change and no longer require the specialised support and housing. Thus, even though intervention is initially premised on tenant dysfunction, the intention is to enable tenants to become functional and then to access normal housing. The transformation that is intended after supportive housing is premised on people's having a right to live positively and to flourish.

The way participants framed support to teach vulnerable people skills rather than doing the tasks for them implicitly draws on a long line of social work theory about autonomy and self-determination. Although self-determination is a core value central to social work and social welfare, scholars recognise the ambiguity of the construct and the way that social service provision and helping interventions often involve coercive practices that impinge on a vulnerable person's capacity to self-determine (Dolgoff et al. 2012).

Banks' distinction between negative and positive self-determination are applicable to the framing of supportive housing as a means to self-determination. She distinguishes between self-determination as a negative freedom, for example leaving people completely alone to do whatever they want; and self-determination as a positive freedom which involves intervention (often from the state) to enable people to have the means to self-determine (Banks 2006).

Participants framed supportive housing consistent with Banks' latter characterisation as a positive intervention. Supportive housing was described as an intervention to provide tenants with the practical resources and opportunities required for them to exercise self-determination. The experience of homelessness is synonymous with diminished access to resources and opportunities to exercise autonomy (Parsell 2011a). Supportive housing was constructed as a solution by providing the means through which tenants could improve their material conditions and capacities to function and participate more fully in society as autonomous and self-determining.

The provision of secure housing and support as a means to learn independent living was not the only means through which supportive housing providers believed independence and self-determination could be achieved. The development of community and informal tenant networks and supports was also framed as deliberate strategies toward tenant empowerment and autonomy.

Creating and building community in supportive housing was as much about the process and the skills learnt through the process of building community as it was about the end outcome of community. Alan was explicit in this sense. He described how tenants were initiating and running activities with other tenants. For Alan, the role of the onsite support was to 'not get in the way' of tenant-led activities happening. Community development activities among tenants was:

> … a process, where people are learning new skills, they're learning new ways to communicate. Just a whole bunch of stuff comes through the process, working as a team, being able to problem solve, getting some practical experience in handling money or keeping records or doing minutes from meetings. (Alan)

Here Alan couches the activities on offer in single-site supportive housing with onsite support, such as preparing and eating meals together, as contributing to and building a sense of community in ways that go beyond social interactions and connections. Community building activities provide opportunities for tenants to engage in what Alan referred to as a 'meaningful use of time'. He referred to an example where tenants led a collective meal preparation and dining initiative. Annette evoked similar notions of participation in community activities as a process of life improvements:

> I'm sure you probably heard about the arts program and the garden and everything that's being run. A lot of the tenants have benefited immensely from all those sort of things and even just as a social interaction, learning to socialise with people and respecting boundaries of other people. So there's quite a lot they can learn in just working in a vegetable garden together. So I think that the important thing for that is the client grows and develops. (Annette)

Annette's comments are important. She stresses how social interactions and tenants coming together to participate in activities provides opportunities for them to learn how to live together. Annette extends the discussion from the section above about support workers helping tenants learn to live together. For Annette, the socialising among tenants participating in activities provides them with organic opportunities to learn and negotiate how to live together: 'respecting boundaries of other people'. Thus, the intervention in supportive housing through the direct actions of support workers to modify tenant behaviour is not the only means to enhance the capacity of tenants to learn to live together. Support workers in supportive housing intend to promote positive social interactions among tenants that will also have the net effect of helping them organically learn to live together and comply with tenancy obligations. In highlighting how social interactions and activity-based communities aim to promote tenant independence and empowerment, Lorraine noted that:

> We have a breakfast club onsite, and we let them run that completely independently. That's been ongoing. They initially wanted it to be for one day a week, and the very first

> day they thought, 'Oh, this is great,' and they've been doing it every morning since then and about maybe two years ago. They identified they'd like to have a Sunday tenant lunch, and that's been ongoing for a very, very long time. We've only just more recently started to provide a little bit of financial assistance towards that. They nominate a cook and they pay $3 to participate and we help the nominated cook to identify the meal menu, and the budget around that, what ingredients I'll need to go and purchase, and then they go and basically run with that themselves. (Lorraine)

Activities are presented as a means through which tenants will grow and develop. All of the participants above emphasised how the ultimate aim is for activities and community initiatives to be led by tenants themselves. It is not just about participation or filling in one's day with recreation and socialising. Participants saw the role of housing and support workers as enablers in the background. Lorraine said that the approach to promote autonomy and empowerment through tenants running activities was 'from the self-determination theory, giving them control'.

Grahame spoke about the importance of tenants leading initiatives as not only more empowering, but also more normal and presumably desirable for them. Grahame is an onsite support provider in single-site supportive housing. He referred to the role of informal support and participation among tenants in community activities as 'normalising'. Grahame said that support among other tenants was more normal because 'you're not there with a support worker with a badge on'. He reflected upon his role and saw his objective to facilitate organic interactions and support among tenants that would render his support superfluous.

Although supportive housing providers identified the centrality of activities, community and support to foster empowerment and autonomy, they clearly articulated the practical barriers:

> One of the greatest challenges certainly is empowering people and not even that implies we'd give that to them, but this intrinsic lack of motivation that exists, it's really overwhelming and it's a real challenge I think of the model. So you can put all the services, psychologists, psychiatrists, masseuse, job network, whatever you want to do and there's still a lack of preparedness, willingness, general interest in engaging with those services, even onsite. (Christine)

Christine draws attention to the disadvantaged tenant group when discussing the challenges to empowerment. Even when geographical and physical barriers to access services are addressed through locating them onsite, Christine observes that it is nevertheless difficult to have tenants actively participate in a way that will foster empowerment and general life improvements. Others identified the challenges that supportive housing faces in ways that went beyond individual tenant problems and located the challenges within existing service systems.

Alan emphasised the importance of supportive housing promoting tenant independence and autonomy in the context of the prevailing welfare system. He argued that the provision and norms of contemporary welfare subverted the independence and autonomy of social service clients. Alan said that not-for-profit community organisations foster a 'feeling of entitlement from certain parts of the tenant cohort'. In turn, Alan believed that supportive housing tenants express dissatisfaction when the model of onsite service provision does not replicate what he sees as the passive and disabling welfare provided by the not-for-profit sector.

> The [supportive housing] model is very much about trying to promote the level of independence for the tenant group. By just doing things for them, that's not achieving what we set out to do. (Alan)

Lorraine presented a similar account of the challenges of supportive housing promoting independence and empowerment because of what she saw as a passive welfare culture. For Lorraine, the cooking and shared meals that take place in single-site supportive housing are more than providing nutrition. She said the shared meals in supportive housing:

> … gives them something nutritional, but it also prevents them from having that welfare mentality, 'Oh, I need to go to an agency and pick up my handout this week'. We're trying to make them think more independently. (Lorraine)

There is literature that both supports and contests Lorraine and Alan's characterisation of welfare. Some argue that contemporary Australian welfare, including social housing, is conditional and contingent on behavioural standards and compliance (Habibis et al. 2013); whereas others, like Alan and Lorraine, see dominant forms of welfare as passive and counterproductive (Saunders 2004). Without debating the veracity of either depiction of welfare in contemporary Australia, Lorraine and Alan, and the comments of participants more broadly, illustrate the way that supportive housing is framed as an intervention that actively and purposefully attempts to engage tenants in the service provision and change process. The resources provided in supportive housing are directed toward enabling the disadvantaged tenant group to self-determine and become independent. Independence is framed as independence from supportive housing. Supportive housing, as has been canvassed and as will be later extended, is an active intervention to promote tenant change and moreover positive life improvement.

2.2.4 Support, disengaging and self-determination

What happens when tenants express autonomy and self-determine to not engage with support? If the purpose of supportive housing is to promote autonomy and self-determination, it is probable that tenants will no longer choose to engage with support. Here we examine this dilemma. Support and tenancy providers spoke about the challenges of balancing the need for tenants to exercise autonomy on the one hand, and the wasted resource if tenants chose not to engage with onsite support workers, on the other. Lorraine explained thus:

> Once you work with people and you do that case management goal planning and all of that, it's a fine balance not to be in their face too much, allow them to drive that, because when I start initially, I'm pretty full on with them. I want them to understand that we are funded to do this: 'You've come in eligible for these particular reasons. We're funded to provide you that support to hopefully get you to a point of sustainable independent living'. I emphasise that a lot, because if a person's going to come in and then not engage at all, and things aren't going too well for them, somebody else could be having that spot and I let them know that. There is an expectation that they will meet with us on a regular basis. (Lorraine)

Lorraine's emphasis on 'that spot' rather than a person's long-term tenancy are instructive. She frames tenants in supportive housing as occupying *a spot* in a program. Moreover, it is a program where participation with support is expected. Indeed, the description of supportive housing as a mechanism to first transition into housing, then to become a good tenant, and then to develop independence and empowerment, all rest upon a model of tenant participation with support. Thus, if tenants do not engage with support, they are not following the theory of the model as understood and expected by service providers.

Christine provides onsite support services in a different single-site supportive housing program to Lorraine (in a different Australian city). Christine couched her analysis of tenants choosing not to engage with support as an 'inherently self-protective mechanism'. Christine understood the social and psychological reasons why highly vulnerable people would not, initially at least, be willing to engage with support services. Irrespective of the explanation for not working with onsite supports, Christine observed that:

> If people don't want to engage, they simply don't, so then it becomes how are you supporting that person other than providing them with something massive which is a place to live, where they are safe. So I think that's a hard one because we do say to people: 'If you don't need the support of these services than perhaps you don't need

> [single-site supportive housing with onsite support]', because that's what makes the model different from other places. (Christine)

The reflections of Christine and Lorraine speak directly to arguments against single-site supportive housing with onsite support. Tsemberis (2010) advocates for scattered-site supportive housing with support provided through outreach over congregate forms on the basis that scattered-site is more preferred by consumers. Busch-Geertsema (2012), likewise, has argued that person-centred support in scattered-site housing is more appropriate than place-centred support in single-site supportive housing. In the case of the latter, if an individual does not want to engage with support, it raises efficiency issues if onsite support workers are unable to engage with tenants (who live onsite). This point from the literature was clearly illustrated in the remarks above. Following Lorraine's comments, Busch-Geertsema (2012) would argue that having support directed to the individual—person centred support—is more efficient and represents a more normalised form of housing and support because it is able to be stepped up and stepped down in accordance with a tenant's needs.

Christine's later assertions pick up on the critique against single-site supportive housing with onsite support. She said that if people do not want to accept support and rather only want to accept affordable housing as a solution to their homelessness, it is arguably reasonable enough for them to do so. But Christine added, for people that do not want to freely and reasonably engage with support, supportive housing with on-site support is not appropriate for them. They have equal right to a roof, but 'maybe not this [single-site supportive housing] roof'.

Alongside questions raised about the efficiencies and appropriateness of single-site supportive housing for people who do not, or no longer, choose to engage with onsite support, participants also presented an argument for the benefits on single-site supportive housing with onsite support. The benefits coalesce around the significance of the identification and monitoring function and the position for support to intervene to address problems. Charles is an onsite support worker in a single-site supportive housing program. He articulated the benefits of onsite support as:

> We are not waiting for the crisis to come and try to solve it, but we see the crisis coming and try to prevent. So prevention is probably one thing. This is why we are here. (Charles)

Here Charles presents an argument common among participants who assert the benefits that stem from support workers being physically located onsite to observe problems as they arise and to intervene accordingly. By virtue of being onsite, as opposed to only seeing tenants through formal case management times during pre-planned appointments, Charles argues that support workers are able to observe and address problems that would go unnoticed without onsite support. He sees these benefits as the fundamental value of support being located onsite, 'this is why we are here'.

In single-site supportive housing, support services involve not only formal support delivered by a support worker, but also concierge. Formal support workers included in this study had experiences and qualifications in welfare, community development, social work, and psychology, whereas the concierge role does not require formal qualifications in human services or social sciences. The concierge role includes monitoring and controlling movement into the building, for example, ensuring that tenants sign in their visitors. Having both the concierge and formal support workers onsite was described as beneficial because the onsite workers could identify problems or potential problems, and as Charles observes, prevent them.

The nature of the concierge role, described by Marcus as the 'familiar face, who knows [all tenants] by name', was described as particularly important in identifying the early stages of problems that, if not addressed, may lead to more significant problems. By virtue of being the friendly face without the formal position of support worker, the concierge was believed to have

the capacity to break down the barriers of tenants engaging with support. Kate provides onsite support services through formal case plans. She believed that:

> Some tenants feel more comfortable talking to concierge because, I suppose, it's a little bit less formal. They're not there as a therapeutic or social worker type role so maybe that's less threatening for some people who have been in the system for years. (Kate)

In addition to informally engaging with tenants, or even monitoring tenants for the purposes of early intervention, onsite support workers were seen as important in ensuring tenants complied with behaviours and actions agreed upon through the formal support process. Below Lorraine explains both the important and commonly referred to function of onsite support workers making referrals to external agencies and the monitoring that follows:

> Identifying what the health needs are and linking them into health services and then monitoring that they attend those appointments. (Lorraine)

Adrian provides tenancy and social support services in both onsite and outreach modes. He presented a case study example to illustrate how onsite support services achieved positive outcomes that he argued were difficult to achieve in the absence of onsite support:

> We've got a guy who's schizophrenic and he's got really florid mental health presentation. He's extremely vulnerable and if there wasn't an onsite presence of staff, he'd just be taken advantage of by a lot of the other tenants there and often is until we intervene. Recently he's had someone basically squatting in his room and telling him that he's allowed to and linking into this guy's mental health presentation to such an extent where the guy's now convinced that this guy is allowed to stay there. So without us intervening and saying, 'Hey, this guy shouldn't be here. You're putting your own tenancy at risk by letting him stay'. (Adrian)

Adrian went on to argue that it was his assessment that when onsite support staff are not present the tenants do not report problems. Moreover, in the absence of onsite support there are additional problems that occur, for example, people squatting. Participants framed the importance of the monitoring function of onsite support, not solely to monitor the tenant, but as Sinead observed to monitor the uninvited visitors that 'stand over tenants'. Sinead, Adrian and Alan all stressed that without onsite support in social housing, or as homeless, tenants were exploited by other people. Sinead said that in her portfolio of properties without adequate onsite support, vulnerable tenants would have their keys stolen by 'known drug dealers' who would then use the property as a venue to deal illicit substances. Thus, as these supportive housing providers asserted, onsite support monitored properties to ensure that unwanted visitors did not undermine the tenancies of vulnerable tenants.

The characterisations of the monitoring function, the enhanced opportunities for observing and the informal opportunities for engagement with concierge were presented as positive dimensions of single-site supportive housing (with onsite support). Participants were also conscious, however, of the extent to which the benefits of onsite support may be problematic. Indeed, participants expressed the view that the problems with having support located onsite may actually be contrary and counterproductive to the fundamental objectives of tenant independence and self-determination. The perceived problems inherent in the presence of onsite support were expressed by those who likewise believed that onsite support played an important role. Thus participants who saw the benefits of onsite support also understood the limitations or potential limitations with support located onsite.

Marcus' comments represent a thoughtful and critical example of this tension. Above we showed how Marcus lauded the presence of concierge for playing a welcoming and friendly function in single-site supportive housing with onsite support. In addition to constituting a positive asset in supportive housing, he appreciated the dilemma that having 24-hour

concierge onsite represented. Marcus recalled practical experiences where tenants described to him how the process of signing visitors into the building with concierge was intrusive:

> You want to give them the autonomy to live independently and stuff but at the same time you're wondering who they're bringing home, so to speak. It's tricky and it's a challenge. It's one of the challenges I've found here is where do you draw the line and who do you draw the line with? I've been approached by young people saying, 'Look, I'm on the dating scene and I've got different people [visiting]'. I'm like, 'Of course you don't want different people seeing' [who else has visited]. (Marcus)

Here Marcus is conscious of the reasonable concern tenants hold about signing guests into the building. Nevertheless, he contrasted this reasonable view with the experiences of other tenants. He stressed that:

> At the same time, you have people who are being stood over by different males, people working, say, in the sex industry and you're like, well, then you're protecting at the same time. (Marcus)

Above Marcus is referring to the policy of all tenants being required to sign-in their guests with concierge. He is aware that in the process of signing their guests into the building, tenants are also inadvertently showing the guest who else they have previously signed into the building. Marcus acknowledges that for tenants 'on the dating scene', they may feel uncomfortable disclosing information about the identity or frequency of their previous guests. Conscious of this intrusion on one's privacy, he rationalised the breach of privacy on utilitarian grounds, in that overall among the entire tenant group, the breach of privacy protects other, more vulnerable, tenants from being 'stood over'. Thus, Marcus acknowledged the limitations to privacy that are part of onsite support, but he believed the loss of privacy is justified to protect vulnerable tenants from being stood over.

A participant responsible for a health organisation that provides onsite support services to tenants in single-site supportive housing identified some of the challenges inherent in concierge services. She said that:

> The problem with [single-site supportive housing with onsite staff], from our point of view perhaps, in terms of the tenants is that because they're so scrutinised in a way, and everyone knows when their mental health medication is due, and all this sort of stuff, which is maybe what needs to happen for it to work, but at the same time it kind of takes away some self-determination by the client. It almost turns it into a facility. (Amy)

Amy went on to explain that she had observed tenants is single-site supportive housing achieve 'amazingly' positive outcomes and she noted that the model was appropriate for some individuals. She balanced these appraisals against the abnormality of having controlled access and monitoring from concierge and on-site support staff more generally. In Amy's professional role she is responsible for the delivery of health services to people who have experienced or are at risk of homelessness over a large geographic area beyond the single-site supportive housing with onsite support building. She thus reflects upon single-site supportive housing from the perspective of observing a range of different models and approaches where support is either not provided or provided through outreach, including poorly serviced rooming house accommodation. In remarking about the scrutiny in single-site supportive housing onsite support, she suggests that it 'is maybe what needs to happen for it to work', but at the same time she couches her critique of single-site supportive housing with onsite support within a broader historical analysis of the return to institutionalisation. Amy observes that:

> So that people who used to be looked after in terrible institutions, they're in a lot of these places now [supportive housing with onsite support]; but now we're almost treating them a little bit like they're institutionalised because they have to check in and

> out and there's these checks, and you can't have people in, and you can't do this. (Amy)

Amy presents a critique of the scrutiny of supportive housing vis-à-vis the concierge and the monitoring function of onsite support services. Her critique is nuanced. She points out that onsite support serves to place too much scrutiny on tenants, but she observes that tenants have achieved positive outcomes in single-site supportive housing and that the monitoring is 'maybe what needs to happen for it to work'. Moreover, she grounded her critique of single-site supportive housing with comments about the limited resources available in other housing models (or just the provision of social housing) that do not provide satisfactory support for vulnerable tenants.

2.2.5 A mechanism for positive life change: life beyond and after supportive housing

Supportive housing was unanimously described as long-term housing. As opposed to homeless accommodation and transitional arrangements, the leases available in the supportive housing offered tenants a degree of permanence. Lorraine and Peter made this clear:

> I suppose the beauty of [supportive housing] is that you can stay here for as long as you want. There's no end point to it, and you're going to have access to those support services forever, and I think that's what makes us different to other programs, other housing programs, is that we are accessible all the time and it doesn't matter how small the intervention is or how brief, it's just that reassurance. (Lorraine)

> I think where the model works well is where there's a sense of stability, where people are valuing their accommodation as being long-term, where people are being housed who have been homeless in the past. (Peter)

Supportive housing providers explicitly described the housing in supportive housing as long-term. They juxtaposed the long-term housing with not only formal policies of crisis and transitional homeless accommodation, but also to the precariousness and instability that homelessness represents on a personal level. As long-term housing, tenants of supportive housing, they were afforded the opportunity to exercise greater control over their lives.

When describing the long-term nature of housing, emphasis was placed on tenants themselves choosing to stay in or leave supportive housing of their volition. As Lorraine described, 'you can stay as long as *you* want'. In addition to the benefits of different forms of support, community, practice and socialising strategies to promote independence, participants saw the long-term housing as the key need of the tenant group. The idea of permanent housing, even in the social housing system however, no longer holds currency. Reflecting a move in the United Kingdom, state housing authorities across Australia are providing fixed-term tenancies for a tenant's duration of need (Fitzpatrick & Pawson 2014).

In Chapter 4 we return to and examine in greater detail fixed-term tenancies and the provision of housing for duration of need from the perspectives of tenants. Recognising that the notion of permanent social housing is increasingly undermined by contemporary policy, supportive housing providers understood that the security of tenure was a fundamental component to the supportive housing model because it enabled tenants to feel sufficiently comfortable to address their problems. Alan highlights this well:

> The fact that a tenant actually signs a residential tenancy agreement, I think that is a part of the supportive nature of the model. The tenant then becomes protected, as much as anybody in the community, in their rights to have their space. (Alan)

Annette also highlighted the importance of tenants having a long-term housing option in the context of their previous experiences of homelessness. For Annette, the long-term nature of housing served as a physical sign that vulnerable tenants had a feeling of belonging to place. Providing a long-term place held particular significance for tenants as supportive housing was

constructed as extremely successful in providing housing for excluded individuals. Christine articulated a common narrative. As a support provider in single-site supportive housing, she openly acknowledged the challenges in providing services to tenants and enacting positive change. She nevertheless argued that fundamentally, supportive housing provides safe and secure housing for people who had lived too many years of their lives chronically homeless.

From the premise that supportive housing was long-term housing, supportive housing was a mechanism to enable tenants to make positive life changes. Indeed, and significantly, the long-term nature of supportive housing was understood to constitute an intervention that would promote positive change to such an extent that tenants would not require the long-term housing. Here we demonstrate how supportive housing was positioned as a strategy to enhance tenants' life skills, opportunities and aspirations so that they no longer required supportive housing. Leaving supportive housing was constructed as (1) directed by the tenant, and furthermore (2), leaving supportive housing was evidence that the intervention had exceeded in meeting its objectives. In Christine's words, supportive housing for people exiting chronic homelessness was not the 'end point' but the 'starting point, the beginning of the journey'.

Supportive housing as a journey to an end point beyond supportive housing was consistent with the expressed intentions of support in the form of creating tenant independence rather than dependence on support providers to conduct day-to-day living activities. Marcus' reflections on his role and how he links support to the ultimate outcome of supportive housing are instructive:

> My line of working to try and empower people to do it themselves and I've heard stories of [support service] going in and cleaning up people's units and they stood there and while the staff are cleaning up they throw things on the ground and it's like, 'Well, what are we doing here? It's not going to do them any favours'. It is permanent housing, but the idea isn't for people to stay here for 100 years or to see out their days. If people are comfortable with that, that's great, but we hope to think that one day they might do something different, go get a job and move to private rental. I know it's very aspirational, or own a home, but I'd hate to think it's just containing people into living day-by-day, week-by-week and I believe it's a brilliant opportunity to really convey skills in people to go ahead and do it themselves and I'd hate to think of it as an opportunity missed. (Marcus)

The construction of supportive housing as a mechanism for life changes that lead people to move on from supportive housing—after they had achieved the positive life changes—was in part a function of the supportive housing stock included in this research. The majority of housing stock available in the supportive housing included in this component of the study was bedsit and one-bedroom, and most tenants were single. Lorraine links life improvements and (single) people's movements to building design and amenity:

> We stipulate quite strongly, on intake, that it's primarily for single people, however we understand life moves on, you might meet someone, enter into a relationship, once you're stable yourself you can reunify with your children and you might get to the point that you can actually get access custody. We might then need to move you onto something more suitable. (Lorraine)

Lorraine went on and evoked the deep psychological aims of supportive housing. She explained that supportive housing was not simply about achieving objectively-defined positive outcomes for tenants after supportive housing, such as accessing different secure housing elsewhere. Rather, she stressed the importance of assisting tenants to change how they think. In referring to an example where a tenant moved out of supportive housing after the tenant realised that supportive housing no longer met his needs, Lorraine said:

> I suppose part of our role is, once we've got them here, is to teach them the skills to know where to go in the community to get their needs met. (Lorraine)

Participants implicitly framed the community as the normal aspiration and supportive housing as the intervention to prepare people to enter the community after supportive housing had done its job. This characterisation of supportive housing as a mechanism for people to learn skills to enable them to move out into the community—or as Kate explicitly states, 'work on the issues that have contributed to their homelessness'—is directly linked to the positioning of tenants as people with limited capacities because of diminished life experiences. Moreover, the aspiration that tenants will leave supportive housing after supportive housing provides them with greater life skills and capacities is consistent with the practice interventions to promote independence.

On the one hand, supportive housing providers presented clear descriptions of the tenant cohort as highly vulnerable and unable to sustain housing or achieve independence in the absence of the supportive housing intervention. On the other, they expressed an optimistic and aspirational view about what tenants could and indeed ought to go on and achieve. Jodie illustrates this optimism for what the future holds post-supportive housing:

> But there's a whole wide world out there and I think that this is the platform for people, but not to be their whole world inside [supportive housing], but to engage outside. I don't see that a single person wants to live [as single]. I see people who want to find partners, find love, have children, move elsewhere. I don't see that a success is that someone remains single here in a studio apartment for the next 30 years. That thought, in a sense, is just horrifying to me. But it's bigger than that and that's what we should be part of it. (Jodie)

Here Jodie described both the optimistic aspirations of supportive housing and the direct role of supportive housing in contributing to the outcomes, 'we should be part of it'. These common descriptions of supportive housing positioned the model as playing a direct role in human flourishing. Moving on from supportive housing was not framed as a policy to spread thin government resources to as many people as possible (Department of Housing and Public Works n.d.).

Instead, moving on was based on an optimistic assumption of human capacities. Further, the life transformations that led to moving on highlighted a normative view that all people, even highly vulnerable people, can go on and flourish. There were tensions, however, in the social housing system that supportive housing relied on. As a manager of tenancies in the single-site supportive housing model, Jodie explained that the visionary ideals of supportive housing were at odds with limiting key performance indicators (KPIs) set by housing providers.

Sustaining tenancies is identified as a measure of success, but premised on the idea that supportive housing ought to function to promote positive life change, Jodie pointed out that 'there are good vacates', such as people finding love, employment and wanting to have children. Like Jodie, May articulated what can only be described as a vision for supportive housing where the model ought to actively ensure that tenants flourished. May reflected on not only what is after supportive housing, but also that keeping people in supportive housing is limiting and problematic:

> You keep them still in this kind of a model, you've lost them. You're only keeping them down. You're not progressing their rehabilitation or whatever you want to call it, their aspirations. (May)

Although May was adamant that supportive housing was an appropriate response to people's immediate housing and support needs, she constructed an idea of supportive housing that was enabling to something else. As such, if the model did not enable life beyond supportive housing

it was an inadequate response. She said that if people with chronic experiences of homelessness and high vulnerabilities stayed in supportive housing they were:

> … being de-skilled. Where you have the dominance of the percentage of people with high care needs and people are just running around taking them to appointments and making sure their apartments are clean … It's dishonouring them really. It's like what are we doing? It's so patronising. (May)

May's descriptions of the function of supportive housing are grounded in an understanding of the model actively working toward enabling tenants to achieve positive life changes that lead them elsewhere. Although she presented a clear case that people accessing supportive housing were extremely vulnerable—as defined by the rates of intellectual, psychiatric and physical disabilities—she expressed a view that the people were nonetheless capable of flourishing. This aspirational view of what tenants could achieve meant that if supportive housing did not actively promote life advancement for tenants it was patronising and devaluing people.

Richard likewise framed the objectives of supportive housing as life beyond supportive housing. As a direct provider of day-to-day support services and from the perspective of a professional who described his job educating and promoting independence, Richard sums up the objective of supportive housing thus:

> The goal in a way is not to work with them again. I think it's a good way to put ourselves out of a job. So, 'Yep, you're fantastic. Bye. Don't need to see you again'. (Richard)

Richard went on to say that it would not be easy given the troubled lives tenants had lived, but nevertheless success in supportive housing meant that people exited and 'they're able to be independent and to go and live a normal life'. Christine offered a detailed and sophisticated analysis of the cognitive and identity shifts that are required—and that are moreover difficult to achieve—in order for tenants to progress to a life transforming stage. She described how tenants who had exited chronic homelessness had to face life changes in supportive housing such as dealing with the state of no longer being 'hyper vigilant' and no longer worrying about 'where's my next meal coming from'.

In addition to the practical challenges explained in terms of tenants never having learnt the day-to-day routine and skills to maintain a tenancy, Christine said that succeeding in supportive housing required a 'shift in identity'. She said that it was hard for tenants who had previously identified themselves as homeless to come to terms with constructing a new sense of self. Christine explained that supportive housing would be successful when:

> A person had a sense of identity, their own sense of who they are and that in that perception of that identity or their belief in themselves, homelessness would not be a part of that. (Christine)

The change in identity represents the last and ultimate aim of supportive housing. Supportive housing is an intervention that will enable people to see themselves differently. The shift in identity—from a homeless person with high vulnerabilities to an independent and autonomous individual—will inevitably mean that people no longer desire to reside in supportive housing. By framing the ultimate aim in terms of people's shift in how they see themselves and what they value (independence), people will self-determine to leave the long-term housing of their own volition. Supportive housing was framed as more than the linking of support with affordable housing; it was framed to address immediate problems to achieve sustainable tenancies (Jacobs & Arthurson 2003; Jones et al. 2014; Seelig & Jones 2004). Supportive housing was a sophisticated, planned and deliberate program to change people's lives and their sense of self. When supportive housing is successful, participants expressed the view that tenants would no longer desire the long-term housing that is available. Their new sense of self will be incongruent with the housing and linked support on offer.

2.2.6 A theory of human change

Supportive housing providers' visionary and aspirational accounts of supportive housing, based as they are on their reflections of their own practices, implicitly drew on a theory of human change. Forte's (2014) observation of a theory of change as a theoretical statement about the assumptions underpinning change are relevant to participants' depiction of supportive housing. According to Forte (2014), a theory of change contains assumptions about the nature of the intended change, the rationale for the change, and the processes to enact change. These questions draw on Louie and Guthrie's (2007) model for developing a theory of change in the policy context. They ask four questions: first, what is the problem you're trying to solve? Second, what will be different if you're successful? Third, what activities will you undertake to achieve your goals? And fourth, what factors will accelerate or inhibit progress?

We can see that the characterisation of supportive housing presented in this chapter directly answer the four questions posed by Louie and Guthrie (2007).

1. Participants clearly explained that 'the problem supportive housing tried to solve' was an individual's homelessness. More specifically, supportive housing tried to solve the complex problems that the highly vulnerable people who accessed supportive housing presented with. For some, trying to solve an individual's homelessness sat within a much broader objective of ending chronic homelessness. In this way the focus on solving an individual's homelessness formed part of a wider agenda.
2. It was unanimously agreed that the individual supportive housing tenants 'would be different if supportive housing was successful'. The difference was explained in clear terms. Supportive housing tenants would achieve independence. Indeed, the notion of independence extended beyond independence in terms of independence to successfully manage a tenancy and to conduct day-to-day activities. Supportive housing tenants, when the model was successful, would no longer see themselves and construct their lives around homelessness. Rather, supportive housing tenants would be different because they would take on an identity congruent with their autonomous and independent self. Moreover, the independent identity that formed would inevitably mean that tenants imagined a life beyond supportive housing.
3. There were likewise consistent and deliberate activities undertaken to achieve the intended goal of independence. In fact, there was a direct relationship explained between the goal of independence and the activities undertaken in supportive housing. Because independence was the ultimate outcome—and not just tenancy sustainment—the activities aimed to promote tenants realising independence. From this perspective, the activities that the support workers did not undertake were equally as important as the activities that were undertaken. In terms of the former, support workers did not undertake day-to-day activities themselves. And, in turn, the activities involved teaching tenants how to maintain a tenancy themselves. Additionally, the participants recognised that independence and a successful life beyond supportive housing required more than tenants learning day-to-day function. The activities provided in supportive housing thus sought to assist tenants to learn about the norms of living in housing. Importantly, the norms included people learning how to socialise, and how to maintain personal boundaries.
4. A nuanced picture emerged of the factors that were seen as accelerating and inhibiting progress. On the one hand, and in addition to the provision of long-term housing, participants believed that onsite support was a crucial accelerating factor. Further, they saw the critical mass of tenants in the one building as a means to develop community and a range of interpersonal and pro-social skills. On the other hand, participants, including the same supportive housing providers who asserted the accelerating factors, acknowledged that the provision of onsite support, and the congregation of highly vulnerable tenants in high density living, may inhibit progress.

2.3 Conclusion

We conclude this section with two comments that sum up the central essence of this discussion. On the one hand, we emphasise the significance afforded to secure long-term housing as a practical and psychological resource to end a person's homelessness. On the other, we present an expectation that, even for people allocated tenancies on the basis of extreme vulnerabilities and chronic homelessness, supportive housing was described as a platform for an improved life beyond supportive housing. Supportive housing aimed to promote human flourishing. Charles and Jodie convey the complexity and ambitious objectives of single-site supportive housing:

> It's not emergency accommodation or crisis accommodation, but for us you can remain at [supportive housing] as long as you want, so it's basically your home. (Charles)

> But to condemn someone to live by themselves their entire life is just appalling to me. (Jodie)

The summative comments from Charles and Jodie above capture the two key concepts examined in this chapter: the importance of secure and long-term supportive housing, and long-term supportive housing as a means for a life beyond supportive housing. Participants described their activities in and the objectives of supportive housing that implicitly drew on a theory of human change. The theory of human change included change in day-to-day functioning and also change at the identity level. When the latter was achieved, the long-term housing central to the supportive housing model would no longer be desirable or appropriate for the tenant.

This is not to say that supportive housing providers advocated for short-term or time-limited housing. They did not. Participants argued that the provision of long-term housing was pivotal to the change process. They argued that long-term supportive housing ensured that tenants felt a sense of belonging and stability after exiting homelessness. It was the benefits that go with long-term housing, coupled with the support, that constituted the necessary ingredients to assist tenants to improve their lives to a point where they—and not the landlord—would decide that supportive housing was no longer necessary. Or, as we have argued, it was envisioned that when the change had occurred, tenants would perceive that supportive housing was incongruent with their sense of self.

3 TENANTS' RATINGS AND OUTCOMES IN SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

This chapter reports on data from the tenant survey. The survey data addresses the research questions about tenants' preferences and ratings in supportive housing. The chapter also provides descriptive data about tenant self-reported outcomes, and draws on a logistic regression to analyse how the various housing provisions and demographic variables relate to the different measures of satisfaction, life improvement, and time spent with other people.

As noted in Chapter 1, the survey respondents comprised three groups of people residing in supportive housing. Twenty-six survey respondents resided in single-site supportive housing with on-site support. This group was allocated housing because of chronic experiences of homelessness and an assessment that they required support to sustain their tenancies. There were 35 people residing in single-site supportive housing with onsite support, but those individuals were allocated housing because of working, low wage earner status. A further 41 survey respondents were residing in scattered-site supportive housing where support was provided by outreach service provision.

The literature from the United States makes clear distinctions between scattered-site supportive housing with outreach support and single-site supportive housing with onsite support. Indeed, and as shown in Chapter 1 and the Positioning Paper (Parsell & Moutou 2014), scattered-site supportive housing is advocated on the basis of being indistinguishable, more normal, and more effective at promoting recovery (Tsemberis 2010). What we found in this research, however, was that people who received support through outreach (and thus assumed to be more normal and less identifiable than single-site supportive housing with onsite support), lived in units in medium blocks of social housing. As such, the tenants in supportive housing receiving outreach support lived in blocks of units with similar levels of concentration of social housing as did survey respondents who resided in single-site supportive housing with onsite support. The distinctions between scattered-site supportive housing as more normal than single-site supportive housing made in the literature from the United States, however, are less meaningful in Australia.

This chapter proceeds in two sections. The first section provides descriptive data from the survey. We present the descriptive data with reference to key survey respondent variables, such as housing time, previous experience of homelessness, gender, country of birth, and Indigenous status. In the last section of this chapter, we present a brief logistic regression.

3.1 Satisfaction with housing

We used several questions to identify people's satisfaction with their housing. The data is presented in Tables 3 and 4. Two key findings can be identified from the data. First, respondents overwhelmingly reported satisfaction with their housing. Satisfaction was evident through a consistent finding of more than 80 per cent of respondents indicating satisfaction across several measures, such as feeling settled in their housing, pleased with housing, and housing meeting household needs. Likewise, at least 85 per cent of all respondents were satisfied with the design, privacy and security of their housing. Indeed, and astoundingly, 95 per cent of supported single-site tenants were satisfied with privacy and 100 per cent were satisfied with security (Table 4).

Drawing on the work of Pawson and Sosenko (2012), contemporary researchers recognise the limitations in interpreting housing satisfaction data (Parsell et al. 2015). Reported levels of satisfaction with housing need to be understood in the context of people's life histories and what they have come to expect. Recognising the limitations of and, as Pawson and Sosenko (2012) note, the nebulous construct of tenant satisfaction with housing, the data presented below provides a clear sense of high satisfaction with multiple domains of housing.

Furthermore, rather than just one question about satisfaction with housing at the broad level, we specifically asked tenants to rate their level of satisfaction with components and features of housing.

We believe that the several separate questions about specific measures in our survey overcome some of the important limitations identified and in turn will assist to ensure that the satisfaction measures are meaningful to respondents as well as researchers (Pawson & Sosenko 2012). As an example, the construct of privacy is particularly significant. Questions have been raised about the scrutiny and monitoring function of single-site supportive housing with onsite support undermining feelings of home (Padgett 2007, see also Chapters 2 and 4 of this report), but the survey responses about privacy in supportive housing with onsite support indicate clear levels of satisfaction with this aspect of housing. Not only do the positive appraisals of security and privacy (and affordability) indicate a sense of home, the survey responses demonstrate that the majority of all participants experienced their housing as home (Table 4). On the other hand, the data suggests that all tenants were least satisfied with the size of their dwellings. This was especially the case for tenants in single-site supportive housing who were allocated properties because of working, low wage earner status. Thirty-one per cent of this cohort reported that the size of their dwellings did not meet their needs.

Second, people overall reported high levels of satisfaction with housing, although higher rates of satisfaction were reported by respondents in supportive housing with support provided through outreach (90%) compared to 85 per cent of respondents in supportive housing with onsite support (Table 3). Moreover, satisfaction was relatively consistently reported among both females and males, and people who had experienced homelessness at some point in their lives and those who had not.

Table 3: Pleased, settled and satisfied with overall housing

	All participants	Housing provider			Homeless status		Gender		COB	
	N = 102	Onsite		Outreach	Previously homeless	Never previously been homeless	Female	Male	Australia	Country other than Australia
		AH	SH							
Pleased in current housing										
Pleased	89.2	91.4	84.6	90.2	88.2	90.7	87.2	90.9	64.0	87.5
Not pleased	10.8	8.6	15.4	9.8	11.8	9.3	12.8	9.1	36.0	12.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Feeling settled in current housing										
Settled	85.3	88.6	84.6	83.0	83.0	88.4	80.8	89.9	89.5	79.2
Not settled	14.7	11.4	15.4	17.0	17.0	11.6	19.2	10.1	10.5	20.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Satisfaction with current housing meeting needs of household										
Satisfied	88.2	88.6	84.6	90.3	86.5	90.7	83.0	92.7	88.5	87.6
Not satisfied	11.8	11.4	15.4	9.7	13.5	9.3	17.0	7.3	11.5	12.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Note: AH = Affordable Housing tenants; SH = Supported Housing tenants

Table 4: Design, privacy, security, affordability and size

	All participants	Housing provider			Homeless status		Gender		COB	
	N = 102	Onsite		Outreach	Previously homeless	Never previously been homeless	Female	Male	Australia	Country other than Australia
		AH	SH							
The overall design and layout of your housing										
Satisfied	90.1	94.3	92.3	85.4	91.5	88.4	85.2	94.5	93.6	79.2
Not satisfied	9.9	5.7	7.7	14.6	8.5	11.6	14.8	5.5	6.4	20.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
The amount of privacy your housing has										
Satisfied	89.3	94.3	84.6	87.8	86.5	93.1	87.2	90.9	89.7	87.5
Not satisfied	10.7	5.7	15.4	12.2	13.5	6.9	12.8	9.1	10.3	12.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
The security of your housing itself										
Satisfied	93.1	100.0	96.2	90.2	91.5	100.0	95.8	94.5	93.6	100.0
Not satisfied	6.9	0.0	3.8	9.8	8.5	0.0	4.2	5.5	6.4	0.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
The affordability of the rent										
Satisfied	85.4	80.0	84.6	82.0	90.3	84.8	86.1	80.9	89.1	82.1
Not satisfied	14.6	20.0	15.4	18.0	9.7	15.2	13.9	19.1	10.9	17.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
The size of the housing										
Meets my household's needs	75.0	68.6	80.8	73.2	74.6	72.1	68.1	78.2	74.4	70.8
Does not meet my household's needs	27.0	31.4	19.2	26.8	25.4	27.9	31.9	21.8	25.6	29.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Is current housing your 'home'?"										
Yes	77.5	74.3	84.6	75.6	79.7	74.4	76.6	78.2	78.2	75.0
No	22.5	25.7	15.4	24.4	20.3	25.6	23.4	21.8	21.8	25.0
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

3.2 Housing preferences

Consistent with the reports of housing satisfaction, the data reveals that the many people identified their current housing as their ideal in terms of both housing and neighbourhood (Table 5 below). The notion of housing preferences is similar to housing satisfaction; but whereas housing satisfaction is an ambiguous concept that is heavily influenced by people's life experiences and what they adapt to and thus come to expect (Parsell & Phillips 2014; Pawson & Sosenko 2012), asking survey respondents to report their ideal housing situation affords them more opportunity to look beyond what they have (and may have settled for) and identify what they would like. Thus the measure used for housing preferences provides a meaningful sense of what housing tenants prefer.

The majority of supported tenants in single-site supportive housing with onsite support most frequently identified their current housing in their current neighbourhood as their ideal (73.1%). On the other hand, slightly fewer than half the tenants residing in the same single-site supportive housing, but who were allocated the housing because of working, low wage earner status, reported their current housing in their current neighbourhood as their ideal preference (48.6%).

Table 5: Housing preferences

	All participants	Housing provider			Homeless status		Gender		COB	
	N = 102	Onsite		Outreach	Previously homeless	Never previously been homeless	Female	Male	Australia	Country other than Australia
		AH	SH							
Best description of housing preference										
Current housing, current neighbourhood	60.8	48.6	73.1	63.4	61.0	60.5	61.7	60.0	65.4	45.8
Current housing, different neighbourhood	11.8	20.0	3.8	9.8	8.5	16.3	8.5	14.5	7.7	25.0
Different housing, different neighbourhood	11.8	8.6	7.7	17.1	11.9	11.6	12.8	10.9	10.3	16.7
Different housing, current neighbourhood	15.7	22.9	15.4	9.8	18.6	11.6	17.0	14.5	16.7	12.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

3.3 Social support, socialising with neighbours and social participation

One measure of the success of supportive housing is that tenants will be supported by and socialise with their neighbours. The extent to which tenants socially participate outside supportive housing is similarly important. The existing research shows that homelessness is associated with a decrease in contact with family and mainstream institutions and that, as homelessness endures, people develop relationships with other people who are homeless and also experience isolation (Johnson & Tseng 2014a). Strengthening people's connection with family and positive social networks may be beneficial both in terms of enabling exits from homelessness and fostering positive housing outcomes. The research from the United States suggests that some people who exit chronic homelessness and sustain housing also report loneliness and social isolation in their housing (Padgett et al. 2008; Tsai et al. 2012).

Rather than formal support provided by case workers or government or community organisations, we saw in Chapter 2 that an onsite service provider described tenants being supported by and socialising with their neighbours to be more normal and desirable. We similarly found in the qualitative interviews with supportive housing providers that they perceived their role to promote independence and life improvements among supportive housing tenants to involve tenants participating in social activities and socialising with their neighbours. Moreover, the urban studies literature suggests that the informal socialising and support among people who live near each other constitutes not only a vibrant form of community, but also an effective and organic measure of social control and social cohesion (Jacobs 1961).

Our survey with tenants of supportive housing aimed to gain an understanding of the extent to which they socialise with their neighbours, whether they feel supported by their neighbours, and whether they participate socially outside of their neighbourhood (and whether they would like to socialise more, less or the same amount—see Appendix 1).

In Table 6 below we can see that the tenants living in single-site supportive housing with on-site support who were allocated housing because of working, low wage earner status have less contact and support from their neighbours, are satisfied with the amount of contact they have, and these people reported feeling lonely less often than the supported tenants with onsite support and those receiving support through outreach. Indeed, the two latter groups report far greater levels of friendships among their neighbours. This is perhaps not surprising. The extent to which people socialise with their neighbours and report their neighbours as their friends is influenced by the stage of their life cycle and lifestyle (Arthurson 2010). The people in single-site supportive housing who were allocated housing based on their working, low wage earner status, were by definition, employed. Whereas the other tenants were not employed and thus they spent more time at home; by not engaging with the labour market or training, they had less opportunities for social interactions and friendship beyond their neighbours.

Table 6: Social support and socialising with neighbours

	All participants	Housing provider			Homeless status		Gender		COB	
	N = 102	Onsite		Outreach	Previously homeless	Never previously been homeless	Female	Male	Australia	Country other than Australia
		AH	SH							
They don't come to visit as often as I'd like										
Agree	17.7	14.3	23.1	17.1	15.3	20.9	12.8	21.9	14.0	29.1
Disagree	86.4	85.7	76.9	82.9	84.7	79.1	87.2	78.2	85.8	70.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
I often need help from them, but can't get it										
Agree	11.8	2.9	15.4	17.1	13.6	9.4	10.9	11.0	9.0	20.8
Disagree	88.2	97.1	84.6	82.9	86.5	90.8	87.3	89.1	91.0	79.1
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Lots of them are my friends										
Agree	50.0	22.9	69.2	61.0	64.4	30.2	42.6	56.3	55.1	33.4
Disagree	49.9	77.1	30.8	39.1	35.6	69.9	57.4	43.7	44.9	66.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
I don't have neighbours that I can confide in										
Agree	44.2	51.4	30.8	46.3	37.4	53.6	46.8	41.9	47.5	33.3
Disagree	55.8	48.6	69.2	53.7	62.7	46.6	53.1	58.2	52.5	66.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
I have no neighbour/s to lean on in times of trouble										
Agree	43.1	51.4	38.5	39.0	39.0	48.8	42.5	43.7	43.6	41.7
Disagree	56.8	48.6	61.5	60.9	61.0	51.2	57.4	56.4	56.4	58.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

	All participants	Housing provider			Homeless status		Gender		COB	
	N = 102	Onsite		Outreach	Previously homeless	Never previously been homeless	Female	Male	Australia	Country other than Australia
		AH	SH							
There is a neighbour who can always cheer me up when I'm down										
Agree	61.7	60.0	69.2	58.5	62.7	60.5	51.1	71.0	61.6	62.5
Disagree	38.2	40.0	30.8	41.6	37.3	39.5	48.9	29.1	38.4	37.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
I often feel very lonely										
Agree	37.2	17.1	42.3	36.6	42.5	30.3	36.2	38.2	40.5	29.2
Disagree	62.8	82.9	57.7	63.4	57.6	69.8	63.8	61.8	60.2	70.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
I enjoy the time I spend with neighbours who are important to me										
Agree	73.5	74.3	73.1	73.2	74.5	72.0	70.1	76.4	75.7	66.6
Disagree	26.5	25.7	26.9	26.8	25.5	27.9	29.7	23.7	24.3	33.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
When something is on my mind, just talking with the neighbours I know can make me feel better										
Agree	65.7	71.4	61.5	63.4	67.8	62.8	61.8	69.1	66.6	62.5
Disagree	34.4	28.6	38.5	36.6	32.3	37.2	38.3	30.9	33.4	37.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
When I need someone to help me out, I can usually find someone in my neighbourhood										
Agree	67.6	25.7	34.6	63.4	66.1	69.8	61.7	72.7	69.2	62.5
Disagree	32.3	74.3	65.4	36.6	33.9	30.3	38.3	27.3	30.8	37.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

The results presented in Table 7 below about social participation are fascinating. We can see that supported tenants in single-site supportive housing with onsite support are excluded from some groups and included in others. No supported respondent in single-site supportive housing had daily contact with family, whereas 11.4 and 12.2 per cent of the other two housing groups reported daily contact with family. Conversely, and perhaps to make up for the absence of daily contact with family, supported respondents in single-site supportive housing reported far more daily contact with friends and neighbours than reported by the respondents in the other two forms of supportive housing. It is also interesting that the respondents who were allocated housing based on working, low wage earner status reported more daily socialising in sporting activities and clubs, and no daily socialising with people in social service or community organisations.

In Appendix 1, we present data on survey respondents' answers to questions about whether they would like to socialise more often, less often, or the same in terms of the five groups (see Table 7). It is noteworthy that more than 50 per cent of the supported tenants in supportive housing with both onsite and outreach support always reported that they would like to socialise the same as what they already do. Similarly, with the exception of 54 per cent of respondents in single-site supportive housing because they were working, low wage earner status, reporting they would like to socialise with friends more frequently, this group too most frequently reported satisfaction with the extent to which they socialised.

Table 7: Social participation frequencies

	All participants	Housing provider			Homeless status		Gender		COB	
	N = 102	Onsite		Outreach	Previously homeless	Never previously been homeless	Female	Male	Australia	Country other than Australia
		AH	SH							
Spend time with parents, children, or other relatives										
Daily	8.8	11.4	0.0	12.2	6.8	11.6	14.9	3.6	9.0	8.3
2–3 times per week	13.7	20.0	15.4	7.3	13.6	14.0	14.9	12.7	16.7	4.2
Once a week	15.7	17.1	19.2	12.2	11.9	20.9	17.0	14.5	16.7	12.5
Once a month	11.8	11.4	11.5	12.2	15.3	7.0	14.9	9.1	11.5	12.5
A few times a year	21.6	25.7	15.4	22.0	18.6	25.6	19.1	23.6	17.9	33.3
Never	28.4	14.3	38.5	34.1	33.9	20.9	19.1	36.4	28.2	29.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Spend time with friends										
Daily	21.6	25.7	38.5	7.3	25.4	16.3	17.0	25.5	19.2	29.2
2–3 times per week	34.3	40.0	23.1	36.6	27.1	44.2	25.5	41.8	35.9	29.2
Once a week	22.5	28.6	15.4	22.0	16.9	30.2	31.9	14.5	21.8	25.0
Once a month	4.9	2.9	3.8	7.3	8.5	0.0	8.5	1.8	5.1	4.2
A few times a year	2.9	0.0	3.8	4.9	5.1	0.0	2.1	3.6	2.6	4.2
Never	13.7	2.9	15.4	22.0	16.9	9.3	14.9	12.7	15.4	8.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Spend time with neighbours										
Daily	15.7	2.9	26.9	19.5	23.7	4.7	8.5	21.8	14.1	20.8
2–3 times per week	21.6	20.0	11.5	29.3	20.3	23.3	19.1	23.6	25.6	8.3
Once a week	14.7	11.4	19.2	14.6	15.3	14.0	19.1	10.9	15.4	12.5
Once a month	9.8	1.4	11.5	7.3	10.2	9.3	12.8	7.3	10.3	8.3

	All participants	Housing provider			Homeless status		Gender		COB	
	N = 102	Onsite		Outreach	Previously homeless	Never previously been homeless	Female	Male	Australia	Country other than Australia
		AH	SH							
A few times a year	4.9	5.7	3.8	4.9	5.1	4.7	4.3	5.5	3.8	8.3
Never	33.3	48.6	26.9	24.4	25.4	44.2	36.2	30.9	30.8	41.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Spend time socially with people at sporting activities or clubs										
Daily	4.9	8.6	3.8	2.4	3.4	7.0	6.4	3.6	5.1	4.2
2–3 times per week	8.8	14.3	11.5	2.4	5.1	14.0	4.3	12.7	7.7	12.5
Once a week	20.6	22.9	26.9	14.6	22.0	18.6	14.9	25.5	17.9	29.2
Once a month	3.9	5.7	0.0	4.9	3.4	4.7	2.1	5.5	5.1	0.0
A few times a year	10.8	8.6	7.7	14.6	11.9	9.3	10.6	10.9	7.7	20.8
Never	51.0	40.0	50.0	61.0	54.2	46.5	61.7	41.8	56.4	33.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Spend time socially with people at social service or community organisations										
Daily	2.0	0.0	3.8	2.4	1.7	2.3	2.1	1.8	2.6	0.0
2–3 times per week	9.8	2.9	19.2	9.8	13.6	4.7	10.6	9.1	10.3	8.3
Once a week	20.6	11.4	30.8	22.0	22.0	18.6	17.0	23.6	17.9	29.2
Once a month	7.8	5.7	11.5	7.3	6.8	9.3	6.4	9.1	9.0	4.2
A few times a year	10.8	14.3	7.7	9.8	11.9	9.3	17.0	5.5	9.0	16.7
Never	49.0	65.7	26.9	48.8	44.1	55.8	46.8	50.9	51.3	41.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

3.4 Health and life satisfaction

Questions of health status, and improved health and life satisfaction are central to supportive housing. Informed by the evidence demonstrating the poor health and wellbeing experienced by people who are homeless (see Johnson & Tseng 2014b for a review), housing provided through supportive housing models is arguably a critical factor to assist individuals improve their health and wellbeing. As presented in Chapter 2, supportive housing providers argue that the provision of support, particularly the role of onsite support, is a necessary ingredient to assist tenants improve their health. Despite the clear recognition that people who are homeless have disproportionately poor health, Johnson and Tseng (2014b, p.49) present data to suggest that there is limited 'support for the conclusion that housing is associated with better health'.

Table 8 below demonstrates the great consistency in reported overall health among the entire sample. Although only 16.7 per cent of the sample reported their overall health as not good, this is higher than the 11.4 per cent of people housed participating in the Journeys Home study (Johnson & Tseng 2014b, p.49).

Table 8: General health

	All participants	Housing provider			Homeless status		Gender		COB	
	N = 102	Onsite		Outreach	Previously homeless	Never previously been homeless	Female	Male	Australia	Country other than Australia
		AH	SH							
General health										
Good	83.3	82.9	84.6	82.9	84.8	81.4	80.9	85.4	82.1	87.5
Not good	16.7	17.1	15.4	17.1	15.3	18.7	19.2	14.5	17.9	12.5
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

We asked survey respondents to indicate whether they perceived their housing to impact on a number of important domains in their lives. As shown in Table 9 below, the supported tenants in housing with onsite support frequently reported that housing did have a positive impact, and this group reported the positive impact of housing at greater rates than people in housing with outreach support and those allocated housing because of working, low wage earner status. From this data, it is not possible to determine whether the onsite support explains the greater rates of reported health improvements, or conversely, whether the higher frequency of people in this form of onsite supportive housing reporting greater improvements in their lives can be attributed to this cohort explicitly being allocated tenancies because of high vulnerabilities.

Table 10 below presents data on respondents' perceptions of the impact of their housing on their household's quality of life. Across the housing groups and the demographics, more than 90 per cent of respondents believed that their housing had improved their quality of life. Although the reported rates of improvement were universally high among the sample, it is surprising that people who indicated that they had never previously experienced homelessness (based on their subjective assessment) reported the highest rates of perceived improved quality of life (97.7%).

The differences between reported rates of housing not improving one's quality of life were similarly noteworthy. Nearly three times as many respondents living in supportive housing with outreach support indicated that their housing had not improved their quality of life compared to tenants living in single-site supportive housing with onsite support.

Table 9: Perceived impact of housing

	All participants	Housing provider			Homeless status		Gender		COB	
		Onsite		Outreach	Previously homeless	Never previously been homeless	Female	Male	Australia	Country other than Australia
		AH	SH							
Enjoying better health (N=98)										
Positive impact	52.0	41.9	69.2	48.8	61.0	38.5	47.8	55.8	52.0	52.2
Not positive impact	48.0	58.1	30.8	51.2	39.0	61.5	52.2	44.2	48.0	47.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Finding a job (N=72)										
Positive impact	34.7	25.9	42.9	37.5	38.1	30.0	34.3	35.1	35.2	33.3
Not positive impact	65.3	74.1	57.1	62.5	61.9	70.0	65.7	64.9	64.8	66.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Starting or continuing education/training (N=76)										
Positive impact	44.7	35.7	68.0	30.4	52.1	32.1	51.3	37.8	45.8	41.5
Not positive impact	55.3	64.3	32.0	69.6	47.9	67.9	48.7	62.2	54.2	58.8
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Having better access to services you need (N=96)										
Positive impact	58.3	62.5	61.5	52.6	57.9	59.0	58.7	58.0	56.8	63.6
Not positive impact	41.7	37.5	38.5	47.4	42.1	41.0	41.3	42.0	43.2	36.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 10: Housing and quality of life

	All participants	Housing provider			Homeless status		Gender		COB	
	N = 102	Onsite		Outreach	Previously homeless	Never previously been homeless	Female	Male	Australia	Country other than Australia
		AH	SH							
How living in current housing changed household's overall quality of life										
Improved	94.2	97.1	96.2	90.3	91.5	97.7	91.4	96.3	94.9	91.7
Not improved	5.8	2.9	3.8	9.7	8.5	2.3	8.6	3.7	5.1	8.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

3.5 Regression discussion

As described in Chapter 1, we fitted statistical models to a number of variables of interests in the dataset to analyse how the various housing provisions and demographic variables relate to the different measures of satisfaction, life improvement, and time spent with other people.

Among the covariates that were included in the model is the Satisfaction with Quality of Life (SWLS) index (Diener et al. 1985) that measures the overall life satisfaction of each respondent. It is assumed that among other things, the greater the SWLS score of an individual, the more positive the impact of the different housing provision will be.

3.6 Satisfaction with Quality of Life (SWLS)

The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS), developed by Diener and colleagues (Diener et al. 1985) is a five item scale of subjective wellbeing. The statements encompass a global notion of life satisfaction, as determined by the respondent. This overall evaluation allows the individual to perceive and judge their life satisfaction by standards set by him or herself. This is important, as many variables contribute to an individual life satisfaction, and is dependent on one's values (e.g. money, good health, or relationships). As such, the SWLS overcomes highly variable individual differences and allows the respondent to determine their satisfaction however they choose.

The SWLS is derived from five statements measured on a 7 point Likert-like scale of agreement (1 = strongly agree, 7 = strongly disagree). Each of the statements is scored from 1 to 7, so that the SWLS has a possible score range of 5 (low satisfaction) to 35 (high satisfaction) (Diener et al. 1985). For our sample of 102 tenants, the summed aggregate score for the scale is 20.41 (SD = 7.74, $\alpha = 0.85$). The reliability coefficient of 0.85 indicates that the scale is a highly reliable measure of satisfaction with life. The guidelines by Diener (2009) shown in Table 11 below, deem this score for the sample to be in line with an 'average' satisfaction with life.

Table 11: Satisfaction with Life Scale: guidelines for interpreting scores

Summed score	Average score	Guideline label
35–30	7–6	Very high score; highly satisfied
29–25	6–5	High score
24–20	5–4	Average score
19–15	4–3	Slightly below average in life satisfaction
14–10	3–2	Dissatisfied
9–5	2–1	Extremely dissatisfied

Diener says that individuals with an average score on the SWLS are defined as the following:

> The average of life satisfaction in economically developed nations is in this range—the majority of people are generally satisfied, but have some areas where they very much would like some improvement. Some individuals score in this range because they are mostly satisfied with most areas of their lives but see the need for some improvement in each area. Other respondents score in this range because they are satisfied with most domains of their lives, but have one or two areas where they would like to see large improvements. A person scoring in this range is normal in that they have areas of their lives that need improvement. However, an individual in this range would usually like to move to a higher level by making some life changes. (Diener 2009, p.1)

The scores of all tenants for the SWLS are similar to a sample of Australians drawn from the general population (Table 12 below). As such, the scores reflect a slightly satisfied to satisfied

outlook on their lives, which is found to be prevalent in most Western countries (Pavot & Diener 1993). Thus, despite the impoverished background of the sample as defined by their previous experiences of homelessness and tenure in supportive housing, their self-reported life satisfaction is similar to general populations.

Table 12: Tenants' satisfaction with life scores compared to Australian adults

Sample source	N	Mean	SD
Sample			
All participants	102	20.4	7.74
Sample			
Australian adults			
Gannon and Ranzijn (2005)	191	24.9	6.0
Schumaker, Shea, Monfries, and Groth-Marnat (1993)	139	23.1	6.3
Pallant and Lae (2002)	439	22.4	6.8

3.6.1 Social support from neighbours

The result of the logistic regression model estimates showed that in comparison to respondents living in supportive housing with outreach support, tenants residing in single-site supportive housing with onsite support who were allocated tenancies because they were working, low wage earners have significantly higher chance to feel that their neighbours are more likely to help whenever they seek or need it (see Appendix 2). The estimates show that tenants living in this housing provision are also 20.8 times more likely to find someone in the neighbourhood to help them whenever they needed it in comparison to those living in supportive housing with support provided through outreach, holding all other things constant. Of the regression analyses conducted, this was the only statistically significant difference between groups of tenants.

Interestingly, tenants who indicate higher ratings of quality of life, have higher probability to respond that just talking to their neighbours can make them feel better. For each point increase in the quality of life index, the chance of feeling better talking to their neighbours increases by 14.3 per cent, holding all other variables constant (95% statistically significant). On the other hand, the logistic model reveals that tenants who are not satisfied with their housing find comfort by talking to their neighbours. Those who do not feel satisfied with their housing are 95.4 per cent more likely to feel better talking to their neighbours compared to those who are satisfied. Meanwhile, tenants who have previously experienced homelessness are also five times more likely than tenants who have never experienced homelessness to indicate such positive feelings talking to their neighbours. Furthermore, tenants who reported previous lifetime experiences of homelessness are also 3.7 times more likely (than those who did not report previous experiences of homelessness) to indicate that lots of their neighbours are their friends, keeping all other factors constant.

3.6.2 Satisfaction with housing

In terms of satisfaction with housing, tenants who are more likely to indicate pleasure and satisfaction with their current housing also report higher quality of life scores. The estimates reveal that the probability increases by 38.8 per cent and 40.0 per cent, respectively, for every point increase in the tenant's score. On the contrary, tenants who identify as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander, compared to tenants who do not identify, are 93.3 per cent less likely to indicate feeling satisfied with their current housing meeting their housing needs, holding all other factors the same.

Similarly, tenants' satisfaction with their current housing meeting their needs, regarding design, layout, privacy, affordability, and size also correlate positively and significantly with their quality

of life index. Each point improvement in the quality of life index increases the odds of tenants expressing satisfaction with their housing's design, privacy, and size by 23.7 per cent, 27.0 per cent, and 15.2 per cent, respectively. On the contrary, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander tenants have 93.7 per cent less odds of expressing satisfaction with the privacy found in their current housing in contrast to non-Indigenous people. Furthermore, using salary and wage earners as base category, tenants who were on a Disability Support Pension or Youth Allowance were 99.7 and 99.8 per cent less likely to be happy with their current housing's overall design (statistically significant at 95%), holding everything else constant.

Tenants with high ratings of quality of life, in general, indicated their household's quality of life had vastly improved. The model estimates 31.0 per cent increase in probability of life improvement for each point increase in the quality of life index (statistically significant at 95%).

3.6.3 Life satisfaction

An overwhelming trend from the regression models indicates that higher scores with satisfaction of life indicate higher or positive ratings of most other variables of interest, holding everything else constant. The respondent's overall score in the Quality of Life index is a significant determinant on how happy and satisfied they will be in the housing provisions, controlling for all other variables in our analysis. Individuals with higher Quality of Life index score will tend to have significantly higher odds of being pleased and satisfied with their housing condition, overall design, provided privacy, and housing needs.

3.7 Conclusion

Returning to the research questions driving this chapter, the survey data reveals that there is a high rate of satisfaction with housing, although higher rates of satisfaction were reported by respondents in supportive housing with support provided through outreach (90%) compared to 85 per cent of respondents in supportive housing with onsite support. Furthermore, the majority of supported tenants in single-site supportive housing with onsite support most frequently identified their current housing in their current neighbourhood as their ideal (73.1%). Fewer tenants in scattered-site supportive housing with support provided through outreach identified their current housing and current location as their ideal preference (63.4%). Slightly fewer than half the tenants residing in the same single-site supportive housing, but who were allocated the housing because of working, low wage earner status, reported their current housing in their current neighbourhood as their ideal preference (48.6%). Single-site supportive housing with onsite support was thus described as the most preferred, as defined by both housing and location, by the survey respondents.

The survey data relied on self-reported measures to identify outcomes. Tenants living in single-site supportive housing with on-site support who were allocated housing because of working, low wage earner status have less contact with and support from their neighbours, but these people reported feeling lonely less often than the supported tenants with onsite support and those receiving support through outreach.

Supported tenants in single-site supportive housing with onsite support are excluded from some groups and included in others. No supported respondent in single-site supportive housing had daily contact with family, whereas 11.4 and 12.2 per cent of the other two housing groups reported daily contact with family. Conversely, supported respondents in single-site supportive housing reported far more daily contact with friends and neighbours than reported by the respondents in the other two forms of supportive housing. It is also interesting that the respondents who were allocated housing based on working, low wage earner status reported more daily socialising in sporting activities and clubs, and no daily socialising with people in social service or community organisations.

The logistic regression found that people with previous experiences of homelessness were more likely to report neighbours as their friends compared to respondents who had not previously experienced homelessness.

The supported tenants in housing with onsite support frequently reported that housing did have a positive impact, and this group reported the positive impact of housing at greater rates than people in housing with outreach support and those allocated housing because of working, low wage earner status. More than 90 per cent of respondents believed that their housing had improved their quality of life. Although the reported rates of improvement were universally high among the sample, it is surprising that people who indicated that they had never previously experienced homelessness reported the highest rates of perceived improved quality of life (97.7%).

Tenants who identify as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander, compared to tenants who do not identify, are 93.3 per cent less likely to indicate feeling satisfied with their current housing meeting their housing needs. Further, tenants' satisfaction with their current housing meeting their needs, regarding design, layout, privacy, affordability, and size also correlate positively and significantly with their quality of life index. Individuals with higher Quality of Life index score will tend to have significantly higher odds of being pleased and satisfied with their housing condition. If we take salary and wage earners as base category, tenants who were on a Disability Support Pension or Youth Allowance were 99.7 and 99.8 per cent less likely to be happy with their current housing's overall design (statistically significant at 95%), holding everything else constant.

4 TENANT EXPERIENCES IN SUPPORTIVE HOUSING

4.1 Introduction

How do tenants experience living in supportive housing? Building on the quantitative data presented in the previous chapter about tenant ratings and preferences, and the ideas of supportive housing as put forward by supportive housing providers in Chapter 2, this chapter describes and analyses tenant experiences in supportive housing. The chapter is premised on the assumption that tenants of supportive housing are active participants who express agency; through their actions and the dynamic relationships with neighbours and support and housing providers, tenants play determining roles in constructing the nature of supportive housing. Supportive housing is not a passive resource, but rather it is shaped and constituted by the experiences of the people who live in and deliver the supportive housing services. Qualitative interviewing is a means to identify the position of tenants in supportive housing and to gather firsthand perspectives on their experiences (Parsell et al. 2014).

This chapter is based on qualitative interviews conducted with 28 tenants of supportive housing. As noted in Chapter 1, these tenants resided in single-site supportive housing with onsite support. They were allocated tenancies because of previous experiences of chronic homelessness and their requirement for support to sustain their tenancies. After briefly introducing the concept of community and its relevance to supportive housing, the chapter presents qualitative empirical material and examines people's experiences in supportive housing through the lens of community and support. First, we examine the experience of supportive housing as positive communities. Positive communities include people having a strong desire to participate in and build community. Second, the interactions, socialisation, activities and communal areas that create community for some tenants, also constitute negative and problematic aspects of supportive housing. The latter contribute to what is experienced as the antithesis to community. The second half of the chapter examines tenants' experiences of support. Three dimensions to support are examined, these are support to enable supportive housing to function; support to make positive life changes; and support as a stepping stone to life beyond supportive housing.

4.2 Community

Consistent with the idea that supportive housing is intended to enable tenants to achieve social inclusion and improve non-housing outcomes, supportive housing has been presented as a vehicle to promote community. In the United States, community integration is one of the key principles of supportive housing. As a response to previous policies of geographically separating and excluding people with mental illness and people who are homeless, supportive housing aims to promote integration and to create the conditions for tenants to meaningfully participate in and contribute to mainstream society (Parkinson et al. 1999; Tabol et al. 2010). Community from this perspective extends physically and socially outside of supportive housing; supportive housing is a conduit to connect tenants—as participants—to external communities.

Community is likewise important in the contemporary Australian discourse about supportive housing. Single-site supportive housing with onsite support, as exemplified through the Common Ground model, aims to create communities for tenants through a deliberate strategy of social mix (Micah Projects n.d.). Further, Common Ground supportive housing includes activities, resources and communal areas in the building that are intended to promote social interactions among tenants (as well as informal interactions with support workers). In the broader housing and urban literature, meaningful and frequent interactions with neighbours in public space has long been recognised as a mechanism to create, maintain and change communities (Henriksen & Tjora 2014). Gehl's (2011) comprehensive analysis illustrates the way that social interactions and community among neighbours is fostered through not only the

urban and built form, but also through a common denominator among residents and opportunities for activities.

Community is thus not a passive outcome of the built environment, but rather something that people actively create (Main & Sandoval 2015). To end homelessness and achieve housing sustainability for people who have experienced chronic homelessness, creating community in supportive housing is important to make up for relationships and networks that people may have severed when leaving homelessness (Stevenson 2014). In his research in Canada, Stevenson found that when people exited chronic homelessness and accessed housing, the loss of social connections and the isolation experienced in housing meant that people found it difficult to maintain housing.

4.2.1 Positive communities

Tenants frequently described supportive housing as a positive community. The concept of community put forward varied, but friendships and socialising among neighbours were important to all experiences and ideas of community. Paul conveyed his experiences of community in supportive housing and contrasted the fundamental friendships and companionship with his previous diminished social relationships in social housing. After commenting favourably about living in supportive housing, Paul was asked: What's good about supportive housing?'. He explained:

> Everything. It really is. If you live in a housing department you've sort of only got a few neighbours and you're sort of independent. You live on your own, you get a little bit lonely, whereas here [supportive housing] there's no loneliness because you're always mingling with other people, every day. Every day that you come out you'll run into someone, and it's a good activity like community where you're chatting with friends and people that you know and you feel relaxed and it makes it more a stable environment to live in whereas in housing you don't get that. (Paul)

Here Paul highlights how the frequent social interactions in supportive housing contributed to a positive feeling of community; he likewise contrasted supportive housing with his experiences in social housing where he felt lonely. Paul linked being relaxed because of opportunities to chat with friends and feel part of a community to the communal areas of and neighbours in single-site supportive housing: 'every day you come out [of your unit] you'll run into someone' [in communal areas]. The two single-site supportive housing buildings sampled for the tenant qualitative interviews consisted of independent and self-contained units, but within the two buildings there were also communal areas, including art and computer rooms, together with kitchen, eating and relaxation areas. The communal spaces constituted important venues for the creation of positive communities, and as described in the section below, these areas were also the site of negative communities. In terms of the former, communal meals were significant sites for community. A supportive housing tenant cooked a regular meal on a Friday evening that served to bring tenants together for socialising. A male tenant, Ben, responding to a question about community and his experiences living in single-site supportive housing explained:

> Would you say it feels like a community here? (Interviewer)
>
> It does; there are a few things. An older guy, Kev, he does Kev's Cuisine which he cooks once a week on Friday nights. (Ben)
>
> Does he cook for everyone? (Interviewer)
>
> Everyone who puts their name down beforehand. It's $3 a head so it's a good meal for people once a week if they like. (Ben)

Kev cooked the Friday meal on a voluntary basis, and tenants opted into the meal if they chose to put 'their names down'. The meal was cooked and consumed in a communal kitchen and

living space in supportive housing, and it was organised and led by tenants. Ben pointed out that he was a vegetarian and thus he did not frequently attend the Friday meal. Nevertheless, he linked the presence of Kev's meal, irrespective of whether he participated, to community. Tenants presented a notion of the community activities as led by themselves that resonate with the stated intentions of support providers discussed in Chapter 2. Consistent with the support worker's described rationale, tenants positioned the activities as something of their own and something that they drove to build community.

> Does it feel like a community? (Interviewer)
>
> Yes. I think you're aware we have usually a weekly Sunday lunch which is attended by a handful, maybe half dozen tenants. (Stanley)
>
> So you normally participate in that Sunday? (Interviewer)
>
> Yes, and it's only $3. It's not expensive … and you may have seen the gardening downstairs. Well we have one lady who seems to have taken over responsibility for that and we sort of take turns at keeping it watered on a daily basis if it's not raining. It's working well and that provides an adjunct to the salads that we have on Sunday lunches. It's quite pleasant. (Stanley)
>
> I get along with everyone and we have a pretty good bond. We have Friday night dinners together sometimes … We've had barbeques together. The communal area allows us to socialise and get along a bit better. (Tony)

Community development scholars have long argued for the importance of community activities and initiatives to be organically developed from the ground up and for people to contribute as active participants (Freire 1970). The collective preparation and sharing of food is recognised as a beneficial social and community activity (Engler-Stringer & Berenbaum 2007). Tenants, who because of allocation processes and the design of the dwellings, all receive low incomes and live alone. In this context communal meals served an important and practical function. The sharing of a meal, particularly as it was framed in desirable ways such as Kev's cuisine, served as an attractive option for tenants to consume a well-cooked meal. More than simply the consumption of food, however, tenants who all lived in their independent units alone described the community meals as means to promote socialisation and to enhance the development of the supportive housing building and the people who inhabit it (Chavis & Wandersman 1990).

It was thus not simply the design features of single-site supportive housing that included shared kitchen and areas to consume food, but the common denominator or limited incomes and living alone that facilitated the organised activities to promote community (Gehl 2011). The supportive housing providers reported in Chapter 2 couched community activities as a strategy for tenants to develop pro-social behaviour, whereas the tenants themselves spoke about activities as a form of and means to socialise and enjoy each other's company.

Stanley commented that only a handful of people attended the Sunday lunch, and observed that participants of the lunch were 'people who have been here [in supportive housing] for more than a year in general'. The extent to which tenants participated in activities and socialised with other tenants was understood as central to the community experience. John described living in supportive housing as 'pretty good', and 'it's pretty social'. After exiting a mental health facility and before that rough sleeping, at the time of the interview John had lived in supportive housing for approximately 18 months. He liked socialising with other tenants and participating in activities, but commented that:

> We have a problem with participation … We don't get as many numbers as we'd like. (John)

Like Stanley and Ben, John is clearly conscious of who participates in social activities; all three articulated awareness of who does and who does not contribute to community in supportive housing. Community, and what was required to achieve community, was important. John's

framing of other supportive housing tenants in the collective ‘we’ gives a strong indication of the significance he places on community and the collective of supportive housing tenants. Moreover, John draws attention to the collective we and their collective desire to be more inclusive and participatory: 'we don’t get as many numbers as we’d like'. These three tenants exemplify the dominant theme of a positive community in supportive housing characterised by voluntary participation in tenant-led activities and socialising together.

There was an expectation that other tenants would contribute toward the project of community. A tenant, William, who had lived in supportive housing for 18 months, and who had planned to leave supportive housing, explained that community was the objective of the model. William underscored the importance of all tenants being on the same page as necessary to realise community by noting:

> [Supportive housing provider] wants this to be a community, but how can you be a community if there’s people in that community that snob you, do not talk to nobody, complain about everything you do. (William)

The expectation of tenant buy-in whereby tenants ascribed to a shared vision of community was premised on the assumption that the imagined and idealised community would constitute a positive resource for all tenants of the supportive housing building. From this view that community would enhance the experiences of all tenants, people actively sought to promote participation among their neighbours:

> I do all the cook ups and all that sort of stuff and try and get people involved in a community atmosphere here. (Harold)
>
> Do you reckon that works? You reckon it’s feeling like a community now? (Interviewer)
>
> Well you’ve got a lot of people that live here that are quite reclusive and they’re coming out of their shell and they will come and spend some time with the other residents and sit outside in the sun and have a chat and all that sort of stuff. (Harold)

The remarks of Harold and others make clear that community was a desirable objective in supportive housing and that, in order to achieve the aspirational objective, tenant socialisation and activity-based interactions needed to be promoted. The remarks of Julia provide an indication of the function and meaning of community in supportive housing to a tenant group who were allocated housing on the basis of high vulnerability and chronic homelessness. Julia alludes to a depth notion of community:

> To build it [supportive housing] to become something that’s successful and I think that’s a big part of what’s made it good for me is that I am a part of it being something that is positive and it’s positive in my life as well as positive for other people who move in here. (Julia)

The socialising among tenants, the activities and networks established, were part of a broader project of creating something positive. For Julia developing community was not only about creating a more social and desirable environment for her and other tenants to live in. Rather, through efforts to be part of something 'positive for other people', Julia spoke about community building as a means to make a valuable contribution. In the context of years of homelessness and disengagement from the labour market and other socially validating roles, the activities and strategies to promote community in supportive housing was a way for Julia to achieve something rewarding. In her words, creating community and achieving a valued life in supportive housing was part of a development stage:

> To actually get out of the lifestyle I was living and move into a more productive and positive life, I need to be involved and not sitting back and going back to what is easy for me. It’s not an easy life, but it’s easier to go back sometimes than forward and I’ve gotten to the point where I have to go forward or else I’m not going to survive. (Julia)

For Julia contributing to community in supportive housing was part of her desire to improve her life. She expressed a notion of community that emphasised the benefits of being part of a collective and helping to achieve something 'positive for others who move in here'. Even when tenants had not experienced or described supportive housing in terms of positive communities or communities as part of deeper personal change, it was evident that other tenants wanted activities and support to better foster community. Gough had lived in supportive housing for just over 12 months. He lamented a knitting class the supportive housing provider offered. He remarked that he and other tenants did not want to knit and eventually the knitting class was disbanded.

Gough's disappointment about the knitting class was framed as a lost opportunity. He strongly desired organised activities to promote community among tenants and criticised the knitting class because it failed to achieve the imagined community he wanted:

> Get more stuff and get more activities happening. Get them out of here. Get company cars so you can get people out of the place. Little things like that. Go and attend barbeques. It just would make the place a little bit more unity and that. (Gough)

Gough's ideas about the means through which community ought to be created in supportive housing differ from the comments above about tenant-led community based activities. Through organised activities such as excursions and transportation, Gough envisaged the supportive housing provider playing a significant role in creating community. Other tenants similarly expressed a desire and even expectation that the supportive housing provider ought to play an active role in fostering communities. Harold spoke about activities and socialising among other tenants and commented that 'we're trying to start up a musical jam session'. He explained that a number of the tenants had musical talents and a desire to come together to play music. Harold said that his support worker was trying to organise the tenant jam session but the barrier was tenants did not have the resources to pursue their interest:

> There's myself, I play drums, and I don't have a kit anymore. So if we had kits and instruments and things like that here we'd get a lot more people interested. (Harold)

Harold identified the tenant interest in coming together for a jam session to 'break up the boredom throughout the days'. He then coupled the desire for tenants to form a jam group with the unavailability of instruments which served to undermine their collective activities. In explaining that his support worker was trying to organise the jam sessions, Harold implied how the limited resources available (at supportive housing) to tenants prevented community:

> So if we can get something happening with that we'd be happy but again we don't have the instruments to carry it out. If we had all that then it would be a different matter. We'd have people getting involved in it. (Harold)

The views expressed by Harold and Gough about the expectation of the supportive housing providers actively delivering resources to promote community were extended by the remarks of Edmund. Like the majority of tenants, Edmund said that he wanted to socialise with other supportive housing tenants, and that he even wanted activities organised by the supportive housing provider to promote community. But he believed that other tenants held unrealistic expectations about what resources the supportive housing organisation should provide. Edmund said that he and other tenants wanted to establish a 'fishing and camping weekend', but because one of the tenants 'wanted to be supplied everything' by the supportive housing organisation, the activity would not go ahead. He said that by other tenants having too great expectations about what supportive housing should provide, they were 'wrecking' the proposition of tenant activities. Commenting on the expectations other tenants hold toward the supportive housing organisation, Edmund remarked:

> Yeah, they all seem to think everything's got to be laid on … It's a bit unrealistic I think. You should have a few basic things. (Edmund)

Edmund's comments about other tenants in supportive housing, similar to the reflections of Harold and Gough, placed emphasis on the supportive housing providers playing an active role in making resources available to contribute to community. Whereas Julia, Stanley, Ben, and John described tenant-led activities as avenues for communities in supportive housing, Gough, Harold and Edmund identified an expectation that the supportive housing organisation would actively intervene to create community through providing resources, such as transport, musical, camping and fishing equipment. The experience and desire for community in supportive housing among tenants is broadly consistent with the policy objectives, and they can also be reflected back to the assertions presented in Chapter 2 about the means through which supportive housing providers believe community will evolve in supportive housing. The notion of tenant-led activities and initiatives to promote community resonate with supportive housing providers framing of the ideal objectives of supportive housing as a means to enable tenant normalisation and independence. On the other hand, a tenant expectation of the supportive housing provider playing an active and resource intensive role in creating community are reflected in the comments from supportive housing providers about the prevailing ethos of a passive welfare system that undermines autonomy, and the efforts of supportive housing in creating independence.

4.2.2 Negative communities

Supportive housing was not a positive community for all, or more specifically, it was not a positive community all of the time. There was a clear tension between tenants describing supportive housing in terms of communities as characterised by socialising, friendships and participation in activities and organised social gatherings, on the one hand; and tenants who, on the other hand, cast living closely with other tenants in the one building—moreover in a building with communal areas where socialising was promoted—meant that (1) conflict arose, (2) there was annoyance and even fear about other tenants, (3) being too close to other tenants was problematic because people were dealing with mental health issues, and (4) living in close contact and interacting with other tenants exacerbated problematic alcohol consumption. Indeed, throughout the discussion below we show how the tension was not simply that some tenants described supportive housing as a positive community and others described it as a negative community. Although this binary is true for some tenants, our qualitative data reveals that some tenants described the socialising and friendships among tenants as both a source of positive communities and at the same time as the antithesis to community and positive living.

Alcohol consumption in supportive housing, particularly in communal spaces of supportive housing, was a complex and dominant form of negative community. From a straightforward and frequently discussed perspective, tenants lamented the way that other tenants consumed alcohol in communal areas. The consumption of alcohol, and then the subsequent intoxication and behaviour of tenants who were intoxicated, had detrimental impacts upon people's experiences in supportive housing. The comments below are in response to open questions about people's concerns in supportive housing or what they believe about supportive housing that does not function well.

> They drink down here. It gets a bit annoying and that. I've tried to talk to [onsite support worker] … I don't need to see people fucking paralytic every day and that's what happens … It's not like every now and then. Certain people who's just a handful and they're drunk every day. I'm not just talking a couple of drinks, social drinking. It's paralytic. (Joseph)

> Yeah, pretty much every night they're drunk out here. It's either walking around the foyer area or in the common room down here and you get like four or five alcoholics in the one spot and they know each other previously before moving here. (Alfred)

> What are some of the worst things [about living here]? (Interviewer)

> People getting drunk and yelling and screaming at each other. (Malcolm)

Joseph's sentiments about feeling concerned by overt and extreme intoxication ('paralytic') and Malcolm's comments about yelling and screaming because of intoxication were consistent with many other tenants who reported dissatisfaction with alcohol consumption in communal areas of supportive housing. It was the presence of alcohol consumption and intoxication that undermined people feeling comfortable to use and socialise in communal areas. Alfred, however, went further. His frustration about being exposed to tenants' intoxication was exacerbated because he felt that tenants consumed alcohol, not only in communal areas, but also in front of supportive housing staff: 'they're all drunk by 4:00pm so it was obviously in front of all the staff. It still happened'. Alfred's comment that it *still* happens, and happens moreover, *in front of staff* highlight that his concerns about tenant intoxication are that it had not been prevented by supportive housing staff. So dismayed by the display of intoxication, Alfred had considered leaving supportive housing.

> What would be the main reason you'd say that you don't see yourself here in five years? (Interviewer)
>
> The carry on, not being listened to about it. So that would be the reason that I don't stay here. It just brings you down a little bit. It makes you anxious. (Alfred)

Alfred's comments about other tenants drinking and his psychological response illustrate a significant concern. In remarks that go far beyond undermining a positive feeling of community, Alfred, Joseph and Malcolm experienced the alcohol consumption of other tenants in communal areas as preventing them from both wanting to participate in activities with others and feeling comfortable in the building where they live. These experiences in single-site supportive housing are consistent with the findings reported in Denmark by Benjaminsen (2013). Although appraising their independent housing unit positively, Alfred, Joseph and Malcolm, like people that had exited homelessness into units located within the one building in Denmark (Benjaminsen 2013), experienced the alcohol consumption and associated behaviours of tenants intoxicated from alcohol subverting their abilities to live comfortably.

In addition to the undermining of community that was a product of neighbours consuming alcohol and displaying intoxication in communal areas, some tenants described the consumption of alcohol in supportive housing as having direct negative impacts on their own alcohol consumption and wellbeing. Arthur described a recent experience (consistent with a previous experience) where the heavy consumption of alcohol with other tenants in the supportive housing led to problems.

Arthur said that he was 'on a bender' and the intoxication among the tenants resulted in 'some agro' (violence). He felt bad about the situation, saying that he was 'drunk', and that 'I probably didn't cope with it very well'. Another tenant noted that the biggest challenge living in supportive housing was that 'I like a drink and sometimes it clashes'. Rather than the conflict that Arthur described, the clash was explained in terms of the tenant consuming too much alcohol in supportive housing and thus not making appointments or other commitments.

The literature on addiction is replete with evidence of the challenges of reducing alcohol consumption or maintaining sobriety when people with alcohol problems have other drinkers in their social networks (Havassy et al. 1991). The experiences of the tenants described above resonate with the findings of Havassy et al. (1991). Although supportive housing provides onsite support workers who through direct service provision and referral are intended to assist tenants address problems such as problematic alcohol consumption, for a number of tenants, exposure to neighbours in supportive housing with alcohol problems exacerbates their own problems. This was particularly evident from the experiences of Tony. After a number of years experiencing homelessness, and after transferring from one supportive housing building to another because of tenancy problems related to alcohol consumption, Tony articulates a

sophisticated understanding of his own alcohol and mental health problems in the context of living in single-site supportive housing.

> I suppose I do drink a bit more around here to cope, the same as [in previous supportive housing], because I want to fit in a bit more. But I'd probably have to say I'd probably prefer to be elsewhere to be truthful because I've found it so difficult here not to go three or four days without it. It's too cheap a habit for me. (Tony)
>
> Is there anything you could suggest to make it better? (Interviewer)
>
> I only feel that a lot of us are coming here with addiction whether that be drugs or alcohol and it has just been so challenging. (Tony)

Tony's experiences and perspective of living in supportive housing represent a key theme within the data, and a theme moreover, that constitutes a challenging theoretical and practical question. How is the need to provide housing to people who have exited homelessness in ways that enable them to have social connections and informal supports among neighbours reconciled with the need to ensure that they are allocated housing in locations where they are not continuously exposed to neighbours and networks that undermine their efforts of recovery, life improvements and indeed tenancy sustainability? In addition to the literature identifying the risk factors to sobriety when people have other drinkers in their social networks, it is recognised that social networks can represent a positive influence and can enable people's efforts to reduce and cease alcohol consumption (McCrady 2004). Even if one is to argue against the appropriateness of single-site supportive housing on the basis of the problems of concentrating tenants with similar histories and problems in the one building, one must also critically consider how this outcome is realised in other forms of social housing in Australia that geographically concentrates high and very high need tenants in the one area (building, neighbourhood, broad acre estate). In these ways tenants will be located next to neighbours with high needs (in the same way they will be in single-site supportive housing).

Tony clearly indicates that living in supportive housing with other people who consume alcohol represents too much of a temptation. He explains this temptation in terms of his own alcohol consumption. On the other hand, Tony spoke about the positive community of support and friendships among other tenants in supportive housing. Tony participates in onsite barbeques, Friday night diners (Kev's cuisine), the tenants action group, and he 'gets along with everyone [other tenants] and we have a pretty good bond'. Thus Tony benefited from the close contact, activities and socialising with neighbours in single-site supportive housing. He also found, however, his own alcohol consumption and mental health was undermined by socialising and participating in activities with the very people he identified as supportive.

Consistent with formal intentions and the assertions of supportive housing providers, tenants both desired socialising and activities-based communities in supportive housing and for many, they experienced supportive housing as positive communities they desired. Even the presence of problematic behaviour in communal areas or the temptation that comes from neighbours engaging in alcohol consumption served to highlight the significance of friendship and activity based communities in single-site supportive housing. The tenants who were characterised as transgressive because of their alcohol consumption and intoxication in communal areas of supportive housing were not only undermining other tenants' capacity to live comfortably, but the alcohol consumption and intoxication were deemed problematic because the acts had the consequence of negating the desired community.

4.3 The role of support

Supportive housing has been developed as an intervention to enable people who have experienced chronic homelessness to exit homelessness, achieve housing stability and, as explained in Chapter 2, supportive housing is an intervention to help people make positive life changes. Extending the discussion on community—and the role of support promoting

community—here we examine three dimensions and operations of support in supportive housing. These are: support to enable supportive housing to function, with some experiencing a loss of freedoms as a product of the intervention to function; supportive housing to make positive life changes; and relatedly, supportive housing as a stepping stone to life beyond supportive housing. We considered these themes in turn.

As discussed in Chapter 2, the single-site supportive housing included in this component of the research consisted of three key components of support. First, support included a 24-hour concierge service. Concierge controls access into the supportive housing building, including signing visitors in and out of the building. Concierge also provides a security and monitoring function in the supportive housing building.

Second, support includes onsite 'support workers'. Onsite support workers provide a range of welfare and social services to tenants. In accordance with the ideal characteristics of the supportive housing model, onsite support services are voluntary and tenancy access or continuation is not contingent on working with onsite support providers. Nevertheless, tenants who were allocated supportive housing because of homelessness and high vulnerability have an onsite support worker assigned to them because they were allocated their tenancy because of the requirement of support (Common Ground Tasmania n.d.). Although voluntary, and in line with the assessment that tenants required support, supportive housing providers firmly expected tenants to actively work with onsite support providers (see Chapter 2).

The onsite support providers also play a direct role brokering and referring to the third element of support in single-site supportive housing: support provided by external organisations. External support organisations, including state-funded primary and mental health services and a diverse range of other state and community organisations, deliver support services both onsite and offsite. The 28 tenants who participated in the qualitative interviews describe their experiences in supportive housing with reference to all three levels of support. Most frequently, however, tenants described support to include the concierge and the onsite support workers.

4.3.1 Support to enable supportive housing to function

Tenants identified support as fundamental to ensure single-site supportive housing functioned. In addition to enabling positive life changes (below) and promoting activity and socialising-based communities (above), support created the conditions for people to live together in a cohesive and desirable way. Concierge and onsite support workers were pivotal in creating cohesion. They also played a central role in mitigating conflict.

Tenants expressed the benefits of having staff onsite who they could approach or who, even in the absence of a direct request, could provide a service to enhance the liveability of supportive housing.

> Here we do have a process where you can say, 'Hey, I'm worried about this' or 'I'm afraid of this' or 'I fear this'. You do have a thing that you can put across how you feel and it has been listened to. Not always acted on straight away, but I've found that eventually what happens is either they get to a point where they do have to act or the people will leave. (Julia)
>
> Does that work? The staff, are they able to achieve that balance? (Interviewer)
>
> I don't know if it ever can be completely achieved where you have the whole place full with people who are always going to get on and everything's going to go perfect. That's very idealistic. I don't think that is ever going to happen, but with things that have been a problem they have addressed the issues and they have addressed them as quickly as they possibly could. Okay, maybe sometimes not to what I wanted or not to what other people wanted, but to a point where it's still comfortable to live here. So I think that having concierges and having counsellors that's a big part of why it probably is working. (Julia)

Onsite support staff assumed the function of ensuring that Julia and other tenants ('we do have a process') had a mechanism to talk about and have problems addressed. The concierge and onsite support workers were a direct conduit for tenants to engage with and seek resolution to their concerns, particularly concerns with other neighbours. As Julia acknowledged, access to onsite staff did not represent a utopia or a panacea to problems experienced in single-site supportive housing. Nevertheless, having access to staff onsite provided tenants with a venue to raise issues and be heard. It was the accessibility of onsite staff that was described as important.

Tony lamented a previous social housing property he resided in, and contrasted it with the availability of onsite support in supportive housing as 'we can steer our own vessel in terms of our direction'. For Tony, onsite support, particularly the way onsite support prevented him receiving unwanted visitors, made it possible for him to live in a way of his choosing.

Social housing tenant involvement in decisions about their housing and their neighbourhoods has long been recognised as an ideal aspiration, with some state governments establishing good practice guides to facilitate tenant participation (Housing Registrar Victoria n.d.) and recognising tenant participation with awards (Department of Human Services 2014). Simmons and Birchall's (2007) work in the United Kingdom demonstrates the importance of enhancing a collective and a sense of community among tenants to promote their participation. Although some participants described participating in the supportive housing Tenant Action Group, they most frequently described meaningful participation and a sense of agency through the capacity to voice their concerns and express their opinions to onsite support workers.

As shown earlier in the chapter, the presence of onsite support did not prevent intoxication in communal areas, despite tenants' request for onsite support workers to intervene to stop such activities. Even though participants described the limitations of onsite support, they appreciated that onsite support provided a mechanism for them to communicate with their housing and support providers. As Julia described, having access to onsite support meant that she was 'comfortable to live here'.

We can infer the importance of easy access to support as a venue to raise concerns and address neighbourhood-based problems from the literature on evictions and exits from public housing in Australia. Wiesel and colleagues (2014) show that it is dissatisfaction with neighbours that constitute one of the most common push factors out of public housing. Extending the comments of participants in this study about access to onsite support, it is reasonable to assume that the identified violence, intimidation and theft experienced in areas with high concentration of public housing that contribute to push factors out of public housing (Wiesel et al. 2014) can be addressed, at least in part, by the presence of onsite support.

Indeed, tenants expressed the view that concierge and onsite support workers played vital interventionist roles to promote cohesion and prevent conflict. Informed by the literature suggesting that the surveillance and monitoring features such as onsite security and support services can undermine feelings of home and can constitute a scrutinised living environment (Padgett 2007), we asked tenants directly to describe how they perceived onsite support.

> Do you like having the security there on the front? (Interviewer)
>
> Yeah. That makes a difference obviously. It would be the ghetto basically if they weren't there. It would have already gone to shit with all the drinking and stuff. It's them there that makes the boys be semi-respectful, well, majority-respectful. Even though they're drunk they're not getting too over the top most of the time. (Alfred)
>
> Having all this security I think it's very comforting for them [tenants with traumatic histories]. (Stanley)
>
> What do you think it would be like here if there was no security? (Interviewer)
>
> Probably lawless. (Stanley)

Alfred and Stanley evoked the importance of concierge playing a key role in ensuring personal security and safety vis-à-vis perceptions of other tenants posing a nuisance or even a threat. The threat of violence perpetrated by neighbours in supportive housing, for some tenants at least, was based on lived experiences. Andrew recalled two separate occasions where he either witnessed aggression or was threatened with violence by another tenant. On both occasions Andrew reports that concierge intervened to appropriately address the violence. He described the concierge as 'very quick and precise'. The need for intervention to address violence perpetrated by supportive housing tenants was brought into clear focus by Tanya when she described a situation where she was moved from one supportive housing unit into another unit:

> So talk us through why they moved you. (Interviewer)
>
> Because I think they had too many issues with me going around with a pitch fork. (Tanya)
>
> What were you doing with a pitch fork? (Interviewer)
>
> I was going to slit someone's throat. (Tanya)

Tanya's dramatic account provides a clear example to support why Alfred and Stanley, along with other tenants who expressed similarly, described concierge and onsite support staff playing a critical role in providing much needed security. Tony far less dramatically comments that if the onsite staff were not present, 'I don't know how the place would function'.

It is difficult to question the significance afforded to the function of concierge and onsite support workers when tenants responded to questions about onsite workers with direct reference to acts and threats of violence occurring in supportive housing. Based on lived experiences, tenants of single-site supportive housing understood the central role concierge and onsite support workers assumed in ensuring their day-to-day safety and creating the conditions for a reasonable place to live. The necessity for concierge and onsite support workers does, however, raise broader questions about the desirability of locating in the one building people who have been allocated a tenancy because of chronic homelessness and high vulnerability.

These broader questions about the appropriate form and location of housing for people with chronic experiences of homelessness and high vulnerabilities extend beyond and have a history that predates current issues made apparent by single-site models of supportive housing. As Dalton and Rowe (2004) observe, public housing estates in Australia, consistent with the experiences internationally, have disproportionately high rates of violence and intimidation that are often associated with the use and trade of illicit substances, the latter also at disproportionately high rates. Dalton and Rowe (2004) note that even when the public housing stock is of good quality and when tenants are satisfied with their individual properties, the communal areas of public housing estates can be dangerous and undesirable to tenants.

With a recognition of the undesirable neighbourhood effects of concentrating disadvantage, in both social and private housing, Cheshire et al. (2014) provide a thorough overview of strategies to improve neighbourhoods through regeneration and tenure social mixing. The single-site Common Ground model of supportive housing explicitly and intentionally allocated tenancies on social mix principles. Advocates for the model state that 'Common Ground buildings have a positive social mix of tenants—ensuring that people with a history of chronic homelessness live in the building alongside workers and students who also need affordable housing' (Australian Common Ground Alliance 2010).

The function of onsite support services in single-site supportive housing addresses problems that have long been experienced on social housing estates and areas where there is a concentration of disadvantaged households. Moreover, the use of concierge and onsite support workers to mitigate or even prevent these issues is not unique to single-site supportive housing. Strebel (2011) demonstrates the role that onsite concierge services play in social

housing high rise buildings in the United Kingdom. She shows how concierge services were introduced into social housing estates in the United Kingdom in the 1980s to ensure the day-to-day functioning of buildings, security, monitoring and to respond to the immediate needs of social housing tenants and their visitors (Strebel 2011). In Australian social housing likewise, the Victorian Government introduced greater security, including CCTV and 24-hour security presence through a concierge system, on social housing estates to address the drug trade and associated violence (Dalton & Rowe 2004).

Although it can be seen that the concierge and security features of single-site supportive housing have a precedence in other forms of social housing, some tenants in this research coupled their unequivocal positive depictions of concierge and onsite support workers to a critique that their freedom and autonomy to live in unscrutinised ways was limited because of the presence of staff onsite. Alfred represents this dilemma clearly.

On the one hand, Alfred described the necessary and appreciated role that concierge played. As noted above, he thought that without concierge, single-site supportive housing would be a 'ghetto', and the problematic drinking among tenants would be exacerbated. On the other hand, living in a building with concierge also had undesirable consequences.

> What about privacy? Do you feel you have enough privacy here? (Interviewer)
>
> No. You've got to go through the front and you get looked at every time you go in and out and constantly have to have a conversation. That privacy side of it can be a bit annoying but sometimes I just nod a little bit and keep walking. So that's the only privacy aspect of it really. I don't mind the cameras around and stuff like that. That's probably a good thing. Once you're in your room you've got privacy … It would be nice to be able to use your back door every now and then and just pop in and out quietly. I guess if I did that then they can't really monitor who comes in and out all the time. (Alfred)

Alfred articulated awareness of the overarching purpose of concierge, to control and monitor access into and out of the building. Recognising the role of concierge to promote the functioning of single-site supportive housing, he juxtaposes the privacy he has in his unit with the surveillance in common areas of supportive housing.

Despite Alfred experiencing the concierge in ways that compromised his privacy, the gaze and influence of the concierge did not penetrate the walls of his unit; as he put it, 'once you're in your room you've got privacy'. Instead, his privacy was compromised in communal areas of supportive housing, namely upon entering and exiting the building. In contrast, for Bronwyn the concierge and her onsite support worker particularly undermined her autonomy in ways that transcended the communal areas of supportive housing and entered into her unit.

Bronwyn recalled an exchange with her support worker soon after he commenced his employment with the supportive housing provider. She said that her support worker had challenged her, incorrectly and unfairly she believed, about breaching the supportive housing rules. Bronwyn's support worker expressed the view that she was not complying with the supportive housing rules as she was allowing her partner (who is homeless) to stay with her more than the permitted three days per week. Bronwyn recounted an exchange with her support worker where he advised her:

> I just feel that you're not living by the rules and that you're not abiding by the rules properly and that you're just living the way that you want to live. And I said 'excuse me. What do you mean by that?' And he goes 'I just feel that you're not cooperating within the Common Ground rules properly', and I said 'I do everything right'. (Bronwyn)

After the heated exchange between Bronwyn and her support worker, the latter 'printed off a bloody page of rules and [gave] them to me'. She said that she felt disrespected. Bronwyn's experiences highlights, without engaging in a discussion of the veracity or otherwise of her

support worker's allegations, how the monitoring of movements in and out of the building by concierge and the presence of onsite *support* workers can impact upon autonomy and freedom to live.

The visitor policy that Bronwyn describes is broadly consistent with other policy across Australian social housing authorities. The significant difference is that the onsite support and single access to the building functions of Bronwyn's single-site supportive housing means that she and other tenants are constantly monitored. Bronwyn's description of onsite support indicates that it served to monitor her visitor's movements rather than provide her with support. Moreover, not only did Bronwyn believe that the monitoring was unnecessary because 'I know the rules', and 'I do everything right', she also described the intervention as disrespectful, and that it 'made me uncomfortable'.

The experiences of Bronwyn and Alfred feeling that their privacy and autonomy is undermined, together with the positive descriptions of onsite support playing a vital role in promoting opportunities for tenants to raise problems and contribute to a comfortable living environment, highlight complex tensions that are not easily reconciled. The concierge and onsite support workers were deemed to play an important function in promoting a secure, safe and liveable supportive housing building. Taking this further, some tenants even wanted the onsite staff to play a more active and interventionist role in fostering the conditions for activity-based communities among tenants. The survey data similarly reveals that the majority of tenants appraised security favourably. On the other hand, Bronwyn and Alfred's experiences demonstrate how the otherwise positive and desirable aspects of onsite staff also have the consequence of feeling the gaze of scrutiny. Clapham (2010, p. 262) takes the view that 'any housing intervention that improves physical conditions but decreases control is liable to be counterproductive if the aim is to increase well-being'.

Survey responses reported in Chapter Three clearly demonstrate that tenants reported their single-site supportive housing with onsite support as high in terms of physical quality, but the comments from the tenants above indicate how control can be limited. Is, however, the loss of freedom and autonomy that comes with the scrutiny of onsite support workers a necessary compromise? By definition, the tenants who were allocated properties in the single-site supportive housing had experienced chronic homelessness and high vulnerabilities. As homeless, the participants faced significant structural and resource barriers to exercise autonomy and control over their day-to-day lives (Parsell 2011a). For the individuals included in this chapter, the housing market, and the structures and conditions of social housing, have not successfully met their needs. Indeed, a number of participants couched their positive descriptions of support and community in supportive housing in the context of their negative previous experiences in social housing or as homeless. Extending the question posed above: Is the loss of freedom and autonomy that comes with the scrutiny of onsite support workers necessary to create the conditions for people exiting homelessness with high vulnerabilities to sustain housing and realise broader life improvements?

4.3.2 Supportive housing to achieve positive life changes

Single-site supportive housing, and specifically, the support provided by supportive housing staff, coincided with positive life changes. Tenants not only described making diverse life improvements, they also attributed their positive life changes to supportive housing. For some tenants, the changes were described as having support to successfully live in housing.

> Well, I have quite severe anxiety so I like the fact there's independent living but you've still got the support around you if you need it. So that's quite nice. It's good that you're getting good people to talk to yet you can still go to your unit and be by yourself if you want to. (Penny)

Like Penny, Joseph explained that working with his onsite support worker and abstaining from illicit substances meant that he was able to sustain housing after years of 'drifting around

couches, on the streets, hospitals, wherever'. Support was particularly important to Joseph when he first commenced his tenancy because he was 'just really dependent on people to get reassurance and stuff like that because everything's just been new'. Joseph described the benefits of his onsite support worker in terms of having someone to help him through a formal process of working his 'goals'. But after living in supportive housing for approximately a year, he said that he was at a stage where 'I haven't really had to see him [onsite support worker] much now'.

Penny and Joseph describe support as important for them to sustain their housing after exiting homelessness. Both, furthermore, identified how the availability of onsite support was sufficiently flexible to enable them to retain autonomy and control. Consistent with the literature which emphasises the significance of support being voluntary and the extent and nature determined by the tenant (Rog 2004), Penny highlighted how she engaged with support and still felt independent. Joseph similarly explained how he was able to freely disengage with onsite support relative to his level of engagement with support in the months immediately after commencing his tenancy.

Other tenants spoke about the role of onsite support playing important but informal roles in helping them sustain housing. Rather than formal goals to be achieved or clear interventions provided by onsite workers, tenants frequently spoke about achieving positive changes in their lives and the resultant sustainment of housing in simple terms of having staff onsite to speak with informally and at a time when they needed it.

The importance of having support workers to speak with and who have an interest in tenant's welfare was highlighted by John. He had previously lived on the streets, which John felt meant that 'no one gives a shit about you'. When asked what had helped to keep his supportive housing for approximately 18 months, John responded, 'just a lot of support, a lot of compliments like "well-done [John]". Even just to hear that it's pretty good'. The support John described primarily involved informal support, by way of encouragement from his onsite support worker with whom he had developed a positive professional relationship.

There are notable gaps in the literature to help us understand the type of informal support that John and others received. Indeed, there are several gaps in the research literature about what exactly constitutes support in supportive housing. Other than the broad statement 'support', we know little about what forms of support are delivered in supportive housing, what support works well, and what support tenants require and prefer. From the available literature, albeit from North America, we know that the voluntary and tenant-directed support is a fundamental criteria of supportive housing (Rog 2004). Nelson et al. (2007) provide an empirical base by demonstrating that tenant choice and control over the services received in supportive housing contributes to tenant quality of life. Following the normative position that tenants ought to control the services accessed in supportive housing, Henwood and colleagues (2013) identified the need for supportive housing in the United States to provide primary care lifestyle type interventions, such as nutrition and exercise (Henwood et al. 2013).

The Pathways to Housing approach of supportive housing places tenant choice and control over services at the centre of the model. In an ideal form, the Pathways to Housing model makes available services provided by a team-based approach that assists tenants with primary and mental health, employment, education, family and community integration (Gilmer et al. 2013). The Pathways to Housing model involve scattered-site housing with support provided by outreach teams, in contrast to single-site supportive housing with onsite support (Parsell et al. 2015). Nevertheless, both the scattered-site (as exemplified through Pathways to Housing) and the single-site (as exemplified through Common Ground) models of supportive housing intend to make a range of services available so that tenants can exercise choice and determine their own goals.

In Chapter 2 supportive housing providers emphasised several characteristics of what they saw as the foundations for support. These include support being directed by the tenant and responsive to their individual needs; support taking account of the tenant making the transition from homelessness into housing; support as assertive and high profile; the significance of informal support from concierge and neighbours, and the role of formal support promoting tenant independence. We can see that the characterisations of support put forward by tenants concur with the ideas presented in Chapter 2.

Moving beyond the informal support described by John and the support to sustain housing outlined by Penny and Joseph, for some tenants support was significant both in terms of the nature of support received and the changes they associated with the support. Instead of a resource to simply enable people to access and sustain housing, as significant as this is, supportive housing was described as a life changing intervention.

> It's [living in supportive housing for 18 months] been great. Look it's totally changed my life around. (Billy)
>
> Really? (Interviewer)
>
> Yeah, it has. I've learned a lot of basic life skills, things I didn't know how to do before which was things that probably you take for granted, that were easy for you like cooking, washing my clothes, washing my dishes, just having a nice clean house or unit. So all these basic things, life skills I didn't have, I've learned.
>
> When you say you learned those life skills when you were here, cooking and cleaning and things like that, how did you learn them? (Interviewer)
>
> I actually asked my social worker, I said, look, I'm not too sure what to do. What washing powder do I buy to wash my clothes, how to clean the hotplates and things like that. So it's just basic things that are basic for most people but for me because I had it done for me by my parents for my whole life I really didn't know how to do it. So I think that the greatest person that has helped me has been my social worker, and she's helped me out in many respects, just advice on anything. (Billy)

Billy's account highlights both the impact of supportive housing and the means through which he understood support contributed. His assertion that living in supportive housing was life changing are not only extreme, but they portray the role of supportive housing consistent with the aspirations of supportive housing identified by supportive housing providers in Chapter 2. Indeed, Billy described 'totally changing my life' in a way that resonates with the ambitious depictions of supportive housing outlined in supportive housing organisation vision statements, whereby supportive housing tenants will 'build social connections, gain access to community resources, develop confidence and skills, discover their gifts and talents' (Yarra Community Housing n.d.).

Billy's narrative makes equally clear the role of support in bringing about his life changes. He grounded the intervention of his social worker (onsite support worker) to help him develop day-to-day living skills in the context of not having learnt the necessary skills to live independently because of his life experiences prior to accessing supportive housing. Billy's example of developing life skills to sustain housing, along with the experiences of John, Penny and Joseph linking their receipt of support to housing sustainment, offers evidence to question the notions of housing readiness.

The concept of housing readiness is premised on an assumption that some people experience homelessness because they are not ready to be housed. This includes people who are not ready to access housing and people who do access housing and lose their tenancy with the assumption that tenancy loss is explained by the individual not being housing ready. The notion of housing readiness is often put forward without analysis of how housing and support structures can or ought to exist to enable people to exit homelessness and sustain housing. In

a recent release of data reporting on housing outcomes for groups vulnerable to homelessness, the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (2014) identifies sections of the homeless population as not housing ready. From this authority charged with disseminating the national Specialist Homelessness Service data, an idea of people not being housing ready is put forward to explain why people continue to experience homelessness. In explaining why sections of the population remained homeless over the data reporting period they assert:

> It is evident that many in this group may not be 'housing ready'. (Australian Institute of Health and Welfare 2014, p.6)

In the characterisation of not being housing ready presented by the leading Australian data authority, there is no evidence of consideration given as to how supportive housing can render the question of housing readiness redundant. These assumptions of the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare direct the focus exclusively to the individual. Housing readiness is constructed in individual client terms without any consideration of the policy and practice context that will determine whether housing is available, accessible and sustainable.

The prevailing ideas about housing readiness have traditionally led to interventions that attempt to train homeless people and prepare them for housing. Busch-Geertsema (2013) and others (Tsemberis 1999) have meaningfully rejected training programs based on assumptions of housing readiness. In a clever and illustrative metaphor, Busch-Geertsema (2013) observes that swimming can be better learned in the water than anywhere else. The experiences reported from tenants of supportive housing provide evidence to question the need for programs to train people to be ready for housing. The participants reported in this chapter all exited homelessness and immediately accessed supportive housing. Their experiences likewise illustrate how through the provision of a diverse range of supports provided in supportive housing, they were able to sustain housing and, as Billy asserted, totally change his life. Tenancy sustainment and life changes occurred among a cohort who self-defined as having experienced many years excluded from housing and for some, with limited skills or knowledge of how to sustain housing in the absence of support.

Life changes were enabled by an interaction of the availability of support and tenants' agency. People located their actions as central to working with and shaping the nature of support in order to sustain housing and achieve or work toward achieving positive changes. Tenant's actions—the agency they exercised—were mediated by the resources and opportunities that living in supportive housing presented.

Harold disclosed having a brain injury and explained that the brain injury meant it was difficult to manage himself. After living in supportive housing for approximately one year, he described how the automatic rent deduction system, the norms of living in close proximity to his neighbours, and the encouragement from support staff to 'do it on your own back' helped him to improve his situation. Harold said that before supportive housing, he would not pay bills but 'I'd rather go and spend it on booze or something like that'. But the structures of supportive housing has meant that [I am] 'just managing myself, it's become a lot easier'.

Harold attributed sustaining housing to his actions, and did so by closely linking the actions he exercised to the structures and support provided to him in supportive housing. Whereas earlier we critiqued the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (2014) for presenting housing readiness as a construct disengaged from housing and support resources and exclusively focused on the individual, here we are demonstrating that accessing and sustaining housing is a product of individual tenants interacting with the resources available in supportive housing. Like Harold, Julia provided a sophisticated explanation of how her actions to keep housing after homelessness and indeed improve her life were embedded within the structures, support practices, and importantly, the opportunities available in supportive housing.

> I'm a middle-aged woman who's had enough and I suppose it depends on how you see things and how you make it work for you and I've made here work for me. (Julia)

> What have you done to make it work for you? (Interviewer)
>
> Well everything that's open to me here in terms of the art studio, certain things going on there's always something that's happening where, say for instance, I've been invited to an International Women's Day luncheon. (Julia)
>
> So you're going to that? (Interviewer)
>
> Yes, and politically I've always fought for women's rights. But there's always something going on that I can be a part of. So to actually get out of the lifestyle I was living and move into a more productive and positive life, I need to be involved and not sitting back. (Julia)

Julia's account of her experiences and actions in supportive housing are significant. She recalls her approach and the extent and manner in which she has exercised agency to exploit the opportunities available to achieve the life improvements she identified. Importantly, Julia does not describe supportive housing as a mechanism that enabled her to think differently about life or to take on different goals or personal values. Rather, supportive housing—'there's always something happening'—provided her with the opportunities to achieve life changes that were important to her. Attending the luncheon, for example, was consistent with Julia's long-term political values, but the opportunity to attend a luncheon was made available because of supportive housing. Living in supportive housing presented opportunities for Julia to pursue the life consistent with her values, but a life that she was unable to realise when she was homeless and insecurely housed.

As Julia explained most clearly, however, her life improvements were not merely a product of living in supportive housing where opportunities were presented, although it is difficult to imagine that opportunities to be invited to a luncheon present themselves to people who are homeless. Instead, Julia placed herself and the way she wanted to live at the centre of the analysis. Conscious of the challenges, 'it's not easy', Julia expressed her desire to take on the opportunities provided in supportive housing to fulfill a desire to 'go forward'. Indeed, in an illustrative manner, Julia rationalised her need to go forward in terms of survival, 'or else I am not going to survive'.

4.3.3 Supportive housing as a stepping stone to beyond

The comments above, particularly Julia's critical self-reflection, point to the role of supportive housing as a mechanism for positive change. For some tenants, the life changes enabled through supportive housing were envisioned as part of a project of further progression. In this final section, we demonstrate how tenants saw the stable and secure supportive housing as a stepping stone to life beyond supportive housing. Joseph is explicit in both the language he uses and the metaphor of a stepping stone to an improved life beyond supportive housing.

> Its [supportive housing] a good stepping stone. (Joseph)
>
> What do you mean stepping stone? (Interviewer)
>
> I'm going to try and get out of here eventually. Definitely. When I'm a bit stronger and stuff like that. I really don't want to go back to drugs and alcohol. (Joseph)

The idea of supportive housing as a stepping stone that inevitably lead one beyond the need and indeed desire for supportive housing is consistent with the characterisation of supportive housing presented in Chapter 2. Although the notion of supportive housing as a means to find alternative accommodation at a later point after life improvements is consistent with the prevailing national social housing policy of short-term leases and housing for the duration of need (Fitzpatrick & Pawson 2014), we can see, in the first instance, that the idea of supportive housing as a stepping stone is a product of the deliberate allocation policy. Supportive housing is deliberately directed toward people who have experienced chronic homelessness and often assessed as having high vulnerabilities.

Because tenants are allocated supportive housing on the basis of problems in addition to homelessness, and because support is delivered to assist tenants to address those problems for which they were allocated the tenancy in the first place, it is not surprising that both tenants and supportive housing providers would express the view that supportive housing is directed toward promoting change. The normative expectation that tenants will achieve change inevitably leads onto the reasoning that people will leave supportive housing.

> Does it feel like home? (Interviewer)
>
> At times, yeah. Yeah, it does feel like home. I like my little unit, I like my little peace and quiet, I like having being able to come back to it and not being bothered, I like the security aspect of the joint … The more that they build places like this for vulnerable people I think probably the better. I don't think it's a long-term solution. I think it's a medium-term solution with the long-term goal being to manage your own self in sustainable accommodation. (James)
>
> Do you see yourself here in five years? (Interviewer)
>
> My basic plan is to get off the pension and work full-time and then hopefully move out of here. (Ben)

As illustrated by James and Ben, supportive housing, when it has functioned as they intended, would no longer be useful or desirable. Supportive housing was seen as part of and a means to fulfil a broader life project characterised by overcoming problems and positive progression. The positive life progression was clearly described at the individual level. James linked leaving supportive housing to gaining the capacity to manage himself. Ben likewise identified full-time employment as his long-term goal and he explicitly linked the attainment of full-time employment with an exit from supportive housing. Supportive housing in these respects was positioned as an intervention to assist people improve their personal situation. Once improvements to the self were achieved, people no longer saw their future in supportive housing.

For some participants, discussions of positive life progression and their desires to move on from supportive housing were couched in terms of the design and built environment of supportive housing. Andrew spoke about supportive housing as a helpful short-term solution, but he explained how a bed-sit in supportive housing is 'not the ideal situation for somebody that is on track'. In these respects, Andrew and other tenants evoked their plans to improve their lives and leave supportive housing to enable them to access housing that they saw as more congruent with their needs. Participants described their progression to housing after supportive housing in ways to have their own garden and a dog, or to not have to worry about close neighbours, and even the autonomy afforded by home ownership. Chris explains why leaving any form of rental housing into home ownership represented an important aspiration to achieve a certain way of living:

> Be able to say 'I don't like white walls. Gee I'd like that painted in blue' and just paint it. 'Geez, I'd love a back door. Change anything for that. Gee, I'd like to put a verandah out the front and then I could sit out the back', things like that. That's what you can do in your own home. You can't do it here. (Chris)

Like all participants who described supportive housing as a stepping stone to a positive life beyond supportive housing, Chris was unambiguous in that living in supportive housing was a positive experience. Leaving supportive housing was not explained as seeing supportive housing as negative, but rather leaving supportive housing was part of an optimistic framing of a progression of the self. Consistent with the narratives of supportive housing providers presented in Chapter 2, tenants saw supportive housing as a mechanism to realise positive life change. When analysing the congruence through which both tenants and supportive housing providers described supportive housing as a mechanism for tenants' improvement and thus to

achieve a state of independence whereby the need for supportive housing is negated, we must consider the way that the language used by clients of social services is influenced by the ideas of a good client presented institutionally and by practitioners.

Writing in the drug treatment context in the United States, Carr (2011) demonstrates how clients learn to articulate their self-assessment of their problems and desired solutions in ways encouraged and indeed expected by their service providers. Drawing on years of ethnographic work and observations of service delivery, Carr (2011, p.4) shows how the language used by clients constitutes 'hard-won products of a clinical discipline'. In order to progress through an intervention, or to comply with the conditions of an intervention to benefit from resources provided (particularly housing), Carr shows how clients express a notion of their problems and aspirations in a way that is strongly influenced by what their support worker expects.

Conscious of the way that tenants in supportive housing may describe their situation and goals in ways encouraged by their support and housing providers as well as ways consistent with broader expectations of independence dominant in Australian society, tenants in this study nevertheless evoked optimistic aspirations. They described supportive housing as an intervention to foster their individual progression. In fact, the optimism about a positive life progression are consistent with ideas and beliefs held in contemporary society about upward mobility, aspiration for something more and life improvements. For some tenants, they described their aspirations as predating supportive housing. William exemplifies the role of supportive housing as a conduit to achieve life aspirations that he had held long before commencing his supportive housing tenancy

> From day one, before I even moved into [supportive housing] they asked me what I wanted from this place. It was plain and simple. I haven't changed what I want from this place. All I wanted from this place was to use it as a stepping stone to get from living in my tent on the Domain into my own home. (William)

Here William refers to his 'own home' as homeownership. He accessed supportive housing after sleeping rough. Prior to sleeping rough he was incarcerated for six months. He linked supportive housing as a progression from his past and as a means to achieve further positive progress. Rather than an idea of life progression influenced by expectations introduced to him in supportive housing, William described home ownership as a normative expectation in his family.

> I've grown up with all my family members owning their own house. Even my mother and stepfather had two houses, one in Queensland and one down here. (William)
>
> So was it that you've always been conscious that buying a house was something you wanted to do? (Interviewer)
>
> Yeah, my whole life. (William)

William's narrative about supportive housing as a stepping stone to home ownership are consistent with other tenants who positioned supportive housing as an intervention to assist them to move elsewhere. Although not as specific as William, tenants constructed supportive housing as a means to achieve both individual life improvements and the type of housing that was what they saw as appropriate for people who were 'on track' in life. Be it a house with a garden, a house where one could have a dog, or tenure arrangements where one could renovate freely, tenants conflated individual problems with residing in supportive housing, on the one hand, and overcoming individual problems and exiting supportive housing, on the other.

The sentiments expressed that supportive housing was a short to medium-term intervention aimed to assist people move on from supportive housing may appear broadly consistent with contemporary social housing policy that sees housing provision to be a fixed term proposition for the duration of need (Fitzpatrick & Pawson 2014). This time, the specific and indeed time-

limited nature of social housing forms the central part of the Queensland Government's plan for social housing to perform as a stepping stone into the private rental sector.

The policy identifies social housing as a 'home for life' as indicative of the *old* social housing system, whereas under the new social housing system there is:

> Greater emphasis on social housing as a transitional period on the path to private rental or home ownership. (Department of Housing and Public Works n.d., p.6)

Although there is little doubt that empirical material reported from tenants in this chapter positions supportive housing creating life opportunities beyond supportive housing, consistent as it is with the sentiments of supportive housing providers, our data does not support the provision of supportive housing as a time-determined transitional resource.

The security and stability afforded to tenants because of the long-term nature of the housing provided was central to their progression to a state where they could think about subsequent life improvements. Fitzpatrick and Pawson (2014) highlight the intrinsic importance to social housing tenants of security of tenure. Even if landlords do not exercise their right to evict tenants after a fixed term agreement, the precariousness of the tenure vis-à-vis the power held by the landlord nevertheless comprises tenant ontological security (Fitzpatrick & Pawson 2014). In a systematic review of the international evidence and fieldwork with housing providers, Hulse and colleagues (2011) have likewise demonstrated how secure tenure contributes to physical comfort, autonomy and the ability to make a home (Hulse et al. 2011).

We can see that the empirical material from tenants highlights the significance they afforded to secure housing. In contrast to their experiences of homelessness and housing exclusion prior to supportive housing, the comments from Julia and Billy are illustrative.

> I've got this for the rest of my life pretty much … When I came here I hadn't had a stable place probably ever. I lived with the idea of fight and flight kind of attitude to life and I could get up and go within 30 minutes and with my lifestyle actually I had to do that, I had to be able to get up and go whereas now I don't have to do that anymore. So for me it's a really important thing to have somewhere stable and secure for the rest of my life. (Julia)

> Well the main thing is not having to be worrying about where you're sleeping that night … Basically just to have a place to call home. That's the main thing. (Billy)

Instead of supportive housing being seen as a time-determined transitional intervention, tenants experienced the security of tenure in supportive housing as contributing to psycho-social wellbeing (Fitzpatrick & Pawson 2014; Hulse et al. 2011). From the benefits attributed to security of tenure, quality housing, community and support, tenants reflected on supportive housing as a mechanism to achieve broader life improvements. These broader life improvements, moreover, were not only attributed to supportive housing but, as Julia makes clear, were also unimaginable when experiencing homelessness or living in insecure housing.

4.4 Conclusion

Informed by qualitative interviews with tenants, this chapter has presented a multifaceted and complex picture of living in single-site supportive housing with onsite support. From the experiences and accounts of those individuals, the emerging evidence both supports and rejects ideas from the literature and advocacy for supportive housing; the accounts are often consistent with but also sometimes contrasting to the sentiments of supportive housing providers, and they demonstrate an aspect of supportive housing that shares similarities with transitional housing and accommodation models. The accounts of supportive housing, more importantly, are fundamentally different from transitional housing.

Tenants overwhelmingly participated in and desired socialising and activity-based communities in supportive housing. They wanted to not only form a community with their neighbours, they

also expected tenants to come together to achieve personal and collective goods. All of the tenants participating in the qualitative interviews lived alone and were outside the labour market. These two key factors are significant in understanding their desire to form friendships and to socialise with their neighbours. Similarly, the desire to participate in and even to actively contribute to community must be understood in the context of people's chronic exclusion from housing and an absence of opportunities for positive socially validating roles prior to accessing supportive housing. We argued that people's reactions to the transgressive acts of intoxication and sometimes intimidation in communal areas of supportive housing served to highlight not only their desire to live in peaceful and safe environments, but also the salience afforded to the desired harmonious and collectively-based community.

Tenants described support as significant to their lives. On the one hand, support was perceived by tenants as important to address problems that occurred or were deemed likely to occur in the absence of onsite support. On the other hand, support was important given people's previous experiences as homeless and in social housing. The latter is supported by current data (Wiesel et al. 2014).

Beyond the role of support in promoting safety and cohesion, and setting to one side the scrutiny that some people experienced because of onsite support, tenants described support and supportive housing more broadly as a resource that they would use—actively—as a means to improve their lives. In this way, tenants articulated a view of the function and vision of supportive housing congruent with those expressed by supportive housing providers outlined in Chapter 2.

We have endeavoured to present a nuanced argument that shows how supportive housing is understood as a mechanism that is meaningfully different from a fixed-term tenancy or a time-transitional housing or accommodation model. Single-site supportive housing, from the perspectives of those residing in it, aimed to promote permanent and positive changes in people's lives so that they would go on, at a time of their choosing, and move beyond supportive housing.

5 CONCLUSION

The need for supportive housing can be traced to state housing authorities and community housing providers being required to allocate their properties to people with very high needs. If policy continues to prioritise social housing to the most marginalised in society—and it is probable that policy will continue along this path for the foreseeable future—authorities that deliver housing will be required to take account of how marginalised tenants are supported. Indeed, if the state uses social housing as a resource to provide housing to only the most marginalised, then it raises more fundamental questions about the position of social housing as one instrument of the state to assist with other functions of state intervention in the lives of marginalised citizens. Given that the marginalised citizens in social housing will also be recipients of other government interventions, such as education, health, child protection, criminal justice, welfare entitlements, the concept of supportive housing represents a mechanism to think about not only how housing can be linked to services to improve housing outcomes, but it also highlights more significant questions about the role of housing and linked support services as a vehicle for the state to effectively and efficiently intervene.

Supportive housing helps us to reflect upon and examine how the coupling of housing and other services, be it those directly delivered by the state or provided by community organisations on behalf of the state, can constitute a coherent function of the state to achieve its multiple and diverse objectives, such as improving the material conditions and lives of marginalised people. The state's objectives to deliver and achieve health, education, rehabilitation, child protection and other functions are all enhanced when housing is both available and provided in a way that complements other service provision objectives.

In this report we have examined some of the ways that linking social housing and support services—supportive housing—is intended to address the long-term needs of people who have experienced homelessness. The research drew primarily on fieldwork in single-site supportive housing with onsite support, but it does not advocate for or discount a particular model or approach to supportive housing. Rather, it has presented qualitative and quantitative empirical material to (1) illustrate some of the key features, practices and objectives of single-site supportive housing with onsite support, and (2) highlight some of the benefits, limitations and tensions that single-site supportive housing with onsite support represents. Because supportive housing builds on, is similar to, and different from other ideas and practices of linking accommodation and housing with a range of support services, the pertinent themes discussed in this report (and briefly summarised below) have relevance outside of the specific arena of supportive housing as a response to homelessness.

5.1 Supportive housing located within, and a response to, existing options

All of the data and analysis presented throughout this report about the value and limitations of single-site supportive housing with onsite support can only be grasped by understanding what this form of supportive housing represents in the context of what is available. It is not useful to evaluate the merits or otherwise of single-site supportive housing without understanding what alternative resources (or lack of them) are actually available and accessible to the people targeted for supportive housing.

Single-site supportive housing with onsite support, we can see based on the evidence presented throughout the report, represents a solution to the limitations and problems in existing modes of housing, accommodation and support service provision in Australia. This is not to say that single-site supportive housing is more effective or desirable than scattered-site supportive housing where support is delivered through outreach. We have no data to substantiate this conclusion. On the other hand, the qualitative data with tenants and supportive housing providers in single-site supportive housing demonstrate how central

features of the model were an effective and desirable solution to the other forms of homeless accommodation and social housing the tenants had experienced. More specifically, tenants did not describe single-site supportive housing as more desirable than scattered-site housing where they received support and felt secure. Rather, tenants saw single-site supportive housing as effective and desirable with reference to their previous experiences in housing and homeless accommodation with limited support and where they did not feel secure.

5.1.1 Security and safety

The evidence presented in this report shows that security and safety are key aspects of single-site supportive housing with onsite support. Both supportive housing providers and tenants appreciated the security available in supportive housing with onsite support because they had experienced firsthand, or observed as practitioners, violence and intimidation in other housing situations. The contemporary work of Wiesel et al. (2014) about the push factors out of public housing and the previous work in Melbourne's public housing estates (Dalton & Rowe 2004) supports the data presented in this report that social housing can be dangerous. More pertinently, this report shows how security and safety features in supportive housing are a means to protect highly vulnerable tenants who have otherwise experienced violence and intimidation when unsupported in public housing and various forms of marginal housing and homelessness. The violence and intimidation experienced in these latter forms of housing and substandard accommodation undermines people's capacity to experience autonomy and to express freedom.

When examining the merits of security and safety features in single-site supportive housing, one should be informed by the violence and intimidation experienced by vulnerable people as homeless or in public housing. Nevertheless, our research showed that both tenant and supportive housing providers are conscious of the tensions that security and safety features in supportive housing represent.

5.1.2 Security and scrutiny

Although our survey data showed that the majority of all tenants appraised the level of privacy in supportive housing positively, our qualitative data demonstrates how the security and safety features of supportive housing can limit privacy and tenant freedoms. Participants showed how the presence of onsite staff can prevent people living their day-to-day lives free from scrutiny. In terms of supportive housing with onsite support, the scrutiny is experienced with people's movements in and out of the building, including the monitoring of tenants' visitors in and out of the building. It was also shown how the presence of onsite support had the consequence of closely monitoring the activities of tenants—such as the length of stay of visitors—that would otherwise go unnoticed without onsite support.

Although supportive housing providers advocated for the presence of onsite support because of the enhanced capacity to observe and thus intervene early to address problems that may cause eviction (if not known and addressed), it is worth considering how the onsite monitoring function may actually mean that day-to-day problems that we all experience are more likely to be observed for those who live in a building with onsite support. In the same way that people who live in public places have all their day-to-day lives on display and thus their problems are observable to us all (Parsell 2011b), the monitoring of single-site supportive housing means that it is not necessarily people in this form of housing who experience more problems than other people. Rather, the problems of people who live in single-site supportive housing with onsite support are observed and thus known.

Is, however, the loss of freedom and autonomy that comes with the scrutiny of onsite support workers a necessary compromise? By definition, the tenants who were allocated properties in the single-site supportive housing have experienced chronic homelessness and high vulnerabilities. As homeless, the participants faced significant structural and resource barriers to exercise autonomy and control over their day-to-day lives (Parsell 2011a). For many tenants

in this study, the housing market, and the structures and conditions of social housing have not successfully met their needs. Indeed, a number of participants couched their positive descriptions of support and community in single-site supportive housing in the context of their negative previous experiences in social housing or as homeless. Extending the question posed above: Is the loss of freedom and autonomy that comes with the scrutiny of onsite support workers necessary to create the conditions for people exiting homelessness with high vulnerabilities to sustain housing and realise broader life improvements?

5.1.3 Support as interactional

The research literature on ending homelessness and achieving sustainable housing outcomes often positions tenants as passive consumers of services whose exits from homelessness will be determined by the presence or absence of certain programs or the availability of certain resources (Parsell et al. 2014). In contrast to the positioning of service recipients as passive, this report has shown how supportive housing is a dynamic intervention. The nature of supportive housing and the support provided is the result of an interaction between tenant and supportive provider. We showed how people located their actions as central to working with and shaping the nature of support in order to sustain housing and achieve or work toward achieving positive changes. Tenant's actions—the agency they exercised—were mediated by the resources and opportunities that living in supportive housing presented.

By actively making resources available, supportive housing can constitute a mechanism for tenants to exercise self-determination. As opposed to the limited resources and diminished opportunities to exercise choices as homeless, the resources of supportive housing can create the means through which tenants are able to improve their material conditions and capacities to function and participate more fully in society as autonomous and self-determining.

When assessing the scrutiny and monitoring function that supportive housing assumes in the lives of tenants, it is important to take into account whether the supportive housing intervention is able to provide tenants with meaningful resources that will enable them to experience greater freedoms and capacities to self-determine than would otherwise be available in the absence of supportive housing. Supportive housing should be evaluated against what actually exists, rather than an ideal and theoretical model of housing and support that does not exist.

5.1.4 Single-site supportive housing to transform lives

This research has shown how single-site supportive housing is far more than providing the means for vulnerable people to sustain their tenancies and live together. Although support did intend to achieve both of these objectives, supportive housing also aimed to transform lives. Supportive housing was presented by both supportive housing providers and tenants as a mechanism to overcome the problems of the latter—often enduring problems—and to achieve positive life changes. Ultimately, the positive life changes that were envisioned meant that supportive housing would act as a stepping stone to a positive and improved life beyond supportive housing. Leaving supportive housing was not framed, by either tenants or supportive housing providers, as time-imposed, pressured or a negative housing outcome. Rather, leaving supportive housing was part of an optimistic framing of a progression of the self. Three significant points follow this objective of supportive housing to transform people's lives to a place where supportive housing is redundant.

The first question that must be asked is: Is the intention to transform lives desirable? Based on this research, and specifically based on the assertions of tenants themselves, we argue that efforts to transform people's lives is desirable. We caveat this comment by noting that life transformation should be determined and driven by the individual tenants themselves. In fact, the proposition that tenants themselves must determine and drive change for themselves is consistent with the model of supportive housing presented throughout this report as an interactional intervention where tenants are active participants. In the context of previous life experiences as homeless, the provision of resources, support and opportunities in supportive

housing can indeed constitute a mechanism for people to improve their lives. We argue that the desire for life improvement and to hold aspirations for future flourishing is central to what it is to be human. Allocating people supportive housing because of high vulnerabilities and disadvantaged life histories and then providing them with resources to transform their lives is a form of social justice.

If we accept that transforming lives is desirable, our second question must be: Is the transformation achievable? Our answer to this question is less equivocal. Our research design did not enable us to follow tenants over a period of time to measure changes in their lives. The research literature agrees that if people exiting chronic homelessness are going to make significant life improvements, it will likely take many years (Johnson et al. 2012). Thus, our data to address this question relies on people's self-assessments of their situation. Based on both the tenant survey and the qualitative interviews, we can see that tenants often spoke optimistically about their futures. Tenants frequently expressed a view (responding to the survey and discussed in qualitative interviews) that they had made positive life changes since accessing supportive housing, and many of them expressed optimism about future life improvements.

Although we have limited evidence to substantiate the assertion that tenants had or would likely experience life transformative change, we certainly have evidence to demonstrate that tenants who saw themselves with limited capacities prior to accessing supportive housing were indeed able to, with support and affordable housing, sustain housing. Our research showed that claims of housing readiness are undermined if one takes into consideration the individual's circumstances within a context of the housing and support resources that can address, if not ultimately transform, the problems associated with their housing exclusion. After chronic homelessness, one may argue that sustaining housing does constitute a life transformation. Apart from sustaining tenancies and thus maintaining their exits from homelessness, our data cannot ascertain whether people can go on of their own volition and obtain home ownership, a significant relationship or a family of their own, as some tenants aspired to. There are currently longitudinal evaluations of supportive housing type programs in Australia that will provide answers to these questions about long-term change.

The third question is: Is the intention of supportive housing to transform lives so that individuals achieve independence and then in turn move beyond supportive housing different from other transitional models? For example, in the mid-1990s the former SAAP aimed to:

- → resolve crisis
- → re-establish family links where appropriate
- → re-establish a capacity to live independently of SAAP (*Supported Accommodation Assistance Act 1994*, p.5).

Although there are similarities at the broad level between contemporary supportive housing and traditional models of transitional support to promote client independence, we believe that the two approaches are meaningfully distinct in at least four ways.

1. SAAP focused on transitional accommodation and housing in a time-orientated manner. Support and accommodation were officially arranged around pre-determined times. Supportive housing, although transitional in what it intends to achieve, is not based on a pre-determined period of time.
2. Perhaps most significantly, the transitional nature of accommodation and support under SAAP was fundamentally determined by the service provider. In contrast, supportive housing is intended to leave the transitional nature of the intervention up to the tenant. More fundamentally, because supportive housing is trying to transform lives, there is no need for the tenancy or service provider to dictate whether or when people should leave because the intervention is aiming to change a person's sense of self and feelings of

independence to a state where they will no longer desire to stay in supportive housing. According to the program model, people will change how they see themselves; post change, people will chose to leave supportive housing of their own violation.

3. The long-term nature of the housing provided in supportive housing, as opposed to the crisis and transitional accommodation provided under the SAAP model, is intended to provide tenants' with the stability and control sufficient for them to be able to work on their problems. Thus, the provision of long-term housing is not for the purposes of people staying long-term. Rather, the inclusion of long-term housing in the model aims to promote the psychological conditions for personal change.
4. Similar to the function of long-term housing, supportive housing is different from SAAP in that the former includes resources and has an explicit theory of change to drive the progression towards independence. SAAP, on the other hand, although identifying client independence as a goal, practiced from a perspective that assumed the simple provision of crisis accommodation and case management would be sufficient to promote independence.

5.2 Policy implications

Based on the evidence generated in this research, there are six key policy implications that follow:

1. Single-site supportive housing with onsite support is one form of supportive housing. It works well for people who have experienced chronic homelessness and negative housing and other outcomes in dominant forms of housing and homeless accommodation. From the perspective of those who live and work in single-site supportive housing with onsite support, it is effective and desirable because it is safe. Tenants who identified the significance of safety invariably identified the threats or experiences of violence, intimidation and danger living outside single-site supportive housing with onsite support. This form of supportive housing represented a means for people to achieve safety, because other modes of housing or accommodation had not provided them with safety.
2. The single-site supportive housing with onsite support was successful in enabling people with chronic experiences of homelessness and support needs to immediately access housing, and to sustain housing for at least 18 months. People who self-reported having experienced long exclusions from housing and limited capacities to sustain housing, identified the coupling of support with affordable housing as important for them to keep housing.
3. People with chronic experiences of homelessness, who also have needs for support, can access and sustain housing, without the need for interventions to prepare them for housing.
4. If the provision of housing is intended to help people with chronic experiences of homelessness both overcome non-housing problems and to develop communities and informal networks of support, the allocation of housing and the dynamics of neighbours is important to consider. Tenants desire to socialise, support and be supported by their neighbours. These networks are important to contribute to sustainable housing. On the other hand, networks and socialising among neighbours can also undermine recovery efforts and contribute to or exacerbate personal problems.
5. The provision of supportive housing, be it single-site supportive housing with onsite support or scattered-site supportive housing with support provided through outreach, must be premised on the acknowledgment that tenants actively constituted the nature of supportive housing, including whether it works well or does not work well. The evidence in this research indicates that support is effective when it is a practical resource to address problems, when barriers to access support are removed, and when support is sufficiently broad to make opportunities available for tenants to exercise choices.
6. Supportive housing is an important and justified means to purposefully improve the lives of tenants, and it has the potential of success, when:

- Tenure arrangements are provided so tenants feel they have the opportunity to feel secure. There is no evidence to suggest that limiting housing provision based on time will help tenants achieve positive change. If state housing authorities are interested in tenants moving on from social housing (supportive housing as a form of social housing), then this objective will arguably be best achieved if tenants are provided with opportunities to improve their lives, and then to leave of their own volition;
- Tenants determine the nature of the changes they want to make. Although we could reach consensus that chronic homelessness and the material and social exclusion associated with it are negative, there is and there ought not to be a consensus on what constitutes a positive life, or the improvements that tenants ought to aspire. Supportive housing has a significant role to play when it provides the resources and opportunities for tenants to reach a stage where they can identify the life trajectories and life changes they want to achieve;
- If supportive housing does intend to play a role in realising the positive life changing aspirations articulated by both tenants and supportive housing providers, the qualitative data in this research, consistent with longitudinal research literature, indicates that many changes will take significant time to realise. More importantly, realisation of positive life changes for people allocated housing because of high vulnerability among a population of already vulnerable people, will require significant resources and skilled practitioners. Overcoming trauma, cumulative disadvantage, or even access to the labour market for people who have been excluded for multiple years, is complex.

REFERENCES

Arthurson, K 2010, 'Operationalising social mix: spatial scale, lifestyle and stigma as mediating points in resident interaction', *Urban Policy and Research*, vol.28, no.1, pp.49–63.

Atkinson, R, Habibis, D, Easthope, H & Goss, D 2007, *Sustaining tenants with demanding behaviour: a review of the research evidence*, Positioning Paper, Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Melbourne.

Atkinson, R & Jacobs, K 2008, *Public housing in Australia: stigma, home and opportunity*, Housing and Community Research Unit, Hobart.

Australian Common Ground Alliance 2010. 'Common Ground innovations in Australia', *Parity*, vol.23, no.7, p.10.

—— (n.d.), *Vulnerability index*, available at http://commongroundaustralia.org.au/index.php/other-initiatives/vulnerability-index.html

Australian Government 2008, *The road home: a national approach to reducing homelessness*, Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs, Canberra.

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) 2014, *Housing outcomes for groups vulnerable to homelessness: 1 July 2011 to 31 December 2013*, cat. no. HOU 274, AIHW, Canberra.

Bacchi, C 2009, *Analysing policy: What's the problem represented to be?* Pearson Education, Frenchs Forest.

Banks, S 2006, *Ethics and values in social work*, 3rd edn, Palgrave, Basingstoke.

Benjaminsen, L 2013, *Rehousing homeless citizens with assertive community treatment: experiences from an ACT-programme in Copenhagen*, SFI–The Danish National Centre of Social Research, Copenhagen.

Bleasdale, M 2007, *Supporting the housing of people with complex needs*, Final Report, Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Melbourne.

Bruce, J, McDermott, S, Ramia, I, Bullen, J & Fisher, K 2012, *Evaluation of the housing and accommodation support initiative (HASI)*, Final Report, Social Policy Research Centre, Sydney.

Bullen, J 2010, *Governing homelessness: the discursive and institutional construction of homelessness in Australia*, PhD Thesis, The University of Technology, Sydney.

Busch-Geertsema, V 2012, 'The potential of housing first from a European perspective', *European Journal of Homelessness*, vol.6, no.2, pp.209–216.

—— 2013, 'Swimming can be better learned in the water than anywhere else', *European Journal of Homelessness*, vol.7, no.2, pp.323–326.

Carr, E 2011, *Scripting addiction: the politics of therapeutic talk and American sobriety*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Chavis, D & Wandersman, A 1990, 'Sense of community in the urban environment: a catalyst for participation and community development', *American Journal of Community Psychology*, vol.18, no.1, pp.55–81.

Cheshire, L, Pawson, H, Easthope, H & Stone, W 2014, *Living with place disadvantage: community, practice and policy,* Final Report, Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Melbourne.

City of Sydney 2009, *Complex needs coordination project: practice guides, notes and tools*, City of Sydney, Sydney.

Clapham, D 2010, 'Happiness, well-being and housing policy', *Policy & Politics*, vol.38, no.2, pp.253–67.

Common Ground Tasmania. (n.d.), *Frequently asked questions*. Available at http://www.commongroundtas.com.au/live-at-common-ground

Dalton, T & Rowe, J 2004, 'A wasting resource: public housing and drug use in inner-city Melbourne', *Housing Studies*, vol.19, no.2, pp.229–44.

Department of Housing and Public Works (n.d.), *Housing 2020*, Queensland Government, Brisbane. Available at http://www.hpw.qld.gov.au/SiteCollectionDocuments/Housing2020Strategy.pdf

Department of Human Services (n.d.), *History of public housing*, Government of Victorian, Melbourne. Available at http://www.dhs.vic.gov.au/ourhousingstories/history-of-public-housing

—— 2014, *Get involved—tenant participation*, Government of Victoria, Melbourne. Available at http://www.housing.vic.gov.au/get-involved-tenant-participation

Desmond, M 2012, 'Disposable ties and the urban poor', *American Journal of Sociology*, vol.117, no.5, pp.1295–335.

Diener, E, Emmons, R A, Larsen, R J & Griffin, S 1985, 'The satisfaction with life scale',. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, vol.49, pp.71–75.

Deiner, E 2009, *Satisfaction with life scale (SWLS).* Available at http://internal.psychology.illinois.edu/~ediener/SWLS.html

Dolgoff, R, Harrington, D & Loewenberg, F 2012, *Ethical decisions for social work practice*, 9th edn, Brooks/Cole, Belmont.

Engler-Stringer, R & Berenbaum, S 2007, 'Exploring food security with collective kitchens participants in three Canadian cities', *Qualitative Health Research*, vol.17, no.1, pp.75–84.

Erebus Consulting Partners 2004, *National evaluation of the Supported Accommodation Assistance Program*, Final Report, A report to the SAAP National Coordination and Development Committee.

Family and Community Services Housing NSW 2012, *Redfern Waterloo public housing tenant survey*. Available at http://www.housing.nsw.gov.au/NR/rdonlyres/3F313909-9A83-4EF7-8BE8-1A17521DB5DD/0/RedfernWaterlooBenchmarkSurvey.pdf

Family and Community Services 2014, *Housing pathways*. Available at http://www.housingpathways.nsw.gov.au/Pathways_Internet/Templates/Overview.aspx?NRMODE=Published&NRNODEGUID=%7bC2E31342-3429-439E-B863-6D9FF49AF42B%7d&NRORIGINALURL=%2fWays%2bwe%2bcan%2bhelp%2fSocial%2bHousing%2fSocial%2bHousing%2bEligibility%2band%2bAllocations%2bPolicy%2bSupplement%2ehtm&NRCACHEHINT=NoModifyGuest#ctbaiailsr

Fitzpatrick, S & Pawson, H 2014, 'Ending security of tenure for social renters: transitioning to ambulance service social housing?', *Housing Studies*. vol.29, no.5, pp.597–615.

Flatau, P, Coleman, A, Memmott, P, Baulderstone, J & Slatter, M 2009, *Sustaining at-risk Indigenous Tenancies: a review of Australian policy responses*. Final Report, Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Melbourne.

Fopp, R 1996, 'Nowhere to go: an analysis of the Supported Accommodation Assistance Program', *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, vol.31, no.2, pp.209–22.

Forte, J 2014, An introduction to using theory in social work practice, Routledge, Oxon.

Fraser, N 1997, *Justice interruptus: critical reflections on the 'postsocialist' condition*, Routledge, New York.

Freire, P 1970, *Cultural action for freedom*, Harvard Educational Review, Cambridge.

Gale, A 2003, *Successful tenancies: stopping the revolving door*, paper presented at the 3rd National Homelessness Conference, Brisbane.

Gannon, N & Ranzijn, R 2005, 'Does emotional intelligence predict unique variance in life satisfaction beyond IQ and personality?', *Personality and Individual Differences*. vol.38, pp.1353–64.

Gehl, J 2011, *Life between buildings: using urban space*, Island Press, Washington.

Gilmer, T, Stefancic, A, Sklar, M & Tsemberis, S 2013, 'Development and validation of a housing first fidelity survey', *Psychiatric Services*, vol.64, no.9, pp.911–14.

Greenwood. M R, Schaefer-McDaniel, N J, Winkel, G & Tsemberis, S J 2005, 'Decreasing psychiatric symptoms by increasing choice in services for adults with histories of homelessness', *American Journal of Community Psychology*, vol.36, no.3–4, pp.223–38.

Habibis, D, Atkinson, R, Dunbar, T, Easthope, H & Maginn, P 2007, *A sustaining tenancies approach to managing demanding behaviour in public housing: a good practice guide*, Final Report, Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Melbourne.

Habibis, D, Memmott, P, Phillips, R, Go-Sam, C, Keys, C & Moran, M 2013, *Housing conditionality, Indigenous lifeworlds and policy outcomes: towards a model for culturally responsive housing provision*, Final Report, Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Melbourne.

Hall, J & Berry, M 2007, *Public housing: shifting client profiles and public housing revenues*, Final Report, Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Melbourne.

Hannigan, T & Wagner, S 2003, *Developing the support in supportive housing: a guide to providing services in housing,* Corporation for Supportive Housing, New York.

Havassy, B, Hall, S & Wasserman, D 1991, 'Social support and relapse: commonalities among alcoholics, opiate users and cigarette smokers', *Addictive Behaviors*, vol.16, pp.235–46.

Henriksen, I & Tjora, A 2014, 'Interaction pretext: experiences of community in the urban neighbourhood', *Urban Studies*, vol.51, no.10, pp.2111–24.

Henwood, B, Cabassa, L, Craig, C & Padgett, D 2013, 'Permanent supportive housing: addressing homelessness and health disparities?', *American Journal of Public Health*, vol.103(S), pp.188S192.

Housing Registrar Victoria (n.d.), *Good practice guide: getting tenants involved.* Available at http://www.housingregistrar.vic.gov.au/Publications-and-guides/Good-practice-guide

Hulse, K, Milligan, V & Easthope, H 2011, *Secure occupancy in rental housing: conceptual foundations and comparative perspectives*, Final Report, Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Melbourne.

Jacobs, J 1961, *The death and life of American cities*, Random House, New York.

Jacobs, K & Arthurson, K 2003, *Developing effective housing management policies to address problems of anti-social behaviour*, Final Report, Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Melbourne.

Johnson, G & Tseng, Y 2014a, 'Social networks and social support', in A Chigavazira, G Johnson, J Moschion, R Scutella, Y Tseng & M. Wooden (eds.), *Findings from wave 1 to 5: special topics*, Melbourne Institute, Melbourne.

Johnson, G & Tseng, Y 2014b, 'Health and homelessness', in A Chigavazira, G Johnson, J Moschion, R Scutella, Y Tseng & M. Wooden (eds.), *Findings from wave 1 to 5: special topics*, Melbourne Institute, Melbourne.

Johnson, G, Parkinson, S, Tseng, Y & Kuehnle, D 2011, *Long-term homelessness: understanding the challenge—12 months outcomes from the journey to social inclusion pilot program,* Sacred Heart Mission, St Kilda.

Johnson, G, Parkinson, S & Parsell, C 2012, *Policy shift or program drift? Implementing housing first in Australia*, Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Melbourne.

Jones, A, Phillip, R, Parsell, C & Dingle, G 2014, *Review of systematic issues for social housing clients with complex needs*, prepared for Queensland Mental Health Commission, Institute for Social Science Research, St Lucia.

Kirsh, B, Gewurtz, R, Bakewell, R, Singer, B & Giles, N 2009, *Critical characteristics of supported housing: findings from the literature, residents and service providers*, Wellesley Institute, Toronto.

Lipsky, M 1980, *Street-level bureaucracy: dilemmas of the individual in public services,* Russell Sage Foundation, New York.

Louie, J & Guthrie, K 2007, 'Strategies for assessing policy change efforts: a prospective approach', *The Evaluation Exchange*, vol.XIII, no.1, p.5.

Main, K & Sandoval, G 2015, 'Placemaking in a translocal receiving community: the relevance of place to identity and agency', *Urban Studies*, vol.52, no.1, pp.71–86.

Marston, C 2004, 'Constructing the meaning of social exclusion as a policy metaphor', in K Jacobs, J Kemeny & T Manzi (eds), *Social constructionism in housing research*, Ashgate, Hampshire.

McCrady, B 2004, 'To have but one true friend: implications for practice of research on alcohol use disorders and social networks', *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors'*, vol.18, no.2, pp.113–21.

Micah Projects (n.d.), *Brisbane Common Ground: home, community, hope*. Available at http://www.micahprojects.org.au/resource_files/micah/BCG-brochure.pdf

Nelson, G, Aubry, T & Lafrance, A 2007, 'A review of the literature on the effectiveness of housing and support, assertive community treatment, and intensive case management interventions for persons with mental illness who have been homeless', *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, vol.77, no.3, pp.350–61.

Nelson, G, Sylvestre, J, Aubry, T, George, L & Trainor, J 2007, 'Housing choice and control, housing quality, and control over professional support as contributors to the subjective quality of life and community adaption of people with severe mental illness', *Administration Policy Mental Health and Mental Health Service Research*, vol.34, no.2, pp.89–100.

Nolan, C, Broeke, C, Magee, M & Burt, M 2005, *The family permanent supportive housing initiative: family history and experiences in supportive housing*, The Urban Institute and Harder Company Community Research, Washington.

Padgett, D 2007, 'There's no place like (a) home: ontological security among persons with a serious mental illness in the United States', *Social Science and Medicine*, vol.64, no.9, pp.1925–36.

Padgett, D 2008, *Qualitative methods in social work research*, 2nd edn, Sage, Los Angeles.

Padgett, D 2012, 'Supported housing and the lamppost—or supported housing in the spotlight?', *Psychiatric Services*, vol.63, no.7, pp.720–22.

Padgett, D, Henwood, B, Abrams, C & Drake, R 2008, 'Social relationships among persons who have experienced serious mental illness, substance abuse and homelessness: implications for recovery. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, vol.78, no.3, pp.333–39.

Pallant, J F & Lae, L 2002,'Sense of coherence, well-being, coping and personality factors: further evaluation of the sense of coherence scale', *Personality and Individual Differences*, vol.33, no. 1, pp.39–48.

Parkinson, S, Nelson, G & Horgan, S 1999, 'From housing to homes: a review of the literature on housing approaches for psychiatric consumer/survivors', *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health*, vol.18, pp.145–64.

Parsell, C 2010, '"Homeless is what I am, not who I am": insights from an inner-city Brisbane study', *Urban Policy and Research*, vol.28, no.2, pp.181–94.

—— 2011a, 'Responding to people sleeping rough: dilemmas and opportunities for social work', *Australian Social Work*, vol.64, no.3, pp.330–45.

—— 2011b, 'Homeless identities: enacted and ascribed', *British Journal of Sociology*, vol.62, no.3, 442–61.

—— 2012, 'Home is where the house is: the meaning of home for people sleeping rough', *Housing Studies*, vol.27, no.2, pp.159–73.

Parsell, C, Johnson, G & Button, E 2013, *Street to home: a national comparative analysis*, report prepared for the Homelessness Research Partnership with the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs, Institute for Social Science Research, St Lucia.

Parsell, C Jones, A & Head, B 2013, 'Policies and programmes to end homelessness in Australia: learning from international practice', *International Journal of Social Welfare*, vol.22, no.2, pp.186–194.

Parsell, C & Parsell, M 2012, 'Homelessness as a choice', *Housing, Theory and Society*, vol.29, no.4, pp.420–434.

Parsell, C & Moutou, O 2014, *An evaluation of the nature and effectiveness of models of supportive housing*, Positioning Paper, Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Melbourne.

Parsell, C, Fitzpatrick, S & Busch-Geertsema, V 2014, 'Common Ground in Australia: an object lesson in evidence hierarchies and policy transfer', *Housing Studies*, vol.29, no.1, pp.69–87.

Parsell, C & Phillips, R 2014, 'Indigenous rough sleeping in Darwin, Australia: out of place in an urban setting', *Urban Studies*, vol.51, no.1, pp.185–202.

Parsell, C, Tomaszewski, W & Jones, A 2013, *An evaluation of Sydney's Way2Home*: Final Report, Institute for Social Science Research, St Lucia.

Parsell, C, Tomaszewski, W & Phillips, R 2014, 'Exiting homelessness and sustaining housing: a human agency perspective', *Social Service Review*, vol.88, no.2, pp.295–321.

Parsell, C, Petersen, M & Moutou, O (2015). 'Single-site supportive housing: Tenant perspectives', *Housing Studies*, Early View.

Pavot, W & Diener, E 1993, 'Review of the satisfaction with life scale', *Psychological Assessment,* vol.5, pp.164–72.

Pawson, H & Sosenko, F 2012, 'Tenant satisfaction assessment in social housing in England: How reliable? How meaningful?', *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, vol.36, no.1, pp.70–79.

Phillips, R, Milligan, V & Jones, A 2009*, Integration and social housing in Australia: theory and practice*, Final Report, Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Melbourne.

Report on Government Services 2000, *Housing, Productivity Commission*, Australian Government. Available at http://www.pc.gov.au/gsp/rogs/2000/housing

—— 2008, *Housing*, Productivity Commission, Australian Government. Available at http://www.pc.gov.au/gsp/rogs/2008

Ritchie, J, Spencer, L & O'Connor, W 2003, 'Carrying out qualitative analysis', in J Ritchie & J Lewis (eds.), *Qualitative research practice: a guide for social science students and researchers*, Sage, London.

Rog, D 2004, 'The evidence on supportive housing', *Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal*, vol.27, no.4, pp.334–44.

Rog, D., Marshall, T., Dougherty, R., George, P., Daniels, A., Ghose, S. & Delphin-Rittmon, M 2014, 'Permanent supportive housing: Assessing the evidence', *Psychiatric Services*, vol. 65, no. 3, pp. 287–94.

Saunders, P 2004, *Australia's welfare habit and how to kick it*, Duffy & Snellgrove, Sydney.

Schumaker, J F, Shea, J D, Monfries, M M & Groth-Marnat, G 1993, 'Loneliness and life satisfaction in Japan and Australia', *The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied,* vol.127, no.1, pp.65–71.

Seelig, T & Jones, A 2004, 'Sustaining tenancies in public housing: motives, issues and options', *Parity,* vol.2, no.2, pp.21–22.

Simmons, R & Birchall, J 2007, 'Tenant participation and social housing in the UK: applying a theoretical model', *Housing Studies*, vol.22, no.4, pp.573–95.

Stefancic, A & Tsembersis, S 2007, 'Housing first for long-term shelter dwellers with psychiatric disabilities in a suburban county: a four-year study of housing access and retention', *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, vol.28, no.3–4, pp.265–79.

Stevenson, J 2014, *Experiences of social connections and sense of community amongst participants of housing first programming*, Thesis, University of Victoria, Victoria.

Strebel, I 2011. 'The living building: towards a geography of maintenance work', *Social and Cultural Geography,* vol.12, no.3, pp.243–62.

Supported Accommodation Assistance Act 1994, available at http://www.comlaw.gov.au/Details/C2004A04835

Tabol, C, Drebing, C Rosenheck, R 2010, 'Studies of "supported" and "supportive" housing: a comprehensive review of model descriptions and measurement', *Evaluation and Program Planning*, vol.33, no.4, pp.446–56.

Thomson Goodall Associates 2003, *People who are assisted by SAAP services and require a high level and complexity of service provision*, Commonwealth of Australia, Canberra.

Tsai, J, Mares, A & Rosenheck, R 2012, 'Does housing chronically homeless adults lead to social integration?', *Psychiatric Services*, vol.63, no.5, pp.427–34.

Tsemberis, S 1999, 'From streets to homes: an innovative approach to supported housing for homeless adults with psychiatric disabilities', *Journal of Community Psychology'*, vol.27, no.2, pp.225–41.

—— 2010, 'Housing first, ending homelessness, promoting recovery, and reducing costs', in I Ellen & B O'Flaherty (eds.), *How to house the homeless*, pp.37–56, Russell Sage Foundation, New York.

Wiesel, I, Pawson, H, Stone, W, Herath, S & McNelis, S 2014, *Social housing exits: incidence, motivations and consequences*, Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute, Melbourne.

World Values Survey Wave 4 1999–2004. OFFICIAL AGGREGATE v.20140429 2014, *World Values Survey Association*. Available at www.worldvaluessurvey.org

Yarra Community Housing (n.d.), *Our vision for the world*. Available at http://www.ych.org.au/

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Social participation preferences

	All participants	Housing provider			Homeless status		Gender		COB	
	N = 102	Single-site		Scattered site	Previously homeless	Never previously been homeless	Female	Male	Australia	Country other than Australia
		AH	SH							
Spend time with parents, children, or other relatives										
More often	27.5	26.8	23.1	26.8	28.8	25.6	31.9	23.6	28.2	25.0
Less often	5.9	8.6	3.8	4.9	6.8	4.7	8.5	3.6	5.1	8.3
The same	66.7	60.0	73.1	68.3	64.4	69.8	59.6	72.7	66.7	66.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Spend time with friends										
More often	43.1	54.3	34.6	39.0	42.4	44.2	46.8	40.0	43.6	41.7
Less often	2.9	0.0	0.0	7.3	5.1	0.0	4.3	1.8	3.8	0.0
The same	53.9	45.7	65.4	53.7	52.5	55.8	48.9	58.2	52.6	58.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Spend time with neighbours										
More often	31.4	22.9	30.8	39.0	32.2	30.2	31.9	30.7	30.8	33.3
Less often	4.9	11.4	0.0	2.4	5.1	4.7	8.5	1.8	5.1	4.2
The same	63.7	65.7	69.2	58.5	62.7	65.1	59.6	67.3	64.1	62.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Spend time socially with people at sporting activities or clubs										
More often	16.7	11.4	26.9	14.6	16.9	16.3	19.1	14.5	14.1	25.0
Less often	10.8	17.1	3.8	9.8	11.9	9.3	14.9	7.3	10.3	12.5
The same	72.5	71.4	69.2	75.6	71.2	74.4	66.0	78.2	75.6	62.5
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Spend time socially with people at social service or community organisations										
More often	30.4	31.4	23.1	34.1	28.8	32.6	27.7	32.7	29.5	33.3
Less often	6.9	2.9	3.8	12.2	11.9	0.0	10.6	3.6	6.4	8.3
The same	62.7	65.7	73.1	53.7	59.3	67.4	61.7	63.6	64.1	58.3
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Appendix 2: Logistic regression tables

Model: Logistics regression

Dependent variable is a binary variable with 'Yes'=1 'No'=0	Pleased with current housing	Feels settled with current housing	Satisfied with housing needs	Satisfied with the housing's overall design	Satisfied with the amount of privacy current housing has	Satisfied with the affordability of the rent	Meeting Household needs: Size	Household's quality of life improved
Housing category (Base category: outreach support)								
Onsite support: Affordable housing	1.404	0.409	0.249	1.894	0.213	0.250	0.275	1.667
	2.383	*0.509*	*0.400*	*3.462*	*0.320*	*0.289*	*0.261*	*4.361*
Onsite support: Supported housing	4.896	1.388	2.927	4.998	2.696	1.300	3.342	13.566
	6.983	*1.381*	*4.204*	*7.940*	*3.108*	*1.465*	*2.811*	*24.926*
Quality of Life Index	1.388**	1.101	1.400**	1.237*	1.270*	1.073	1.152**	1.310*
	0.160	*0.058*	*0.152*	*0.115*	*0.125*	*0.063*	*0.055*	*0.150*
Age	1.078	1.008	1.030	1.040	1.062	0.938	0.971	1.039
	0.067	*0.039*	*0.053*	*0.054*	*0.048*	*0.035*	*0.027*	*0.068*
Female	0.909	0.490	0.206	0.191	0.423	0.598	0.643	0.100
	0.893	*0.371*	*0.200*	*0.211*	*0.392*	*0.436*	*0.361*	*0.151*
Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander	0.169	0.209	0.067*	.	0.063*	0.592	0.422	2.840
	0.237	*0.213*	*0.090*	*.*	*0.085*	*0.777*	*0.412*	*9.593*
Born in Australia	1.206	4.563	2.415	10.956	12.393	0.246	1.330	37.315
	1.771	*4.795*	*3.669*	*15.073*	*19.057*	*0.308*	*1.038*	*82.195*
With disability	0.073	0.434	0.256	9.492	5.039	0.458	2.321	7.734
	0.228	*0.528*	*0.824*	*15.208*	*6.544*	*0.496*	*1.897*	*15.674*
Previously experienced homelessness	11.507	0.631	3.745	5.476	3.337	0.745	1.494	0.168
	19.001	*0.643*	*5.061*	*7.594*	*4.537*	*0.691*	*1.123*	*0.329*
Number of people in the household (Base category: one-person household)								
Two-person household	3.880	1.38E+07	10.137	0.191	1.72E+06	2.467	0.673	2.80E+07
	8.811	*3.40E+10*	*26.417*	*0.384*	*6.48E+09*	*3.411*	*0.672*	*9.52E+10*

Dependent variable is a binary variable with 'Yes'=1 'No'=0	Pleased with current housing	Feels settled with current housing	Satisfied with housing needs	Satisfied with the housing's overall design	Satisfied with the amount of privacy current housing has	Satisfied with the affordability of the rent	Meeting Household needs: Size	Household's quality of life improved
Three-person household	0.572	.	0.734	.	.	.	.	.
	1.536	*.*	*2.162*	*.*	*.*	*.*	*.*	*.*
Income source (Base category: wage/salary earners)								
Disability Support Pension (DSP; paid by Centrelink)	1.964	1.158	1.419	0.003*	0.000	8.705	0.179	0.043
	6.528	*1.774*	*5.134*	*0.007*	*0.000*	*12.524*	*0.220*	*0.138*
Aged pension	.	0.475	.	0.003	.	13.188	1.671	.
	.	*0.971*	*.*	*0.009*	*.*	*26.976*	*2.958*	*.*
Unemployment benefit (e.g.Newstart)	22.139	2.626	8.553	0.062	0.000	14.026	1.243	0.144
	79.072	*4.515*	*30.315*	*0.169*	*0.000*	*22.411*	*1.482*	*0.410*
Parenting payment	0.107	0.000	0.410	.	0.000	.	1.165	0.000
	0.292	*0.000*	*1.224*	*.*	*0.000*	*.*	*2.609*	*0.000*
Youth allowance	0.002*	0.096	0.017	0.002*	0.000	.	0.018*	.
	0.006	*0.180*	*0.040*	*0.005*	*0.000*	*.*	*0.030*	*.*
Austudy or Abstudy	.	0.133	.	.	.	1.687	0.680	.
	.	*0.253*	*.*	*.*	*.*	*2.798*	*1.038*	*.*
Other	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
Constant	0.001	1.063	0.013	0.116	1.27E+06	70.588	1.084	0.045
	0.004	*2.366*	*0.041*	*0.353*	*3.85E+09*	*161.295*	*1.796*	*0.188*
N	90	97	90	84	88	92	97	85

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Standard error in italics, results show the odds ratio

Model: Logistics regression

Dependent variable are binary variables with 'Yes'=1 'No'=0	Neighbours visit me as often as I want	Neighbours provide help whenever needed	Lots of my neighbours are my friends	I have neighbours that I can confide in	I have neighbours to lean on in times of trouble	I have a neighbour who can always cheer me up when I'm down	I don't feel lonely very often	I enjoy the time I spend with neighbours who are important to me	When something is on my mind, just talking with the neighbours I know can make me feel better	I can usually find someone in my neighbourhood to help me whenever I need
Housing category (Base category: outreach support)										
Onsite support: Affordable housing	1.996	1485.061*	0.282	0.595	0.527	1.910	3.966	1.073	7.030	20.824*
	2.783	*4.6E+03*	*0.255*	*0.521*	*0.454*	*1.726*	*4.760*	*1.022*	*8.063*	*30.371*
Onsite support: Supported housing	0.658	0.410	0.988	1.210	0.804	1.182	0.831	0.479	0.415	0.858
	0.546	*0.466*	*0.716*	*0.832*	*0.538*	*0.810*	*0.599*	*0.366*	*0.344*	*0.603*
Quality of Life Index	1.048	0.945	1.052	0.990	0.993	1.063	0.990	1.023	1.143*	1.001
	0.061	*0.087*	*0.049*	*0.042*	*0.042*	*0.045*	*0.047*	*0.047*	*0.065*	*0.048*
I feel like my current housing is my home	1.266	3.258	2.778	2.306	1.896	2.750	1.939	1.163	2.104	0.756
	1.121	*4.081*	*1.983*	*1.503*	*1.256*	*1.821*	*1.334*	*0.955*	*1.705*	*0.545*
I feel satisfied with my housing needs	1.909	9.297	1.936	1.468	1.803	0.403	2.668	0.331	0.046*	1.510
	2.286	*18.042*	*1.891*	*1.376*	*1.666*	*0.406*	*2.583*	*0.412*	*0.069*	*1.536*
Age	0.996	1.081	1.005	1.014	0.977	0.992	1.046	0.974	0.978	0.992
	0.029	*0.052*	*0.025*	*0.023*	*0.023*	*0.022*	*0.031*	*0.028*	*0.031*	*0.029*
Female	1.719	0.793	0.410	0.962	1.016	0.454	0.657	0.554	0.316	0.370
	1.199	*0.776*	*0.223*	*0.480*	*0.499*	*0.223*	*0.373*	*0.302*	*0.190*	*0.201*
Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander	0.314	1.642	1.601	1.436	0.282	1.138	0.713	0.590	0.962	0.768
	0.319	*2.445*	*1.667*	*1.201*	*0.243*	*0.975*	*0.616*	*0.539*	*1.002*	*0.675*
Born in Australia	3.619	3.280	2.091	0.412	0.600	0.521	2.256	1.423	1.008	0.924
	2.994	*3.952*	*1.479*	*0.275*	*0.392*	*0.359*	*1.759*	*1.009*	*0.760*	*0.672*
With disability	2.949	0.257	0.972	0.580	2.578	0.973	0.502	0.236	0.498	1.221
	2.422	*0.299*	*0.657*	*0.377*	*1.631*	*0.618*	*0.369*	*0.188*	*0.378*	*0.863*
Previously experienced homelessness	3.694	4.287	3.709*	1.633	1.548	1.322	0.624	1.953	5.203*	2.404
	3.376	*4.826*	*2.411*	*1.011*	*0.969*	*0.835*	*0.472*	*1.284*	*3.978*	*1.673*

Dependent variable are binary variables with 'Yes'=1 'No'=0	Neighbours visit me as often as I want	Neighbours provide help whenever needed	Lots of my neighbours are my friends	I have neighbours that I can confide in	I have neighbours to lean on in times of trouble	I have a neighbour who can always cheer me up when I'm down	I don't feel lonely very often	I enjoy the time I spend with neighbours who are important to me	When something is on my mind, just talking with the neighbours I know can make me feel better	I can usually find someone in my neighbourhood to help me whenever I need
Number of people in the household (Base category: one-person household)										
Two-person household	0.551	0.313	0.523	1.316	0.303	0.240	11.588	0.177	0.288	0.321
	0.674	*0.674*	*0.510*	*1.190*	*0.272*	*0.210*	*16.746*	*0.185*	*0.295*	*0.330*
Three-person household	0.387	80.347	.	0.757	.	.	16.904	.	.	.
	0.916	*223.545*	*.*	*1.460*	*.*	*.*	*39.860*	*.*	*.*	*.*
Income source (Base category: wage/salary earners)										
Disability Support Pension (DSP; paid by Centrelink)	0.190	25.214	0.423	0.775	0.286	1.303	1.912	2.941	10.496	8.333
	0.283	*47.310*	*0.451*	*0.790*	*0.293*	*1.327*	*2.201*	*3.297*	*13.269*	*10.814*
Aged pension	.	.	0.180	0.139	0.988	1.292	.	2.484	2.179	.
	.	*.*	*0.272*	*0.196*	*1.419*	*1.834*	*.*	*3.758*	*3.549*	*.*
Unemployment benefit (e.g. Newstart)	0.327	6.014	0.787	0.221	0.381	2.706	1.007	2.478	6.200	6.469
	0.494	*11.496*	*0.871*	*0.237*	*0.392*	*2.772*	*1.174*	*2.776*	*7.663*	*8.673*
Parenting payment	0.866	0.032	.	0.124	.	2.339	0.037	1.354	.	.
	1.418	*0.066*	*.*	*0.189*	*.*	*5.113*	*0.069*	*2.393*	*.*	*.*
Youth allowance	.	.	1.334	.	.	.	3.544	.	.	.
	.	*.*	*2.122*	*.*	*.*	*.*	*6.563*	*.*	*.*	*.*
Austudy or Abstudy	0.112	.	1.977	.	0.526	0.724	0.334	.	.	.
	0.193	*.*	*3.049*	*.*	*0.820*	*1.063*	*0.600*	*.*	*.*	*.*
Other	.	.	.	0.421	1.022	0.384	0.169	.	.	.
	.	*.*	*.*	*0.659*	*1.565*	*0.609*	*0.310*	*.*	*.*	*.*
Constant	0.302	0.001	0.083	1.243	3.823	1.026	0.07	14.207	0.475	0.207
	0.622	*0.005*	*0.146*	*1.959*	*6.029*	*1.63*	*0.14*	*29.807*	*1.053*	*0.44*
N	90	87	95	96	95	97	96	91	89	83

* p<0.05, ** p<0.01, *** p<0.001

Standard error in italics, results show the odds ratio

Appendix 3: Survey

Supportive Housing 2013 [respondent i.d.]

Q1

Q2 Please enter your survey ID:

5.3 Section A—Housing dwelling characteristics

Q3 Who is your housing provider?

- ❍ [single-site] (1)
- ❍ [scattered-site] (2)
- ❍ Don't Know (3)

Q4 How many bedrooms are there in your current housing? (if you live in a bedsit or studio, then your answer should be zero)

- ❍ Zero (1)
- ❍ One (2)
- ❍ Two (3)
- ❍ Three (4)
- ❍ Four (5)
- ❍ Five or more (6)

Q5 What type of dwelling is the housing that you currently live in?

- ❍ Detached house (traditional style house on its own block of land) (1)
- ❍ Duplex (also known as half-a-house) (2)
- ❍ Attached house (a town house, three or more units built next to each other and divided by common walls) (3)
- ❍ Apartment (unit or flat) (4)
- ❍ Seniors unit (tailored for residents 55+ years) (5)

5.4 Section B—Housing satisfaction

Q6 Are you pleased with your current housing?

- ❍ Yes, definitely (1)
- ❍ I think so 2)
- ❍ Not really (3)
- ❍ Definitely not (4)

Q7 Do you feel settled in your current housing?

- ❍ Yes, definitely (1)
- ❍ I think so (2)
- ❍ Not really (3)
- ❍ Definitely not (4)

Q8 Thinking about your current housing, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the overall suitability for the needs of your household?

- ❍ Very satisfied (1)
- ❍ Satisfied (2)
- ❍ Neutral (3)
- ❍ Dissatisfied (4)
- ❍ Very dissatisfied (5)

5.5 Section C—Housing satisfaction: location & physical design

Q9 For each of the following, please select how satisfied or dissatisfied you are.

	Very satisfied (1)	Satisfied (2)	Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (3)	Dissatisfied (4)	Very dissatisfied (5)	Not applicable (6)	Don't know (7)
The overall design or layout of your housing (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The overall condition of the inside of your housing (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The overall condition of the outside of your housing (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The amount of privacy your housing has (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The security of your housing itself (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The affordability of the rent (6)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The location of your housing (7)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Q10 Can you tell us if your housing meets your household's needs in respect to how near it is to each facility or service?

	Meets my household's needs (1)	Does not meet my household's needs (2)	Not applicable (3)	Don’t know (4)
Being close to shops (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Being close to public transport (e.g. buses, trains) (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Being close to parks and recreational facilities (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Being close to children’s schools (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Being close to medical services/hospitals (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Being close to other educational and training facilities (6)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Being close to child care facilities (7)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Being close to employment/place of work (8)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Being close to community and support services (9)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Being close to family and friends (10)	❍	❍	❍	❍

Q11 Can you tell us if your housing meets your household's needs in respect to these features?

	Meets my household's needs (1)	Does not meet my household's needs (2)	Not applicable (3)	Don't know (4)
The size of the housing (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Easy access and entry (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Car parking (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Yard space and fencing (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍
The safety and security of the neighbourhood (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍
The modifications for special needs (e.g. ramp for a wheelchair) (6)	❍	❍	❍	❍

Q12 Could your housing provider improve what they offer you?

- ❍ Yes (1)
- ❍ No (2)

If *Yes* is selected, then skip to *What could your housing provider improve?* If *No* is selected, thenskip to *Could your housing provider offer you...?*

Q13 What could your housing provider improve?

Q14 Could your housing provider offer you something different, from what they already offer you?

- ❍ Yes (1)
- ❍ No (2)

If *Yes* is selected, then skip to*What would you like your housing provider...?* If *No* is selected, then skip to end of block.

Q15 What would you like your housing provider todo differently, from what they already offer you?

5.6 Section D—Neighbourhood & housing satisfaction

Q16 Which of the following best describes your housing preferences?

- ❍ Your current housing in your current neighbourhood (1)
- ❍ Your current housing in a different neighbourhood (2)
- ❍ Different housing in a different neighbourhood (3)
- ❍ Different housing in your current neighbourhood (4)

5.7 Section E—Quality of life and satisfaction

Q17 How has living in [current supportive housing] changed your household's overall quality of life?

- ❍ It has improved a lot (1)
- ❍ It has improved a little (2)
- ❍ It hasn’t really made any difference (3)
- ❍ It has worsened a little (4)
- ❍ It has worsened a lot (5)

If *It has improved a lot* is selected, then skip to*How has your current housing improved...?* If *It has improved a little* is selected, then skip to*How has your current housing improved...?* If *It hasn't really made any difference*. is selected, then skip to*Why hasn't your current housing changed...?* If *It has worsened a little* is selected, then skip to*How has your current housing worsened...?* If *It has worsened a lot* is selected, then skip to*How has your current housing worsened...?*

Q18 How has your living in [current supportive housing] improved your household's quality of life? Please write your answer in the space below:

If *How has your current housing …* is displayed, then skip to *Do you feel like your current housing...?*

Q19 Why hasn't your [current supportive housing] changed your quality of life? Please write your answer in the space below:

If *Why hasn't your current housing …* is displayed, then skip to *Do you feel like your current housing...?*

Q20 How has your [current supportive housing] worsened your household's quality of life? Please write your answer in the space below:

Q21 Do you feel like your current housing is your 'home'?

- ❍ Yes (1)
- ❍ No (2)

If *Yes* is selected, then skip to *What makes your current housing feel ...?* If *N*o is selected, then skip to *What makes your current housing not feel...?*

Q22 What makes your current housing feel like your 'home'?

If *What makes your current housing...*? is displayed, then skip to end of block

Q23 What makes your current housing not feel like your home?

5.8 Section F—Social support

Q24 How much do you agree with each statement below about the support you may get from your neighbours?

	Strongly agree (1)	**Agree (2)**	**Agree a little (3)**	**Neither agree nor disagree (4)**	**Disagree a little (5)**	**Disagree (6)**	**Strongly disagree (7)**
They don't come to visit me as often as I would like (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I often need help from them but can't get it (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Lots of them are my friends (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I don't have neighbours that I can confide in (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I have no neighbour/s to lean on in times of trouble (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
There is a neighbour who can always cheer me up when I'm down (6)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I often feel very lonely (7)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I enjoy the time I spend with neighbours who are important to me (8)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
When something is on my mind, just talking with the neighbours I know can make me feel better (9)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
When I need someone to help me out, I can usually find someone in my neighbourhood (10)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Q25 Do you feel that you are currently receiving positive or negative influence in your life, from the following people?

	Positive influence (1)	**Negative influence (2)**	**Not applicable (3)**	**Don't know (4)**
Friends (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Family (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Housing provider (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Social support or case worker (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Neighbours (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Other, please specify: (6)	❍	❍	❍	❍

5.9 Section G—Social participation

Q26 The following is a list of social activities. How often do you do these activities? Please also indicate if you would prefer to do them more often, or less often or the same.

	How often do you do this activity?						**Would you prefer to do this activity...?**		
	Never (1)	Daily (2)	2–3 times per week (3)	Once a week (4)	Once a month (5)	A few times a year (6)	More often (1)	Less often (2)	The same (3)
Spend time with parents, children or other relatives (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Spend time with friends (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Spend time with neighbours (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Spend time socially with people at sporting activities or clubs (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Spend time socially with people at social service or community organisations (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Q27 To what extent would you like [housing provider] to assist you with access to...?

	More (1)	The same (2)	Less (3)	Not applicable (4)
Social support group (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍
A hobby or interest group (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Neighbours (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Family (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Friends (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Health services (6)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Social or welfare workers (7)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Employment opportunities (8)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Training/education (9)	❍	❍	❍	❍
Other, please specify: (10)	❍	❍	❍	❍

Q28 To what extent would you like [housing provider] to help improve your...?

	More (1)	The same (2)	Less (3)
Housing (1)	❍	❍	❍
Wellbeing (2)	❍	❍	❍
Health (3)	❍	❍	❍
Happiness (4)	❍	❍	❍
Life satisfaction (5)	❍	❍	❍

5.10 Section—Perceived impact of housing on quality of life

Q29 Using the scale below, please rate how you feel the support you receive from [current supportive housing] impacts you and your household, where the 0 is very negative, and 10 is very positive.

- ❍ 0 Very negative (1)
- ❍ 1 (2)
- ❍ 2 (3)
- ❍ 3 (4)
- ❍ 4 (5)
- ❍ 5 Neither positive nor negative (6)
- ❍ 6 (7)
- ❍ 7 (8)
- ❍ 8 (9)
- ❍ 9 (10)
- ❍ 10 Very positive (11)

Q30 What impact, if any, do you feel living in your current housing has had on you and your household in regard to:

	Improved (1)	No impact (2)	Worsened (3)	No impact yet, but it may in the future (4)	Not applicable (5)	Don't know (6)
Feeling more settled in general (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Enjoying better health (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Being more able to cope (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Feeling part of the local community (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Being able to continue living in this area (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Managing rent/money better (6)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Finding a job (7)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Finding better job/promotion (8)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Starting or continue education/training (9)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Having better access to services you need (10)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Improving your financial situation (11)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Other, please specify: (12)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Q31 Using the scale below, please rate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements.

	Strongly agree (1)	Agree (2)	Neither agree nor disagree (3)	Disagree (4)	Strongly disagree (5)
My satisfaction with the housing I live in is a result of my actions (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
My satisfaction with the support I receive is a result of my actions (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I am responsible for improving my wellbeing and happiness (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

5.11 Section I—Health and quality of life

Q32 For the following statements indicate your level of agreement about your life at present.

	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Slightly disagree (3)	Neither agree nor disagree (4)	Slightly agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly agree (7)
In most ways my life is close to my ideal (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
The conditions of my life are excellent (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
I am satisfied with life (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
So far I have gotten the important things I want in life (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Q33 In general, would you say your health is:

- ❍ Very good (1)
- ❍ Good (2)
- ❍ Fair (3)
- ❍ Bad (4)
- ❍ Very bad (5)

Answer if *Who is your housing provider? [single-site]* is selected

Q34 Have the number of health problems that you experienced increased, decreased, or not changed, since you have been living at [single-site]?

- ❍ Increased (1)
- ❍ Decreased (2)
- ❍ Not changed (3)

Answer if *Who is your housing provider? [scattered-site]* is selected

Q35 Have the number of health problems, that you have experienced increased, decreased, or not changed, since you have been living in [scattered-site] housing?

- ❍ Increased (1)
- ❍ Decreased (2)
- ❍ Not changed (3)

5.12 Section J—About you and your household

Q36 What is your date of birth?

- dd/mm/yyyy (1)

Q37 What country were you born in?

- ❍ Australia (1)
- ❍ Other, please specify: (2) _____

Answer if *What country were you born in? Other, please specify:* is selected

Q38 What year did you come to Australia? (yyyy)

Q39 What language do you speak at home?

- ❍ English only (1)
- ❍ English, plus another language (2)
- ❍ Other only, please specify: (3) _____

Q40 Have you ever been homeless?

- ❍ Yes (1)
- ❍ No (2)

Q41 How many people, including yourself, live in your household?

Answer if *How many people, including yourself, live in your household?* Text response is equal to 1

Q42 Could you tell us your age, and gender?

	Age in years	**Gender**	
	Age (1)	Male (1)	Female (2)
You (1)		❍	❍

Answer if *How many people, including yourself, live in your household?* Text response is equal to 2

Q43 Could you tell us about each person in your household, including yourself, how old they are, what their gender is, and what their relationship is to you?

	Initials	**Age in years**	**Gender**		**Relationship to you**				
	Initials/first name (1)	Age (1)	Male (1)	Female (2)	Spouse/Partner (1)	Child/step child (2)	Other/adult relative (3)	Unrelated flatmate or co-tenant (4)	Not applicable (5)
You (1)			❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Person 1: (2)			❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Answer if *How many people, including yourself, live in your household?* Text response is equal to 3

Q44 Could you tell us about each person in your household, including yourself, how old they are, what their gender is, and what their relationship is to you?

	Initials	**Age in years**	**Gender**		**Relationship to you**				
	Initials/first name (1)	Age (1)	Male (1)	Female (2)	Spouse/Partner (1)	Child/step child (2)	Other/adult relative (3)	Unrelated flatmate or co-tenant (4)	Not applicable (5)
You (1)			❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Person 1: (2)			❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Person 2: (3)			❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Answer if *How many people, including yourself, live in your household?* Text response is equal to 4

Q45 Could you tell us about each person in your household, including yourself, how old they are, what their gender is, and what their relationship is to you?

	Initials	**Age in years**	**Gender**		**Relationship to you**				
	Initials/first name (1)	Age (1)	Male (1)	Female (2)	Spouse/Partner (1)	Child/step child (2)	Other/adult relative (3)	Unrelated flatmate or co-tenant (4)	Not applicable (5)
You (1)			❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Person 1: (2)			❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Person 2: (3)			❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Person 3: (4)			❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Answer if *How many people, including yourself, live in your household?* Text response is equal to 5

Q46 Could you tell us about each person in your household, including yourself, how old they are, what their gender is, and what their relationship is to you?

	Initials	**Age in years**	**Gender**		**Relationship to you**				
	Initials/first name (1)	Age (1)	Male (1)	Female (2)	Spouse/Partner (1)	Child/step child (2)	Other/adult relative (3)	Unrelated flatmate or co-tenant (4)	Not applicable (5)
You (1)			❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Person 1: (2)			❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Person 2: (3)			❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Person 3: (4)			❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Person 4: (5)			❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Answer if *How many people, including yourself, live in your household?* Text response is equal to 6

Q47 Could you tell us about each person in your household, including yourself, how old they are, what their gender is, and what their relationship is to you?

	Initials	**Age in years**	**Gender**		**Relationship to you**				
	Initials/first name (1)	Age (1)	Male (1)	Female (2)	Spouse/Partner (1)	Child/step child (2)	Other/adult relative (3)	Unrelated flatmate or co-tenant (4)	Not applicable (5)
You (1)			❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Person 1: (2)			❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Person 2: (3)			❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Person 3: (4)			❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Person 4: (5)			❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
Person 5: (6)			❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Answer if *How many people, including yourself, live in your household?* Text response is equal to 7

Q48 Could you tell us about each person in your household, including yourself, how old they are, what their gender is, and what their relationship is to you?

	Initials	**Age in years**	**Gender**		**Relationship to you**				
	Initials/first name (1)	Age (1)	Male (1)	Female (2)	Spouse/Partner (1)	Child/step child (2)	Other/adult relative (3)	Unrelated flatmate or co-tenant (4)	Not applicable (5)
you (1)			❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
person 1: (2)			❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
person 2: (3)			❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
person 3: (4)			❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
person 4: (5)			❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
person 5: (6)			❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
person 6: (7)			❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Answer if How many people, including yourself, live in your household? Text response is equal to 1

Q49 Can you tell us whether you are of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin, and whether you are in paid employment?

	Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander		**In paid employment?**		
	Yes (1)	No (2)	Yes (1)	No (2)	Not applicable (3)
You (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Answer if *How many people, including yourself, live in your household?* Text response is equal to 2

Q50 Can you tell us for each person in your household, whether they are of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin, and whether they are in paid employment?

	Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander		**In paid employment?**		
	Yes (1)	No (2)	Yes (1)	No (2)	Not applicable (3)
you (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
person 1: (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Answer if How many people, including yourself, live in your household? Text response is equal to 3

Q51 Can you tell us for each person in your household, whether they are of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin, and whether they are in paid employment?

	Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander		**In paid employment?**		
	Yes (1)	No (2)	Yes (1)	No (2)	Not applicable (3)
You (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
person 1: (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
person 2: (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Answer if *How many people, including yourself, live in your household?* Text response is equal to 4

Q52 Can you tell us for each person in your household, whether they are of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin, and whether they are in paid employment?

	Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander		**In paid employment?**		
	Yes (1)	No (2)	Yes (1)	No (2)	Not applicable (3)
You (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
person 1: (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
person 2: (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
person 3: (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Answer if *How many people, including yourself, live in your household?* Text response is equal to 5

Q53 Can you tell us for each person in your household, whether they are of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin, and whether they are in paid employment?

	Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander		**In paid employment?**		
	Yes (1)	No (2)	Yes (1)	No (2)	Not applicable (3)
You (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
person 1: (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
person 2: (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
person 3: (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
person 4: (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Answer if *How many people, including yourself, live in your household?* Text response is equal to 6

Q54 Can you tell us for each person in your household, whether they are of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin, and whether they are in paid employment?

	Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander		**In paid employment?**		
	Yes (1)	No (2)	Yes (1)	No (2)	Not applicable (3)
You (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
person 1: (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
person 2: (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
person 3: (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
person 4: (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
person 5: (6)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Answerif *How many people, including yourself, live in your household?* Text response is equal to 7

Q55 Can you tell us for each person in your household, whether they are of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander origin, and whether they are in paid employment?

	Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander		**In paid employment?**		
	Yes (1)	No (2)	Yes (1)	No (2)	Not applicable (3)
You (1)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
person 1: (2)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
person 2: (3)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
person 3: (4)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
person 4: (5)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
person 5: (6)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍
person 6: (7)	❍	❍	❍	❍	❍

Q56 Which person or persons living in your household, if any, has an ongoing disability or health condition that limits participation in daily activities (such as work, cooking, gardening, self-care)?

- ❍ Nobody (1)
- ❍ Myself (2)
- ❍ My partner (3)
- ❍ A child in my household (4)
- ❍ Another relative living in the household (5)
- ❍ An unrelated relative living in the household (6)

Q57 Who is the main income earner in your household (by income we mean salary, aged pension, or other payments/benefits paid)?

- ❍ I am (1)
- ❍ Someone else is (2)
- ❍ We are both equal earners (3)

Answer if *Who is the main income earner in your household (by income... We are both equal earners* is not selected

Q58 What is the main source of income of the main income earner?

- ❍ Wages/salary (1)
- ❍ Disability Support Pension (paid by Centrelink) (2)
- ❍ Aged Pension (3)
- ❍ Unemployment benefit (such as Newstart) (4)
- ❍ Parenting Payment (5)
- ❍ Youth Allowance (6)
- ❍ Austudy or Abstudy (7)
- ❍ Other government pension/benefit (including any other payment from Centrelink or the Department of Veteran Affairs) (8)
- ❍ Other (e.g. Compensation or Superannuation) (9)
- ❍ Nil income (10)

Answer if *Who is the main income earner in your household (by income... We are both equal earners* is selected

Q59 What is your main source of income?

- ❍ Wages/ salary (1)
- ❍ Disability Support Pension (paid by Centrelink) (2)
- ❍ Aged Pension (3)
- ❍ Unemployment benefit (such as Newstart) (4)
- ❍ Parenting Payment (5)
- ❍ Youth Allowance (6)
- ❍ Austudy or Abstudy (7)
- ❍ Other government pension/benefit (including any other payment from Centrelink or the Department of Veteran Affairs) (8)
- ❍ Other (e.g. Compensation or Superannuation) (9)
- ❍ Nil income (10)

Answer if *Who is the main income earner in your household (by income... We are both equal earners* is selected

Q60 What is the main source of income for the other equal main income earner in your household?

- ❍ Wages/ salary (1)
- ❍ Disability Support Pension (paid by Centrelink) (2)
- ❍ Aged Pension (3)
- ❍ Unemployment benefit (such as Newstart) (4)
- ❍ Parenting Payment (5)
- ❍ Youth Allowance (6)
- ❍ Austudy or Abstudy (7)
- ❍ Other government pension/benefit (including any other payment from Centrelink or the Department of Veteran Affairs) (8)
- ❍ Other (e.g. Compensation or Superannuation) (9)
- ❍ Nil income (10)

Answer if *Who is the main income earner in your household (by income... We are both equal earners* is not selected

Q61 Which one of the following best describes the work situation of the main income earner last week?

- ❍ Employed full-time (35 hours or more a week) (1)
- ❍ Employed part-time (less than 35 hours a week) (2)
- ❍ Unemployed (actively looking for work in the last four weeks) (3)
- ❍ Not in the labour force (not actively looking for work or available for work in the last four weeks) (4)
- ❍ Other, please specify: (5) _____

Answer if *Who is the main income earner in your household (by income... We are both equal earners* is selected

Q62 Which of the following best describes your work situation?

- ❍ Employed full-time (35 hours or more a week) (1)
- ❍ Employed part-time (less than 35 hours a week) (2)
- ❍ Unemployed (actively looking for work in the last four weeks) (3)
- ❍ Not in the labour force (not actively looking for work available for work in the last four weeks) (4)
- ❍ Other, please specify: (5) _____

Answer if *Who is the main income earner in your household (by income... We are both equal earners* is selected

Q63 Which of the following best describes the work situation of the other equal main income earner in your household?

- ❍ Employed full-time (35 hours or more a week) (1)
- ❍ Employed part-time (less than 35 hours a week) (2)
- ❍ Unemployed (actively looking for work in the last four weeks) (3)
- ❍ Not in the labour force (not actively looking for work available for work in the last four weeks) (4)
- ❍ Other, please specify: (5) _____

Q64 What is the usual weekly or yearly combined income of everyone in your household, before tax and other deductions? (Please include income from all sources (wages, investments, and government pensions).

- ❍ Negative or zero (1)
- ❍ $1–$189 per week OR $1–$9,999 per year (2)
- ❍ $190–$379 per week OR $10,000–$19,999 per year (3)
- ❍ $380–$579 per week OR $20,000–$29,999 per year (4)
- ❍ $580–$769 per week OR $30,000–$39,999 per year (5)
- ❍ $770–$959 per week OR $40,000–$49,999 per year (6)
- ❍ $960–$1,149 per week OR $50,000–$59,999 per year (7)
- ❍ $1,150–$1,529 per week OR $60,000–$79,999 per year (8)
- ❍ $1,920–$2,399 per week OR $100,000–$124,999 per year (9)
- ❍ $2,400–$2,879 per week OR $125,000–$149,999 per year (10)
- ❍ more than $2,880–$3,839 per week OR $150,000–$199,999 per year (11)
- ❍ Don’t know (12)

AHURI Research Centres

AHURI Research Centre—Curtin University
AHURI Research Centre—RMIT University
AHURI Research Centre—Swinburne University of Technology
AHURI Research Centre—The University of Adelaide
AHURI Research Centre—The University of New South Wales
AHURI Research Centre—The University of Sydney
AHURI Research Centre—The University of Tasmania
AHURI Research Centre—The University of Western Australia
AHURI Research Centre—The University of Western Sydney

Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute
Level 1, 114 Flinders Street, Melbourne Victoria 3000
Phone +61 3 9660 2300
Email information@ahuri.edu.au Web www.ahuri.edu.au