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Abstract. Over about twenty years, Housing First (HF) and its adaptations have become internationally promoted housing models for long-term homeless people with mental health difficulties or/and substance abuse issues. The model called Pathways Housing First (PHF) created in New York by Sam Tsemberis, the founder of the Pathway to Housing organization, is the most well-known. PHF model is depicted in the research literature as the original implementation of Housing First (HF). In addition to a housing model, HF has been defined as a philosophy and it is a rapidly growing research branch. In this review article, HF is approached first and foremost as a diverse research branch and the aim is to map HF literature from 1990 to 2014. The article is based on 184 publications. The main criterion for including a publication in the database was that it takes as a starting point and/or comments on the original PHF model. The following research questions were asked: 1) what are the research types that are represented in HF literature? (we call these ‘literature orientations’), and 2) what kind of political-practical arguments and objectives are expressed within each type i.e. orientation? The review found nine different types of research: 1) comparative studies, 2) guidelines and text books, 3) evaluation reports, 4) commentaries, 5) reviews, 6) implementation and outcome studies, 7) the development of scales and tests, 8) experiences and interaction studies and 9) critical social science research. As a conclusion, possible future directions of HF research are discussed.
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Introduction

Homelessness is a globally persistent social problem. Long-term homelessness, in particular, is an indicator of extreme exclusion, poverty and human vulnerability. Long-term homelessness is often intertwined with severe mental health problems and substance abuse issues (e.g., Waegemakers-Schiff and Rook, 2012; Watson et al., 2013). It is a major burden on individuals and societies (Whittaker et al., 2015). In order to understand long-term homelessness and tackle it successfully, we need to scrutinize and influence societal structures, organization-level policies and practices, and human agency (e.g., Watson et al., 2013). In Western societies, governments and non-governmental organizations have made great efforts to diminish long-term homelessness. For example, the Finnish government recently launched two programmes to reduce long-term homelessness (running 2008–2011; 2012–2015) (Tainio and Fredriksson, 2009). Australia, Denmark and the Netherlands also launched national level homelessness strategies and targeted initiatives to decrease homelessness (Benjaminsen, 2013b; Whittaker et al., 2015). Van Wormer and van Wormer (2009) describe nationwide developments in US. These initiatives, programmes and strategies are seen to represent a homelessness policy shift from the linear residential treatment (LRT) model (also called the continuum of care or the staircase model) to the Housing First (HF) model.

Over the last twenty years or so, HF and its adaptations have become internationally promoted housing models for long-term homeless people with mental health difficulties and/or substance abuse issues. It is often argued that the original model called Pathways Housing First was created in New York by the Pathway to Housing organization, founded by Sam Tsemberis (for a history, see Felton, 2003; Waegemakers-Schiff and Rook, 2012). PHF is depicted in the literature as the original and truest way to implement HF. In addition, it has been presented as an evidence-based practice and, as a result of this research evidence, it has received a great deal of international recognition (Johnsen and Teixeira, 2012; Johnson et al., 2012; Pleace, 2012; Pleace and Bretherton, 2012a; b; Greenwood et al., 2013b) and has been widely adopted across the US, Canada, Australia and Europe (Greenwood et al., 2013b).

The aim of the HF model is to provide immediate access to permanent housing and sufficient, sustained support for former long-term homeless people with their special support needs. The HF model comprises the following principles: housing is a human right and a precondition for a decent life and recovery; to be housed should not require adherence to treatment and care and, thus, housing and support are to be separated; and residents are to be encountered with empathy, respect and patience without coercive practices. Freedom of choice and self-determination are important preconditions in successful housing and recovery. Scattered housing
is to be the primary option. Both recovery-orientation and harm reduction are to be combined in support services (e.g., Tsemberis, 2010a; Busch-Geertsema, 2013; Gilmer et al., 2013; Kaakinen, 2013).

In addition to a housing model, HF has also been defined as a philosophy and it is a rapidly growing research branch. Some scholars even talk about a paradigm shift in homelessness and mental health policy and practices (Nelson, 2010; Bostad först som., 2013; Kaakinen, 2013). As stated by Greenwood et al. (2013a; b), research was a crucial precursor to the implementation of HF from the 1990s in the US and Canada, and from the 2000s in many European countries. Commonly, HF initiatives are demonstration projects with strong research and evaluation components and political-practical objectives (Greenwood et al., 2013a).

In this review article, we approach HF first as a diverse research branch and our aim is to map and give an overall view of the HF literature, from the 1990s to 2014. The review identified nine different types of literature: 1) comparative studies, 2) guidelines and text books, 3) evaluation reports, 4) commentaries, 5) reviews, 6) implementation and outcome studies, 7) the development of scales and tests, 8) experiences and interaction studies and 9) critical social science research.¹ HF has thus generated a wide range of homelessness research and societal discussion on homelessness. The starting point of this review is the idea that, after twenty years of HF research, it is worth taking the time to analyse and classify the growing number of publications that relate to applying, translating, evaluating, examining and discussing HF across many Western countries. By doing this, the review also captures future directions of HF research. Before presenting the nine different types of literature identified, we clarify how the literature was collected and mapped in the database and how the analysis was conducted.

The Review: Data and Research Questions

In this review article, the aim is to map HF literature from 1990 to 2014. The first objective is to classify publications according to the scientific genre they represent – i.e., what kinds of research tasks are set and data and methods used. The review covers HF literature broadly, and includes e.g. policy reviews, debate papers, reports and textbooks. The second objective is to study the publications in terms of the political-practical arguments and objectives they set forth. This aim is grounded in the assumption that the HF literature is linked to promoting the HF model itself as a practical and working solution to homelessness, and that the

¹ Waegemakers-Schiff and Rook (2012, p.11) categorize HF literature in the following way: a) quantitative studies, b) qualitative studies, c) program descriptions, d) program outcomes, e) policy review, f) health outcomes, g) cost-effective studies, and h) population studies.
literature thus primarily produces knowledge and arguments that are useful for political decision-making and for implementing local HF models (Stanhope and Dunn, 2011; Waegemakers-Schiff and Rook, 2012; Greenwood et al., 2013a). Accordingly, scrutiny of the political-practical arguments contained in the literature constitutes the core conceptual framework for this review. The following research questions were asked: 1) what are the research types that are represented in HF literature? (we call these literature orientations), and 2) what kind of political-practical arguments and objectives are expressed within each type i.e. orientation?

The database of the review was created and reported on in two phases. The first publication search was conducted in November 2013 (in total, 77 publications) and reported on as a Finnish review article (Raitakari and Juhila, 2014). In the second phase, a supplementary data search was done in November 2014, which increased the total number of publications to 184. This article is based on the 184 publications identified by these first and second publication searches. We included a variety of literature produced within different genres and using different research designs, and also literature that represents non-scientific contributions, such as policy reviews and debates. The main criteria were that a publication was officially published (at least on the internet) between 1990 and 2014 and that it takes as a starting point and/or comments on the original PHF model. Accordingly, the database comprises academic research articles, evaluation reports, literature reviews, textbooks, manuals, policy reviews and debate papers. In the publication search we used ‘Housing First’ and ‘Asunto Ensin’ (‘Housing First’ in Finnish) as keywords. Only one key word was used to find a wide range of HF literature types (academic and policy literature) that explicitly use the term Housing First. We searched publications from different sources and used search engines, such as Google Scholar and Academic Search Premier. Important sources turned out to be the reference lists of previous publications. They led us to new publications and ensured that we had relevant literature included in the database. Although we aimed for a comprehensive review, there are certainly publications missing. This is mostly due to the fact that we only read publications in English and Finnish (excepting two texts in Swedish) and that the search engines used are not all-inclusive. Another major challenge has been the accelerated speed at which new HF publications are appearing. Despite these notable limitations, the large data corpus makes it possible to specify the different orientations of literature on HF, and the political-practical arguments expressed by each of them to a sufficient extent.

In practice, the review was conducted in the following way. We spent a great amount of time reading through the publications from the angles of the different scientific genres and research questions, and eventually grouped the texts according to: a) what kind of data was used, b) what kind of research design and method was established, c) how the text was written, and d) for whom and for what
purpose the publication was intended. Nine ‘literature orientation charts’ were created to document the publications within each orientation; these charts included the names of the authors, the year of publication and the political-practical arguments expressed.

Each of the orientations represents a different way of doing HF research and discussing HF. Thus, the content of the publication was not the criterion for the grouping, but rather the way the publication was composed and the scientific genre it represented. When categorizing the literature orientations, we were influenced both by established methods of naming different publication types and by the terms used in the HF literature itself (e.g., in evaluation reports and reviews), and we applied them to the specific purposes of the article (Waegemakers-Schiff and Rook, 2012; Publication Characteristics, 2014). Categorizing was not a straightforward task. For example, only fine-grained differences exist between some qualitative evaluation reports, implementation studies and experiences and interaction studies, as they all are based on grassroots-level experiences and views of HF. Thus, in some cases a publication could straddle two orientations and we were forced to choose one over the other, depending on the publication’s dominant features. In so doing, we concentrated on the main features of each orientation and the factors that differentiate the literature orientations from each other, thus bypassing many details when sketching the ‘big picture’ of the HF literature.

The order of the literature orientations displayed in the article shows how HF publications have changed over time; the ‘comparisons’ orientation is the ‘root’, from which the current diverse HF literature sprouted. Research orientations are built on previous research, inspired by perceived gaps and deficiencies. The orientations also move from less critical modelling, testing and evaluating of HF to more critical research. As HF practice and research diversifies, the vocabularies become richer; alongside the original PHF come many different applications and translations of the HF model, and this produces new concepts including ‘housing-led’, ‘light HF’ and ‘mixed-model’. This trend in HF research literature also brings conceptual variety to the article.
### Table 1. Comparative Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLICATIONS (36)</th>
<th>POLITICAL-PRACTICAL ARGUMENTS</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tsemberis 1999; Tsemberis et al., 2002; Gulcur et al., 2003; Tsemberis et al., 2003; Tsemberis et al. 2004; Greenwood et al., 2005; Padgett et al., 2006; Gulcur et al., 2007; Stefancic and Tsemberis 2007; Yanos et al., 2007; Gilmer et al. 2009; Larimer et al., 2009; Robbins et al., 2009; Gilmer et al. 2010; Tsai et al., 2010; Edens et al., 2011; Goering et al., 2011; Henwood et al., 2011; Padgett et al., 2011; Appel et al., 2012; Collins et al., 2012b; Hwang et al., 2012; Padgett and Henwood 2012; Watson 2012; Collins et al., 2013; Henwood and Shinn et al., 2013; Montgomery et al., 2013; Palepu et al., 2013; Patterson and Moniruzzaman et al., 2013; Patterson and Rezansoff et al., 2013; Somers and Patterson et al., 2013; Somers and Rezansoff, 2013; Srebnik et al., 2013; Tinland et al., 2013; Patterson et al., 2014; Russolillo et al., 2014</td>
<td>1. HF clients’ housing is more sustainable than LRT clients’ and thus HF is a more effective solution to long-term homelessness 2. HF decreases the use of emergency and inpatient services more than LTR and is thus a more cost-effective option 3. HF clients use alcohol and they have mental health difficulties to the same degree (or less) than LRT clients 4. Permanent housing, client choice and self-determination decreases mental health symptoms and increases quality of life; HF thus supports mental wellbeing better than LRT 5. Social integration is an essential element in successful housing, yet multifased and complex process 6. The essential principle of HF is adherence to mental health treatment is not a requirement of obtaining housing is well met in practice according to the residents’ accounts</td>
<td>Convince the politics, civil servants, managers, practitioners and researchers worldwide that HF is more cost-effective way than LRT to tackle with long-term homelessness, and that individuals with major deficiencies in daily functioning can live in a scattered housing if sufficient support is available Advocate for support services based on permanent housing, voluntariness, client choice, long-term support and harm reduction and recovery</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the ‘Comparative Studies’ orientation we included publications that are based on comparative research designs. The publications make use of different types of experimental designs to compare LRT and HF housing models and their client outcomes, including pre-test and post-test designs, quasi-experimental designs and true experimental designs, or RCTs. Studies commonly utilize administrative documents (registers), client surveys and different kinds of ability-to-function tests.
as data. A common way to collect data is to do baseline survey-interviews with the clients and renew them every three to four months for a one- to two-year period. As seen in the forthcoming sections, the data of the comparative studies can also be used in other kinds of research designs and publication types (e.g., in evaluation reports and in outcome and implementation studies).

The HF model itself and comparative studies concerning it are motivated by the critics of the LRT model (e.g., Tsemberis and Henwood, 2011). The early HF literature was almost solely about comparing HF to other treatment/housing models or to existing services. In the LRT model, the basic idea is to build a continuum of treatment-accommodation units (such as a hospital-shelter, group home, supportive housing or normal apartment) to help people recover from mental health and substance abuse problems and homelessness. Thus, adherence to treatment and recovery endeavours are embedded in accommodation solutions. The transition from homeless to housed is thought to require abstinence and, at the beginning of the continuum (more or less), professional control and regulations. Many contributors (e.g., Tsemberis and Asmussen, 1999; Atherton and McNaughton-Nicholls, 2008; Johnsen and Teixeira, 2010; Pleace, 2011; Hahtela, 2013; Granfelt, 2014) have brought up that the LRT model is not suitable for those categorized as the ‘most difficult to house’ and ‘having severe mental health and substance abuse problems’, and that it has many deficiencies, including the fact that many individuals with severe conditions have difficulties going along with the restrictions, fulfilling recovery expectations and moving forward in the continuum. Thus, the model easily excludes those with the greatest needs. In contrast, the HF model is argued to serve the most needy individuals. Long-term homelessness is not perceived as being caused by ‘difficult to house’ individuals but rather by unsuitable housing solutions and structural obstacles (Tsemberis and Asmussen, 1999).

‘Comparative studies’ is a strong research orientation in the HF field (36 publications). From the 1990s, the Pathways to Housing organization was successful in arguing for the (cost-) effectiveness of PHF compared to LRT, or ‘treatment as usual’ (TAU). Tsemberis’ article ‘From Street to Home: An Innovative Approach to Supported Housing for Homeless Adults with Psychiatric Disabilities’ (1999) started a series of articles that constituted the foundation of the international debate on PHF. In this way, PHF grew from a small-scale, innovative experiment to an acknowledged programme model with the status of an evidence-based practice (Pleace and Bretherton, 2012a; Greenwood et al., 2013a). This research

The following studies represent exceptions to this: Patterson et al. (2013) carried out the first study “to use longitudinal, narrative data from adults with mental illness who were randomly assigned to HF or TAU.” Henwood et al. (2013) conducted a mix-method comparison of the perspectives and values of HF and LRT providers. Watson (2012) compared HF and LRT by using interviews of HF clients and staff members.
orientation achieved a major reinforcement in 2009 when the Mental Health Commission of Canada funded a five-year, randomized controlled trial (RCT) study called ‘At Home / Chez Soi’, which implemented and evaluated PHF in five Canadian cities (Goering et al., 2011).

The ‘comparative studies’ research orientation is based on the making of a distinction between the HF and LRT models. It reinforces the idea that the models are clearly separable and ideologically different. In recent studies, comparison is additionally made between different applications of HF – i.e., between scattered and congregate housing (e.g., Somers, Patterson et al., 2013; Patterson, Moniruzzaman et al., 2013; Russolillo et al., 2014). The other, more resent research publications utilize, repeat and expand this polarized view and also the main political-practical arguments of this orientation (e.g., Johnson et al., 2012; Johnsen and Teixeira, 2012).

The main political-practical arguments of this research orientation are: 1) HF client housing is more sustainable than that of LRT clients and HF is therefore a more effective solution to long-term homelessness (e.g., Tsemberis, 1999; Tsemberis and Eisenberg, 2000; Tsemberis et al., 2004; Stefancic and Tsemberis, 2007; Collins et al., 2013); 2) HF decreases the use of emergency and inpatient services (more than LTR/TAU) and is thus a cost-effective option (e.g., Gulcur et al., 2003; Gilmer et al., 2009; Larimer et al., 2009; Gilmer et al. 2010; Padgett et al., 2011; Srebnik et al., 2013; Russolillo et al., 2014); 3) HF clients use alcohol and they have mental health difficulties to the same (or lesser) degree than LRT clients (Tsemberis et al., 2003; Tsemberis et al., 2004; Padgett et al., 2006; Robbins et al., 2009; Collins et al., 2012a; b; Padgett et al., 2011); 4) permanent housing, client choice and self-determination decrease mental health symptoms and increase quality of life – HF thus supports mental wellbeing better than LRT (e.g., Greenwood et al., 2005; Patterson, Moniruzzaman et al., 2013); 5) social integration is an essential element in successful housing, yet it cannot be expected to mean the same thing for everyone, or for HF clients to be more integrated than people in general in urban life – social integration is a multifaceted process, influenced by the neighbourhood, the form of housing (the model), daily activities and the resident’s characteristics (Yanos et al., 2007; Patterson et al., 2014); 6) the essential principle of HF – i.e., that adherence to mental health treatment is not a requirement of obtaining housing – is well met in practice, according to the accounts of residents (Robbins et al., 2009).

In this research orientation, the objectiveness of experiments and the practical mission are combined to support the dissemination and development of the HF model. The objective is to build up evidence for an evidence-based practice and, through doing this, convince politicians, civil servants, managers, practitioners and researchers worldwide that HF is a cost-effective way to tackle long-term homelessness and that individuals with major deficiencies in daily functioning can live in
scattered housing if sufficient support is available (e.g., Tsemberis, 1999; Tsemberis and Eisenberg, 2000; Gulcur et al., 2003). In addition, the authors of literature within this orientation advocate for support services based on voluntariness, client choice, long-term support, and harm reduction and recovery (Greenwood et al., 2005; Larimer et al., 2009; Padgett and Henwood, 2012).

A critical reading of the orientation’s publications requires special knowledge about register-based designs, RCTs and quasi-experimental research designs. In contrast, the political-practical arguments and objectives come across easily to a wide range of audiences, as is evidenced through the circulation of these arguments in other research orientations.

Tackling long-term homelessness means asking the question: which housing/treatment model is the most (cost-)effective for those categorized as the ‘most difficult to house’? The following literature orientation gives tools and guidelines to plan and run such a housing project effectively.

Guidelines and Textbooks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLICATIONS (11)</th>
<th>POLITICAL-PRACTICAL ARGUMENTS</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tsemberis and Asmussen, 1999; Lanzerotti, 2004; Tsemberis, 2010a; 2010b; McManus et al., 2011; Tsemberis and Henwood, 2011; De Decker, 2012; Bostad först som ...2013; Gaetz et al., 2013; Goering and Tsemberis, 2014; Polvere et al., 2014</td>
<td>1. Guidelines and exemplars are needed in developing and implementing HF in practice. 2. HF possesses the values, ingredients and practical means to tackle long-term homelessness so it is worth taking seriously and making it known to a variety of audiences.</td>
<td>Model HF’s values, ingredients and practices into clear ways of doing homelessness work. Generate and distribute knowledge about HF and to enhance proper ways of implementing it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the ‘guidelines and text books’ literature orientation we included HF textbooks, book chapters and toolkits (11 publications). The publications included follow the professional textbook tradition, presenting proper professional practices in an educational and idealistic way. In addition, they are written in an introductory and practical style, and HF is depicted as a successful intervention that transforms long-term homeless with mental health and substance abuse difficulties into responsible residents. The guidelines and textbooks are based on the practical/personal knowledge of experts groups, researchers, practitioners and clients, yet references to this knowledge are not always made in an exact and explicit way.
The textbooks and toolkits in this literature orientation offer practical guidelines to putting PHF into practice, and they can be identified by the simplified and educational way in which they present PHF (Tsemberis and Assmussen, 1999; Lanzerotti, 2004; Tsemberis, 2010b; McManus, 2011; De Decker, 2012; Gaetz et al., 2013; Polvere et al., 2014). Tsemberis and his co-authors have described the PHF model’s core principles, implementation processes and current research evidence (Tsemberis and Assmussen, 1999; Tsemberis, 2010a; b; Tsemberis and Henwood, 2011; Goering and Tsemberis, 2014). The guidelines and textbooks are addressed to those who plan, establish, develop, provide, run and engage with HF – i.e., to the actual ‘doers’ of HF projects. Book chapters (Tsemberis 2010b; Tsemberis and Henwood, 2011; Goering and Tsemberis, 2014) comprise overall introductions to HF’s background, principles, research evidence and successes. Book chapters are aimed at a wide range of societal and scientific audiences and they are written in more academic language than guidelines and textbooks. Yet they can be read as ‘advertising’ HF’s particularities and the advantages to ‘outsiders’ of the HF field (e.g., Tsemberis and Henwood, 2011).

The orientation’s main political-practical arguments are that: 1) guidelines and exemplars are needed in developing and implementing HF in practice; and 2) the HF model contains the values, ingredients and practical means to tackle long-term homelessness, so it is worth taking seriously and making it known to a variety of audiences. The main objective is to model HF’s values, ingredients and practices into clear ways of doing homelessness work. Another objective is to generate and distribute knowledge about HF and to enhance proper ways of implementing it.

Tackling long-term homelessness requires making the best use of existing knowledge about HF when planning and running local HF projects. HF research evidence comes very much from demonstration projects that have strong evaluation research components; these are presented next.
### Table 3. Evaluation Reports

| PUBLICATIONS (27)                                                                                                                                                                                                 | POLITICAL-PRACTICAL ARGUMENTS                                                                                                                                                                                                 | OBJECTIVES                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Perlman and Parvensky, 2006; Toronto Shelter Support..., 2007; Pearson et al., 2007; Pearson et al., 2009; Busch-Geertsema, 2010; Goering et al., 2012; Johnsen and Fitzpatrick, 2012; 2013; Kristiansen and Espmarker, 2012; Mental Health Commission... 2012 a, 2012b; Stergiopoulos et al., 2012; Benjamin, 2013a; Busch-Geertsema, 2013; Fehér and Balogi, 2013; Johnsen and Fitzpatrick, 2013; Nelson and Macnaughton et al., 2013a; Ornelas, 2013; Wewerinke et al., 2013; Aubry et al., 2014; Busch-Geertsema, 2014; Currie et al., 2014; Distasio et al., 2014; Wewerinke et al., 2013; Goering et al., 2014; Latimer et al., 2014; Stergiopoulos et al., 2014 | 1. HF generates cost savings, increases wellbeing and is an effective route out of homelessness 2. In successful implementation of HF it is crucial to have sustainable resources and skilled practitioners 3. Scattered housing is to be preferred 4. Clients value HF principals, scattered housing and long-term support, and report their life situation being improved 5. To achieve the best outcomes, HF programmes should demonstrate high fidelity to the core aspects of the PHF model 6. HF can be effectively implemented and disseminated in Canadian and European cities of different size and with different 'ethno-racial' and cultural composition 7. To overcome stigmatization, social isolation, poverty and unemployment, structural level measures are needed | Document and display the pivotal elements of each individual demonstration project and thus to prove the advantages of HF and to promote its development, funding and research. Take a stance on the issue of adapting and disseminating HF in a different contexts Call for national and EU-level responsibility to enhance and support HF research and practice Support the implementation of demonstration projects by constructing the success and hindrance factors when putting HF into practice |

Evaluation reports typically involve qualitative data (or both qualitative and quantitative), and carefully describe implementation processes, client characteristics and housing stability rates. In addition, they assess changes in the wellbeing and life situations of clients. This literature orientation is based on an evaluation research tradition, although methodological commitments and decisions are not commonly reflected in depth. Mostly methodological considerations are embedded in the final reports (Busch-Geertsema, 2013; Goering et al., 2014). (Evaluation) research has long been a crucial element in advocating for, and disseminating the concept of HF in the US, Canada and most recently in Europe. As Greenwood, Stefancic et al. (2013b, p. 310) state: “Many European HF initiatives are demonstration projects with strong research or evaluation components that stakeholders hope will build a strong European evidence base for HF.” There have been several (some remarkably large-scale) HF projects, which have produced a major number of evaluation reports). 27 reports were included in the ‘evaluation reports’ literature orientation.
The first three reports (Perlman and Parvensky, 2006; Toronto Shelter Support and Housing Administration, 2007; Pearson et al., 2007) are evaluations of HF models in the US and Canada. More recently, the world’s largest trial of HF – i.e., Canada’s ‘At Home / Chez Soi’ five-year (2009–2013) implementation and research project with RCT and mixed-method research design – has made a significant contribution to the HF literature. As stated by Goering and the team (2014, p.11): ‘At Home / Chez Soi’ was designed to “help identify what works, at what cost, for whom, and in which environments.” Evaluation was carried out by examining various aspects of the lives of HF clients, such as housing stability, quality of life, community functioning, recovery, employment, inclusion and costs. In addition, the researchers conducted assessments of fidelity to the original PHF, documented the local implementation processes, and provided extensive training and technical assistance at the sites (Nelson, Macnaughton et al., 2013a; Goering et al., 2014). The data used includes both quantitative and qualitative components and thus facilitates a variety of research publications from different research orientations (Goering et al., 2014).

A major boost to European HF projects and evaluation research has been ‘Housing First Europe’ (HFE, 2011-2013), funded by the European Commission. HFE was a demonstration project, which promoted mutual learning across several European cities that were implementing HF, and synthesized the findings of local evaluations (Busch-Geertsema, 2011; 2013; Greenwood, Stefancic et al., 2013b). As stated in the final report (Busch-Geertsema, 2013), European HF projects have been

---

3 Pearson and his colleagues (2007) conducted a multi-site, descriptive, implementation-outcome evaluation of three HF sites that were: 1) Downtown Emergency Service Center, Seattle, Washington, 2) Pathways to Housing, New York City, New York; and 3) Reaching Out and Engaging to Achieve Consumer Health, San Diego, California. Perlman and Parvensky (2006, p.1) carried out a “Cost Benefit Analysis focused on examining the actual health and emergency service records of a sample of participants [N=19, number added by the authors] of the DHFC (Denver Housing First Collaborative) for the 24-month period prior to entering the program and the 24-month period after entering the program.”

4 Local demonstration projects of ‘At Home / Chez Soi’ in Vancouver, Winnipeg, Toronto, Montréal and Moncton are documented in several evaluation reports (Aubry et al., 2014; Currie et al., 2014; Distasio et al., 2014; Latimer et al., 2014; Stergiopoulos et al., 2014). The final evaluation report, which summarizes the cross-setting implementation processes and general outcomes, was conducted by Goering and the research team (Goering et al., 2014). ‘At Home / Chez Soi’ research was based on the following data types: a) interviews with clients at baseline and every three months for up to two years of follow-up, b) information from the demonstration projects (such as the number of clients and conducted service encounters), and c) national and provincial administrative data sources on the use of health and justice services before and after the beginning of the study.

5 HFE comprised five ‘test site cities’ (Amsterdam, Budapest, Copenhagen, Glasgow and Lisbon) and additional partners – i.e., ‘peer site cities’ (Dublin, Ghent, Gothenburg, Helsinki and Vienna) (Socialstyrelsen/Housing First Europe). The final report summarizing the implementation processes and outcomes was written by Busch-Geertsema (2013).
pioneering attempts to implement HF in an environment dominated either by the LRT model or by emergency sheltering services. Only Copenhagen’s demonstration project was part of a national homelessness strategy to promote HF on a national scale. Danish and Finnish endeavours to eliminate long-term homelessness and to implement, study and stabilize HF at a national level have encouraged literature and discussion on HF (Busch-Geertsema, 2010; Benjaminsen, 2013a; b). None of the HFE test sites were an exact replica of the original PHF, although they did follow the core ideas of PHF in many aspects. The ‘fidelity test’ was not conducted and it was difficult to verify implementation of some of the principles in practice (Busch-Geertsema, 2013). There was diversity between test sites in terms of scale and implementation, data collection and evaluation methods. Administrative data and interviews with the participants were important sources of information. Both of these large-scale demonstration projects support and give grounds to argue that HF can be successfully carried out outside the U.S context with significant outcomes in housing sustainability and the well-being of clients.

The evaluation reports often end up with political-practical arguments that are similar to those of the comparative studies, although the literature orientations differ from each other in terms of research design and data types (evaluation reports are mostly based on qualitative data and descriptive analysis). The main political-practical arguments of the evaluation reports orientation are: 1) HF generates cost savings, increases well-being and is an effective route out of homelessness (e.g., Perlman and Parvensky, 2006); 2) for successful implementation of HF, it is crucial to have sustained and sufficient resources (e.g., affordable apartments) and skilled practitioners (Busch-Geertsema, 2013; Goering et al., 2014); 3) scattered housing is to be favoured as much as possible, yet other options are possible if they are in line with client choice and expressed needs (Benjaminsen, 2013a); 4) clients value HF principles, scattered housing and long-term support, and report their life situation as being improved (Kristiansen and Espmarker, 2012; Benjaminsen, 2013a; Johnsen and Fitzpatrick, 2012; 2013; Wewerinke et al., 2013); 5) to achieve the best outcomes, HF programmes should demonstrate high fidelity to the core aspects of the PHF model (Goering et al., 2014); 6) HF can be effectively implemented and disseminated in Canadian and European cities of different size and with different ‘ethno-racial’ and cultural composition (Goering et al., 2014; Busch-Geertsema, 2013); 7) to overcome stigmatization, social isolation, poverty and unemployment, structural level measures are needed (Busch-Geertsema, 2013).

The aim of the ‘evaluation reports’ orientation is to document and display the pivotal elements of each individual demonstration project (and/or those of multi-site totalities) and thus prove the advantages of HF and promote its development, funding and research. The intent is to take a stance on the issue of adapting and disseminating HF in different contexts. The orientation calls for national and EU-level
responsibility to enhance and support HF research and practice. It also supports the implementation of current and future demonstration projects by documenting the factors leading to success and hindrance when putting HF into practice. Hindrance factors include difficulties in getting proper apartments (delays in access to housing), in integrating clients into society and in engaging them in meaningful daily activities. Endeavours to quit substance abuse and scattered housing increase the risk of isolation and loneliness (Busch-Geertsema, 2013; Johnsen and Fitzpatrick, 2012; 2013). Having provided an apartment, the question of ‘what next?’ arises. Recently, social integration has become a strengthened theme in HF literature. The publications in this orientation make it possible to assess and discuss the following: What is HF in different contexts? Who are HF clients? What are the effects and client outcomes of HF? How are demonstration projects implemented and what are the critical factors leading to success and hindrance? The knowledge in this orientation is aimed at those who fund, plan, establish, develop, provide, run and engage with HF projects.

The homelessness issue leads to questions of what works in what context and how to balance PHF fidelity with adapting the initiative to local circumstances. These issues are also central in the following literature orientation: ‘Commentaries’.
### Table 4. Commentaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLICATIONS (32)</th>
<th>POLITICAL-PRACTICAL ARGUMENTS</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
2. Previous research evidence on HF is not unquestionable nor totally robust  
3. HF has shown outstanding outcomes on housing sustainability but less promising results concerning recovery and social integration  
4. There are many structural and cultural constraints to be taken into account when transferring HF from one locality to another  
5. Most important is to hold on to the PHF ethos, i.e. strong housing rights, scattered housing, off-site and intensive support, client choice, self-determination, a resilient and compassionate attitude  
6. HF is not an all-powerful solution to long-term homelessness and structural changes are crucial in the fight against poverty and marginalization  
7. HF has lot to offer, but critical thinking and research is essential | Advance the academic discussion and research on HF  
Make HF better known to a variety of administrative/professional/academic audiences |

The ‘Commentaries’ literature orientation covers texts that are not empirical studies, reviews or text books. Thus, these texts do not include empirical data or any systematic way of going through previous literature or presenting analysis. The orientation includes a variety of text types, including debates, (critical) discussions, policy reviews and descriptions of on-going HF projects. These texts are usually quite short and they offer particular input into on-going (academic) discussions on HF, relying on the author’s existing knowledge of the HF field. In the database, there are 32 such publications in total. Texts in this orientation can be identified on the
one hand by arguments that call for ‘orthodoxy’ and on the other hand by arguments that set forth the need to modify HF to different contexts. The texts can be either positive towards or critical of HF.

The HF model is applied in different contexts and in many different ways. Unlike the original PHF model, HF projects may include such elements as 'light support', congregate or on-site housing (a well-know example of this is the Downtown Emergency Service Center in Seattle), fixed-term housing, limited client choice, or the use of social housing and existing support services (e.g., Tainio and Fredriksson, 2009; Johnson et al., 2012; Pleace, 2012a; Kettunen, 2013). Raitakari and Juhila (2012) discuss the dilemmas embedded in both the LRT and HF models, while Kettunen and Granfelt (2011) raise the issue of how demanding it is to do support work by relying on the harm reduction principle. As HF has become more popular, the risk has been highlighted of projects drifting away from the core elements of HF and of the term ‘Housing First’ being used loosely (e.g., Pleace and Bretherton, 2013). As such, housing projects may be labelled as HF without major, transformative changes in the practitioners’ LRT-related patterns of thinking and acting (e.g., Knutagård and Kristiansen, 2013). Accordingly, there are great numbers of discussion texts in HF literature that deal with the problem of ‘drifting away’ from PHF, and how to apply HF and scale it to different contexts. The puzzling question is as to what a HF project is and what is not (e.g., Hansen Löfstrand, 2012). As Tsemberis (2013, p.236) asks: “which project components are flexible enough to be adapted to new localities as well as serve new populations, and which components are core principles that must remain constant?”

For example, in relation to scaling HF to different contexts, Atherton and McNaughton-Nicholls (2008) state that client groups, national and local differences in legislation, social and health services, and housing markets have a crucial impact on the implementation and outcomes of HF (see also Johnson, 2011; Johnson et al., 2012). Accordingly, it is important to scrutinize the local constraints and possibilities of a particular HF project and evaluate its outcomes according to that knowledge (e.g., Knutagård and Kristiansen, 2013). Atherton and McNaughton-Nicholls (2008) conclude, as do many authors in the texts of other orientations, that in order to adapt HF successfully to different societal contexts, we need more European research on the success and hindrance factors in HF models.

Pleace (2011) also sets forth cautionary arguments concerning the translation of HF to different contexts, in particular the ‘drifting away’ phenomenon and about the term ‘Housing First’ being used in a loose way. It is also likely that for some clients, better outcomes can be achieved using models other than HF (see also Culhane et al., 2013), and there is a risk of HF dominating the social discussion on homelessness, which may lead to an overemphasis on the vulnerabilities and
troubles of particular individuals instead of an emphasis on the structural and societal barriers that sustain long-term homelessness in Western societies (Pleace, 2011). In addition, Johnson and his co-writers (2012) bring up the possibility that, in political-practical discussions, the research evidence of HF may be interpreted in a simplified and overly positive way, thus setting too high expectations on it. It should not be forgotten that setting up a proper HF project requires major and sustained resources.

Some of the publications in this literature orientation present endeavours to promote HF as a national-level policy (e.g., Fitzpatrick, 2004; Tainio and Fredriksson, 2009; Benjaminsen, 2013b; Culhane et al., 2013) while others introduce and summarize on-going demonstration projects (Busch-Geertsema, 2011; 2012a; b). Yet there are also articles that reflect more critically on translating HF to local contexts and on its potentials and constraints (Pleace, 2011; Hansen Löfstrand, 2012; Johnsen, 2012; Knutagård and Kristiansen, 2013).

From the publications in this orientation, the following main political-practical arguments can be summarized: 1) more research is needed on HF and other housing models in a European context (e.g., Atherton and McNaughton-Nicholls, 2008; Tainio and Fredriksson, 2009; Tsai and Rosenheck, 2012); 2) previous research evidence on HF is not absolute nor should it automatically be considered robust (Johnson et al., 2012); 3) HF has led to outstanding outcomes in terms of housing sustainability but has shown less promising results in terms of recovery and social integration (Pleace, 2011; Johnson et al., 2012); 4) there are many structural and cultural constraints to be taken into account when transferring HF from one locality to another (Knutagård and Kristiansen, 2013); 5) the most important thing is to hold on to the PHF ethos – i.e., strong housing rights, scattered housing, off-site and intensive support, client choice, self-determination, and a resilient and compassionate attitude; 6) HF is not an all-powerful solution to long-term homelessness, and structural changes are crucial in the fight against poverty and marginalization; 7) HF has lot to offer, but critical thinking and research are essential (Padgett, 2013; Pleace, 2013; Pleace and Bretherton, 2013).

The objective of the orientation is to advance academic discussion and research on HF. Texts are meaningful in making HF better known to a variety of administrative, professional and academic audiences. They are based on previous research and discussion papers, yet references to these are often made in implicit ways. Previous research is made much more explicit in the ‘reviews’ orientation that is presented next.
Reviews

Table 5. Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLICATIONS (6)</th>
<th>POLITICAL-PRACTICAL ARGUMENTS</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Johnsen and Teixeira, 2010; Nelson, 2010; Pleace, 2012; Waegemakers-Schiff and Rook, 2012; Groton, 2013; Raitakari and Juhila, 2014 | 1. It is essential to gather, compare and critically evaluate the existing research evidence of different housing models and to make informed choices concerning homeless peoples' services  
2. Present research evidence is incomplete and, in part, not robust enough methodologically; yet the evidence supports adapting and implementing HF in different contexts  
3. It is essential to do more research on housing models and also to develop the methodology of such research | Develop existing HF research  
Provide bases for informed decision making in homelessness services and policies |

For the ‘reviews’ orientation, we included articles and reports that are based purely on previous HF publications and that summarize existing HF knowledge and research evidence. The publications commonly map and categorize previous HF literature, summarize and assess the existing research evidence and/or conceptualize different approaches to HF research and practice. Johnsen and Teixeira’s review (2010) provides an overview of research and (critical) discussions related to the LRT model, and it contrasts this with research on the HF model. They state here, as do many other contributors, that departures from the original PHF model make it difficult to draw firm conclusions regarding the effectiveness of different HF projects, yet the existing literature does identify a number of key outcomes and advantages. These results are summarized in the review and the authors conclude with recommendations on how to strengthen (evaluation) research on different housing models (Johnsen and Teixeira, 2010). Nelson (2010) analyses the historical shifts in housing approaches (from institutions to housing to homes) for people with a serious mental illness. He describes HF under the ‘supported housing’ approach and argues that a shift to that approach represents a transformative change in mental health policy and practice.

In a review report, Pleace (2012) makes an interesting grouping of different kinds of HF applications. There are housing projects, which are very much exact replicas of PHF. In addition, some housing projects can be defined as Communal Housing First (CHF), as they are based on congregate housing and on-site support. By Housing First ‘Light’ Services, Pleace (2012) refers to living in ordinary apartments and receiving less intensive floating support. This classification extends the ‘boundaries’ of the concept of HF, yet also makes it clearer what the original PHF is and what the different ways of mixing it with other housing models are.
Groton’s quite recent article (2013) scrutinizes studies that compare the effectiveness of various HF programmes with the effectiveness of LRT programmes – i.e., studies included in the ‘comparative studies’ orientation. Client outcomes related to housing retention, substance use and mental health are compared. The article concludes that, while HF provides strong promise, existing studies contain methodological deficiencies and, thus, a reserved attitude towards HF should be maintained. Waegemakers-Schiff and Rook (2012) include a much more comprehensive range of HF literature in their review report than Groton (2013), but the authors, similarly, seek and critically evaluate evidence on HF. They (2012, p.17) come to the following conclusion: “given the paucity of highly controlled outcome studies, we examined the process whereby HF had so rapidly become accepted as a ‘best practice’. Declaring the Housing first model a best practice appears to be a political decision rather than a scientific research decision.”

The political-practical arguments of the ‘reviews’ literature orientation are the following: 1) it is essential to gather, compare and critically evaluate the existing research evidence of different housing models and to make informed choices concerning services for homeless people (Johnsen and Teixeira, 2010); 2) existing research evidence is incomplete and, in part, not sufficiently robust methodologically, but it supports adapting and implementing HF in different contexts (Waegemakers-Schiff and Rook 2012; Groton, 2013); 3) it is essential to do more research on housing models and also to develop the methodology of such research (e.g., Johnsen and Teixeira, 2010; Groton, 2013). The objectives of this literature orientation are to develop existing HF research and to provide bases for informed decision-making in homelessness services and policies. These objectives are also essential in the following, and sixth, research orientation: ‘implementation and outcome studies’.
Implementation and Outcome Studies

Table 6. Implementation and Outcome Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLICATIONS (28)</th>
<th>POLITICAL-PRACTICAL ARGUMENTS</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Felton, 2003; Falvo, 2009; Pearson et al., 2009; van Wormer and van Wormer, 2009;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stergiopoulos et al., 2010; McNaughton and Atherton, 2011;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wideman, 2011; Collins et al., 2012;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldbloom and Bradley, 2012;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zabkiewicz et al., 2012;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bean et al., 2013; Clifasefi et al., 2013; Gilmer et al., 2013; Greenwood and Stefancic et al., 2013a; Greenwood and Stefancic , et al., 2013b ; Keller et al., 2013; Macnaughton et al., 2013; Nelson et al., 2013; Palepu et al., 2013; Watson et al., 2013; Davidson et al., 2014; Gilmer et al., 2014; Granelli et al., 2014; Henwood and Matejkowski et al., 2014; Henwood and Melekis et al. 2014; Nelson et al., 2014; Stergiopoulos et al., 2014; West et al., 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Describing and exploring programme implementation is central to a better understanding of the critical ingredients and practices that help clients to achieve positive outcomes and life changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. High fidelity to PHF associates with better housing stability and quality of life outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The combination of research, ‘evidence-based’ practices and advocacy will foster new programmes in the future that will continue to expand the use of PHF with new client groups and localities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Especially important in successful implementation is the recruiting of staff whose technical and interpersonal skills, and personal values are congruent with the HF model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The publications within this literature orientation are academic, empirical research articles based on implementation-outcome research. They describe and scrutinize a particular HF project (or HF projects) in its (or their) own right – the HF project is not compared to other housing models or evaluated in such a context. Both qualitative and quantitative data, such as interviews, surveys and documents are used. Research articles that deal with the following were included in this orientation: a) the outcomes and success/hindrance factors of a particular HF project (e.g., McNaughton and Atherton, 2011; Bean et al., 2013; Nelson et al., 2014); b) the implementation of a particular HF project (or HF projects) and its (or their) fidelity to the original PHF (Greenwood, Stefancic et al., 2013b; Nelson, Macnaughton et al., 2013b; Nelson et al., 2014); and c) a description of a particular research design used in HF research (Zabkiewicz, 2012). There are 28 publications in literature orientation ‘implementation and outcome studies’ and it is a rapidly expanding
This kind of research has been generated by HF demonstration and research projects in particular (see the section ‘evaluation reports’) and these two literature orientations are therefore very closely related.

For example, with regard to the outcomes of a particular HF project, Clifasefi and his co-writers (2013, p.291) state that “[m]onths of project-based HF exposure – not prior criminal histories – predicted significant decreases in jail days and bookings from the two years prior and subsequent to participants’ move into HF.” Similarly, Collins, Malone and Larimer (2012) conducted a quantitative secondary study to shed light on the potential mechanisms associated with improved alcohol-use outcomes following engagement in a HF project. The study utilizes data gathered in a HF context. It is common for implementation and outcome studies to be based on data gathered in large-scale and multi-site comparative (and/or evaluative case study) HF research projects (e.g., Palepu et al., 2013a; b). In such studies, a particular research question, preliminary observation or theme, which has come up in the original ‘host’ study, is analysed in more detail. For example, Henwood, Matejkowski et al. (2014) focused especially on quality of life and community integration outcomes, which are the rising themes in current HF research.

Some studies depict and reflect on the implementation of HF per se (e.g., Henwood, Melekis et al., 2014). For example, Greenwood, Stefancic et al. (2013a) tell the ‘triumph story’ of HF moving from exile to mainstream. The article explains how research was used to persuade key stakeholders to support funding for and dissemination of HF. It also presents strategies to maximize social change impact, as well as the key challenges that were faced along the way to triumph. Van Wormer and van Wormer (2009) describe the policy shift from a sobriety-first requirement to a Housing First philosophy in the US through a case study from Portland. Felton (2003) describes and analyses the implementation – both barriers and facilitators – of a particular HF project as understood by stakeholders in the change. As she concludes (2003, p.321): “The narrative method reveals on-going concern with interagency relations and, possibly, ambivalence about the values and assumptions of the new practice, and thus offers a richer and more content-based picture of the change process.” Nelson, Macnaughton et al. (2013b) describe the planning process of the ‘At Home / Chez Soi’ demonstration project and the challenges associated with it.

Other publications investigate the relationship between the implementation and outcomes of housing projects and their fidelity to PHF (e.g., Davidson et al., 2014; Gilmer et al., 2014). The need to examine the fidelity of a particular HF project to the original PHF arises from the dilemma of PHF being a flexible model for dissemination in different locations, yet being on the other hand a clearly articulated procedure with its own premises, practices, ‘rules’ and values (Stefancic, Tsemberis et al., 2013; Gilmer et al., 2014). In addition, outcomes are seen as being bound to implementation
processes. If there are major differences and flaws in implementation between HF projects, it makes it difficult to compare the results and argue for the ‘evidence base’ of HF (Watson, Wagner and Rivers, 2013). Watson, Wagner and Rivers (2013, p.169) define the following six critical ingredients of a successful HF project: 1) a low-threshold admissions policy, 2) harm reduction, 3) eviction prevention, 4) reduced service requirements, 5) the separation of housing and services and 6) consumer education.

Greenwood and co-authors (2013b) describe and evaluate the fidelity to the PHF model of HF initiatives in six European countries (Finland, France, Ireland, the Netherlands, Portugal and Scotland) and they examine the larger social and historical factors that may foster or impede model fidelity. Key stakeholders representing six European HF initiatives completed semi-structured phone interviews. Greenwood, Stefancic et al. (2013, p.307) summarize implementation challenges as involving “skepticism and resistance from existing services, availability of affordable private-market housing, and moral judgments about worthiness for housing.”

The ‘At Home / Chez Soi’ demonstration project’s fidelity, and the factors facilitating or hindering its implementation, were assessed in a large qualitative study using key stakeholders as informants (Nelson, Macnaughton et al., 2013b). Both studies (Greenwood, Stefancic et al., 2013b; Nelson, Macnaughton et al., 2013b; Nelson et al., 2014) find that, although local context meant the need for unique adaptations of HF, the principles of the model provided the foundation for a common approach across sites and nations.

The main objective of the literature in this orientation is to document and display the implementation of HF projects and to study the relations between planning, implementation, local contexts, fidelity and outcomes – and thus to strengthen the understanding and credibility of the HF initiatives. The publications are research articles and are addressed primarily to academic readers. They include the following political-practical arguments: 1) describing and exploring programme implementation is central to a better understanding of the critical ingredients and practices that help clients to achieve positive outcomes and life changes (Davidson et al., 2014); 2) high fidelity to PHF is associated with better housing stability and quality of life outcomes; 3) the combination of research, ‘evidence-based’ practices and advocacy will foster new programmes in the future that will continue to expand the use of PHF with new client groups and localities (Greenwood, Stefancic et al., 2013b); 4) especially important in successful implementation is the recruiting of staff whose technical and interpersonal skills, and personal values are congruent with the HF model (Nelson, Macnaughton et al., 2013b; Nelson et al., 2014). In this literature orientation, looking at how to tackle long-term homelessness comes back to the question of how to implement a housing project that is sufficiently in line with PHF principles yet fits well in the local context, in order to produce outcomes as remarkable as those reported from the original PHF model (see section on ‘comparative studies’).
An interesting observation is that the term ‘fidelity’ is increasingly used and circulated in the most recent HF literature; fidelity is to be defined, assessed, measured and put into practice. The next, quite marginal (at this time) literature orientation concerns the development of fidelity and outcome tests. The viewpoint shifts from implementation of HF projects to developing reliable research instruments and data to assess fidelity.

**Development of Scales and Fidelity Tests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLICATIONS (6)</th>
<th>POLITICAL-PRACTICAL ARGUMENTS</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clifasefi <em>et al.</em>, 2011; Raphael-Greenfield, 2012; Gilmer <em>et al.</em>, 2013; Stefancic <em>et al.</em>, 2013; Watson <em>et al.</em>, 2013; Adair <em>et al.</em>, 2014</td>
<td>1. The fidelity scale is to be used as a guide in programme development and training, and as a research tool 2. It is necessary for researchers, policy makers and practitioners to have tools for measuring the extent to which a housing model is implemented according to PHF principals and procedures 3. Fidelity tests help to assess the relations between model ingredients, implementation and outcomes 4. Point 3 promotes a broader understanding of how to facilitate stable housing and recovery from homelessness and other adversities at a grass roots level</td>
<td>Provide a tool to define and measure in a reliable way the elements and practices of particular HF initiatives Enhance dissemination of more consistent and accurate replicas of PHF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The research articles in this literature orientation describe and make explicit the making of a measuring tool. The aim is to develop a tool to define and measure in a reliable way the elements and practices of particular HF initiatives, and through this to enhance dissemination of more consistent and accurate replicas of PHF. Authors make use of mostly qualitative data produced during the development process, such as interviews and focus groups of wide range of stakeholders. This orientation is quite new and marginal within the HF research field and it contains six publications.

Debates surrounding the implementation, outcomes and dissemination of HF have prompted the creation of ‘fidelity tests’, which measure the fidelity of housing projects to the PHF model along both structural and philosophical dimensions (Johnsen and Teixeira, 2010). As Watson, Orwat *et al.* (2013, p.1) argue, “[a] lack of clear fidelity guidelines has resulted in inconsistent implementation.” They continue (2013, p.3) to say that “[n]o fidelity instrument had been created at the time we
started development of the HFM (Housing First Model) Fidelity Index." This research orientation includes descriptions of creating and validating fidelity measuring tools, and texts that address use of the Observer-Rated Housing Quality Scale (Adair et al., 2014) as well as use of the Executive Function Performance Test to assess executive and community functioning among homeless persons with substance use disorders (Raphael-Greenfield, 2012).

Gilmer, Stefancic et al. (2013) describe the development and validation of the HF fidelity survey; the 46-item survey was created to measure fidelity across five domains: housing process and structure, the separation of housing and services, service philosophy, service array and team structure. The staff and clients of 93 supported-housing programmes in California validated the survey. Similarly, Stefancic, Tsemberis et al. (2013) conducted a study to develop and test a PHF fidelity scale. In the article they (2013, p.241) describe the process of making the scale and summarize it in the following way: “The PHF model’s guiding principles and prospective ingredients were identified through reviews of PHF literature and relevant fidelity scales, interviews with PHF administrators and a survey administered to HF providers. An expert panel developed the items into a fidelity scale, which was field-tested as part of two large-scale research initiatives in California and Canada.” Watson, Orwat et al. (2013, p.3) argue that they have conducted “a bottom-up approach to the development of the index that sought to identify and operationalize the critical elements of the HFM that differentiate it from the abstinence-based approach”. They come up with a five-dimensional index (staff, client enrolment, flexible policies, low demand, and intensive case management and housing arrangements) by which to assess and measure project implementation.

The texts are written primarily for researchers, funders, planners and those running HF projects. The following political-practical arguments are contained in the articles: 1) the fidelity scale is to be used as a guide in programme development and training, and as a research tool (Stefancic, Tsemberis et al., 2013); 2) it is necessary for researchers, policy-makers and practitioners to have tools for measuring the extent to which a housing model is implemented according to PHF principals and procedures; 3) fidelity tests help to assess the relationships between model ingredients, implementation and outcomes, and, thus, they 4) promote a broader understanding of how to facilitate stable housing and recovery from homelessness and other adverse situations at a grass roots level. Next we will turn to the research orientation that examines the grass roots level of HF – i.e., the joint encounters and experiences of practitioners and clients.
### Table 8. Experiences and Interaction Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLICATIONS (22)</th>
<th>POLITICAL-PRACTICAL ARGUMENTS</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yanos et al., 2004; Padgett, 2007; Padgett et. al., 2008; Burlingham et al., 2010; Collins et al., 2012; Padgett and Henwood, 2012; Piat et al., 2012; Stefancic et al., 2012; Granfelt 2013a; 2013b; Hahtela 2013; Henwood et al., 2013; Polvere et al., 2013; Tiderington et al., 2013; Austin et al., 2014; Balogi and Fehér 2014; Henwood and Padgett et al., 2014; Juhila et al. 2014; Kirst et al., 2014; Ornelas et al., 2014; Zerger and Pridham et al., 2014a; Zerger and Pridham et al., 2014b</td>
<td>1. It is important to study HF as the local, mutual and interactional accomplishment of clients and practitioners 2. Stakeholders construct and realize HF ‘in-action’ and in particular settings 3. The extent to which macro-level conceptualizations and ideals are able to make social changes are dependent on the transfer processes at the micro-level 4. HF is to be understood and studied as societal, local, interactional and situational social practice and experience</td>
<td>Scrutinize how macro-level ways of thinking and policies are transferred and understood in micro-level practices and in personal experiences Make visible the relations between current politics, policies and everyday practices, and by doing this to inform the development of HF initiatives and support work more generally</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ‘experiences and interaction studies’ literature orientation involves qualitative methods and data. We included research articles in this orientation that focus on everyday interactional practices and the experiences of clients, practitioners and policy-makers in HF contexts. The purpose of these studies is to scrutinize how macro-level ways of thinking and policies (e.g., recovery and harm reduction) are transferred to and understood in micro-level practices and in personal experiences. The research agenda is to make visible the relations between current politics, policies and everyday practices, and by doing this to inform the development of HF initiatives and support work more generally (Juhila et al., 2014). Only after a housing model has been planned and implemented can its micro-level practices be studied – i.e., as a joint endeavour accomplished in practitioner–client interaction, producing and being affected by particular experiences and emotions. Thus, it is not surprising that the ‘experiences and interaction studies’ orientation is quite recent, though rapidly expanding and strengthening (22 publications). It overlaps with the qualitative evaluation reports, which are based on stakeholders’ accounts (e.g., Johnsen and Fitzpatrick, 2012; 2013; Kristiansen and Espmarker, 2012; Piat et al., 2012; Polvere et al., 2013; Balogi and Fehér, 2014), and as this orientation is a rapidly growing one, the publications included in this review likely do not cover this research field properly.
Researchers within this orientation analyse the realization of HF initiatives in terms of practitioner–client interaction and from the viewpoints and experiences of practitioners (e.g., Collins et al., 2012a; b; Granfelt, 2013a; b; Haahela, 2013; Henwood, Padgett et al., 2014), clients (Collins et al., 2012a; b; Granfelt, 2013a; b; Haahela, 2013; Kirst et al., 2014) and civil servants (Johnsen and Teixeira, 2012). There are also texts that more generally map the experience of transferring from homelessness to having an apartment, being at home and experiencing ‘ontological security’ (Padgett, 2007; Henwood, Hsu et al., 2013). Kirst and her colleagues (2014) use clients’ narratives of ‘hopes for recovery’ and see housing as a pivotal condition in creating hope for future recovery. Yet, they mention (as do the other researchers, including Johnsen and Fitzpatrick (2012; 2013) and Granfelt (2013b)) that there are risks such as isolation, boredom, poverty and insecurity, which might temper the success of independent living and recovery. Accordingly, housing is essential but is not on its own a sufficient resource for living in the community and for recovery. Burlingham et al.’s (2010) phenomenological study analyses accounts of women with alcohol issues who become homeless, and examines how personal life histories explain decisions to stay or leave (HF) housing.

Granfelt (2013a; b) has developed the concept of ‘housing social work’. This working method comprises the following dimensions: interactional skills (particular skills involved in negotiating with, for example, tenants, neighbours, social housing authorities and other stakeholders); ‘therapeutic’ skills for genuine and empathic presence in support work; and the ability to set boundaries and to support (often severely traumatized) persons in converting apartments into secure homes (rather than a distressing trap). Tiderington et al.’s (2013) ethnographic study, based on observations and interviews, explores how the principle of harm reduction is interpreted as an element that enhances trust in a practitioner–client relationship. The article is a good example of the mission of this literature orientation to make sense of how HF principals and procedures are talked into being and understood in everyday encounters with clients and practitioners.

The common political-practical arguments set forth in the publications within this orientation are: 1) it is important to study HF as the local, mutual and interactional accomplishment of clients and practitioners; 2) stakeholders construct and realise HF ‘in-action’ and in particular settings; 3) the extent to which macro-level conceptualizations and ideals are able to make social changes are dependent on the transfer processes at the micro-level; 4) HF is to be understood and studied as a societal, local, interactional and situational social practice and experience; accordingly, the essential question in the fight against homelessness is: how is HF (to be) accomplished as an everyday practice, and how is it conceptualized and experienced by different stakeholders?

Next we turn to the final literature orientation, which approaches HF as an exemplar of Western thinking and is ready to question it.
Critical Social Science

Table 9. Critical Social Science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLICATIONS (6)</th>
<th>POLITICAL-PRACTICAL ARGUMENTS</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kertesz et al., 2009; Kertesz and Winer, 2010; Stanhope and Dunn, 2011;</td>
<td>1. HF is based on liberal values and premises</td>
<td>To question common premises, norms, expectations and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hansen Löfstrand and Juhila, 2012; Lindovská, 2014</td>
<td>2. Alliance between HF research and politics is strong, yet not unproblematic</td>
<td>To open up our minds to doing things differently, in a new way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. We need to be cautious about the ways research results and political-practical arguments are used in homelessness policy and in making decisions about housing, health and social services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. HF research and practice is a creation of our time and it must be both questioned and promoted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This literature orientation approaches HF as a case exemplar, which informs us about our time and Western thinking patterns. The research articles included draw from the critical research tradition that questions and deconstructs our common ways of thinking and acting as citizens in Western societies. By doing this, the aim is to open up our minds to doing things differently, in a new way. All articles have strong theoretical frameworks and most of them are based on and scrutinise previous HF writings and documents. Texts are written for academic and professional audiences and for those interested in questioning common premises, norms, expectations and values.

This research orientation is at the margin of the HF literature with only six publications. These texts critically scrutinise the presumptions of HF, including intertwined practices of evidence-based research and evidence-based policy (Stanhope and Dunn, 2011), (restricted) client choice (Hansen Löfstrand and Juhila, 2012) and support for liberal economics and individualized interpretations of social problems (Willse, 2010).

Willse (2010) shows how HF leans on and is in line with liberal thinking – how it takes as self-evident the primacy of economics. Homeless persons are not housed for ethical reasons but for economic ones. HF is not advocated by using an ethical-humanistic argument but by using economic arguments. Accordingly, HF is not targeted at changing society or dismantling the inequalities that are causing and maintaining long-term homelessness in the first place. This makes it very understandable that, although HF is shown to be successful in securing sustained housing, the total number of homeless people may not decrease (or it even may increase) in
Western societies due to, for example, high unemployment rates. Hansen Löfstrand and Juhila (2012) analyse the consumer discourse in Tsemberis’ (2010) textbook: ‘Housing First’. They discuss how on the one hand, the textbook emphasises client choice and self-determination, yet on the other hand, in the HF model (as in the society as a whole) the client’s choices are limited and restricted. The client is expected to make the ‘right choices’ and if he/she does not comply, the possibilities for making choices become scarcer. Accordingly, HF does not totally solve the question of what happens to those who are not able to, or do not want to, conform to ‘normal’ life and to its demanding expectations and rules of acting.

Stanhope and Dunn (2011) outline HF’s assumptions about (scientific) knowledge, and power and influence on political decision-making. HF research is depicted as an apparatus for making policies and advocating ‘what works’ initiatives. As Stanhope and Dunn (2011, p.276) argue, “[f]or EBPol’s (Evidence Based Policy) proponents, the search for ‘what works’ is guided by survey research, experimental and quasi-experimental designs, cost-benefit analysis and system analysis.” HF offers the possibility for reflection on the relationship between knowledge claims, research and policy, and on the place that values have in this bigger picture. There is the risk that the triumph of the ‘evidence base’ simplifies the understanding of decision-making, which in real life involves moral issues, conflicting interests and difficult negotiations of power. Also, Kertesz, Crouch et al. (2009) warn about the risks associated with the close alliance of HF research and policy-making; there is a possibility that policy actors overreach, interpret the research findings too positively and place exaggerated expectations on HF initiatives. There is no quick, easy or inexpensive fix for social problems or ethical injustices.

Publications in this literature orientation present three pivotal political-practical arguments, which are: 1) HF is based on liberal values and premises; 2) alliance between HF research and politics is strong, yet not unproblematic; 3) we need to be cautious about the ways in which research results and political-practical arguments are used in homelessness policy and in making decisions about housing, health and social services – HF research and practice is a creation of our time and it must be both questioned and promoted.

Conclusions and Discussion

In this article, we have introduced and mapped out nine different literature orientations, which approach HF from different genres and research designs, pursue different audiences and set forth a variety of political-practical arguments. The teasing out of the political-practical arguments made it clear that the majority of HF research is practice-oriented and motivated by promoting the HF model at interna-
tional, national and local levels. The analysis also shows how contributors within different literature orientations end up with quite similar political-practical arguments, such as: HF generates cost savings, increases wellbeing and is an effective route out of homelessness; high fidelity to PHF is associated with better housing stability and quality of life outcomes; and there are many structural and cultural constraints to be taken into account when transferring HF from one locality to another. Although there are doubtful and questioning voices in the HF literature, there is considerable agreement that HF is a promising, (cost-)effective and client-friendly housing solution for long-term homeless people with special needs and barriers in life. However, analytical and questioning arguments are crucial and valuable in further developing HF discussions, research and practice. It is essential to evaluate existing HF literature critically and, most importantly, to develop the conceptual-theoretical frameworks, methodological grounds and methods employed within each orientation.

It can be concluded that HF research has both expanded and developed enormously in the last few years; HF literature has grown quantitatively, new orientations have appeared and traditional ones have been made more solid. New texts have been published since our literature search, from which we include some examples in this conclusion section (and which are not included in the database). Yet research is never completed; new questions are asked, new directions and critical stances taken. This is how research orientations develop and go from exile to mainstream or in the opposite direction (see for HF research’s future directions Nelson and MacLeod in progress). The main body of HF literature consists of: quantitative comparisons between the HF and LRT/TAU models (Nelson, Patterson et al., 2015); evaluations of HF demonstration projects and national strategies and descriptions of their implementation processes (Nelson, Macnaughton et al., 2015; Macnaughton et al., 2015; Pleace et al., 2015); and discussions on the transferability of PHF to different contexts and societies.

Theoretically oriented research has a valuable role in deconstructing taken-for-granted HF discourses and thereby advancing societal thinking (and endeavours). For example, HF provides many possibilities to study current macro-level discourses and ideals (and their realization in practice), such as, for example, responsibilization, consumerism and deinstitutionalization. Thus, there is much potential within the (critical) social sciences for HF research and practice. There are also increasing numbers of qualitative studies on the experiences of clients, practitioners and other stakeholders on everyday HF practices (e.g. Aubry et al. 2015). This line of research is particularly valuable in unpacking the dilemmas of translating abstract principles (like choice, harm reduction, integration, resilience and recovery) into everyday practices and interactions between the clients and practitioners who apply these principles (Raitakari et al., 2015). There is much untapped potential for
research on experiences and micro-level interaction. For example, outcome evaluations and qualitative studies on HF are usually done separately rather than being integrated. However, there is a call for mixed method approaches that integrate qualitative and quantitative approaches (and current research is going to this direction) as well as macro-micro level analyses. In addition, there is a need for innovative research projects that concentrate solely on grass roots level HF experiences and practices.

Another rising direction for research lies in comparing different ways of putting HF into practice – i.e., scattered and congregate housing sites and the variety of ways to provide support services (e.g. Stergiopoulos et al., 2015; Whittaker et al. 2015). There is also a call for long-term follow-up studies, as most studies follow clients for only one or two years at most (Nelson and MacLeod in progress). Greater attention should be devoted to examining the variety of ways in which support can be offered (e.g., informal and formal; peer- and professionally driven; intensive and less intensive; short- and long-term; practical and therapeutic).

The development of fidelity tests is also an interesting future direction for HF research, yet this should also be approached with caution. This direction has major advantages since fidelity has been shown to be critically important for successful client outcomes. However, there is a risk that we start to rely on fidelity tests too much, as they can only inform us about the realities of housing projects from a narrow, specific point of view. There is also the dilemma that while effective professional support work requires (ethical) guidelines and procedures, it also requires autonomy, discretion and the ability not to go by the book. In addition, fidelity tests do not tell us how HF is actually put into practice in situ.

Since HF is not implemented in a vacuum, it is also vital to examine further what contemporary policy trends in relation to public services (such as active and responsible citizenship discourse) mean for the implementation of HF in different contexts and for the life conditions of the people with severe mental and substance abuse difficulties. When value for money and demonstrable client outcomes are increasingly emphasized in society, this might bring undesirable consequences for homelessness services, such as ‘creaming’ and tightening eligibility criteria. That is why research on client selection processes as well as ‘client failures’ is topical. As stated in the HF literature, a minority of clients cannot yet be helped or housed through HF; they are important for research, as there are valuable lessons to be learned from them and their situations, although they are hard to reach. Eligibility criteria, and failures and successes should be studied, for example in regard to differences among long-term homeless people. Are some client groups more vulnerable (women, former prisoners, young people, immigrants), and do they become dropouts from the HF models more easily and, if so, for what reasons?
Alasuutari (2009, p.70) uses the concept ‘domestication’ in examining how “supranational policy models are introduced within a nation-state.” He claims that the actual implementation of new models at a national level is always culturally bound and the result of compromise between different stakeholders. The concept of domestication might be useful in analysing how HF models are applied in different countries and in more local contexts (municipalities or service providers with certain histories and cultures of working with homelessness). How the culturally strong LRT approach is present and mixed in the ideas of HF in local homelessness work practices should be studied more closely, even though the HF model is widely accepted as the new approach to be applied. When analysing the possibly mixed housing practices, the starting point should not be that the practices are divided into ‘bad’ (old) and ‘good’ (new). Mixed models might include innovative practices to tackle long-term homelessness.

As a final remark, we conclude that the HF literature seems to be a rather internal research field in the sense that the publications refer to each other a lot. However, there is range of research conducted in other fields, especially in mental health studies, that might produce new insights for both HF research and practice, and support the research findings presented in the HF field. For instance, research done on deinstitutionalization and home-based services includes many relevant themes for HF, among others – scattered housing, community integration and support work based on home visiting or floating support. Also, literature related to recovery and citizenship (in mental health and substance abuse studies) and desistance (in criminal studies) would probably be useful. Some social work studies also come very close to the topics dealt with in HF research (e.g., topics related to client choice, involvement and participation). Without doubt, HF research would also have a lot to offer these other research fields. Research develops through reciprocal, respectful dialogues between different disciplines and through innovative crossing of the boundaries of research fields.
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