

## Description of Measures

Demographic variables included age, gender, race, ethnicity, marital status, years of education, history of homelessness, service connected disability status, method of initial contact with program, and era of active military duty. Clinical characteristics included diagnosis, suicidal ideation and attempts, and composite scores on the Addiction Severity Index (ASI) for drug and alcohol use and expenditures, psychiatric symptoms, legal, and medical issues (1). Community adjustment variables included amount and source of income; employment status; number of days homeless, in an institution, or housed out of the previous 90; recent criminal activity; and quality of life (assessed via the Quality of Life Interview) (2).

*Social Network Size* was assessed by asking participants to indicate the people (up to 8) they felt close to in each of 10 family, peer, or provider relationships. Family included: 1) family of origin (parents, grandparents, and siblings), 2) family of procreation (children and spouse/significant other), and 3) extended family (other family). Peers included other veterans, non-veteran friends, and coworkers. Providers referred to any healthcare provider.

The second measure, *Frequency of Contact*, was assessed by asking participants to indicate, on a Likert scale ranging from 0 ("Never") to 6 ("Lives with me"), the maximum frequency of face-to-face contact over the past year with any person in each of the 10 relationship categories, yielding 10 frequency of contact scores (3, 4). Family, peer, and provider contact indices were then created by multiplying the total network size within each domain by the maximum frequency of contact with any person in that domain. A *Total Contact Index* was also created by multiplying total network size by the maximum frequency of contact with any person in any relationship category.

The third measure, *Perceived Availability of Support*, was assessed using a modified version of the Social Support Resources (SS-R) measure (5). Respondents were provided with a list of 10 relationship categories and asked to indicate, in a yes/no format, whether he/she "could have counted" on anyone within the relationship categories for: tangible support (financial help of a loan of \$100), instrumental support (help with transportation to an appointment), and emotional support (help in an emotional crisis) (6, 7). Amount of tangible, instrumental, and emotional support indicators were created by summing the total number of "yes" responses within each type of support, regardless of relationship category.

The fourth and fifth measures assessed satisfaction with family and non-kin friends using two subscales of the Lehman Quality of Life interview— which rely on a 1-7 terrible to delighted scale (2).

## References

1. McLellan AT, Kushner H, Metzger D, et al.: The fifth edition of the Addiction Severity Index. *Journal of substance abuse treatment* 9:199-213, 1992
2. Lehman AF: A quality of life interview for the chronically mentally ill. *Evaluation and program planning* 11:51-62, 1988
3. Leda C, Rosenheck R: in a Residential Treatment Program for Homeless Veterans. *Am J Psychiatry* 149:1219-24, 1992
4. Leda C, Rosenheck R: Race in the treatment of homeless mentally ill veterans. *The Journal of nervous and mental disease* 183:529-37, 1995
5. Vaux A: Assessment of social support; in *The meaning and measurement of social support*. Edited by Baumann HOFVU. Washington, DC, US: Hemisphere Publishing Corp, 1992
6. Rosenheck R, Seibyl CL: Effectiveness of treatment elements in a residential–work therapy program for veterans with severe substance abuse. *Psychiatric services*, 1997
7. Lam JA, Rosenheck R: Social Support and Service Use Among Homeless Persons With Serious Mental Illness. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry* 45:13-28, 1999

<b>Table</b>								
<b>Baseline Socio-Demographic Characteristics</b>								
	<b>Total Sample</b>		<b>HUD-VASH</b>		<b>ICM Only</b>		<b>Standard Care</b>	
	N = 460		N = 182		N = 90		N = 188	
	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Age (M ± SD)	42.5 ± 7.8		41.6 ± 7.6		43.1 ± 6.9		42.9 ± 8.2	
Male	438	95	174	96	81*	90	183	97
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>								
White, not Hispanic	139	30	59	32	24	27	56	30
Black, not Hispanic	287	63	109	60	58	65	120	64
Hispanic	18	4	9	5	1	1	8	4
Other	15	3	5	3	6	7	4	2
<b>Marital Status</b>								
Married	24	5	8	4	4	4	12	6
Widowed	9	2	4	2	2	2	3	2
Separated	75	16	32	18	17	19	26	14
Divorced	194	43	69	38	40	44	85	46
Never Married	155	34	67	37	27	30	61	33
<b>Education and Income</b>								
Years of education (M ± SD)	12.7 ± 1.7		12.7 ± 1.6		12.8 ± 1.9		12.7 ± 1.6	
Total income (M ± SD)	\$443 ± \$540		\$431 ± \$449		\$487 ± \$520		\$436 ± \$626	
<b>Employment</b>								
# days worked for pay in last 30 (M ± SD)	3.5 ± 7.4		3.6 ± 7.6		3.8 ± 7.6		3.2 ± 7.2	
<b>Living Situation</b>								
# days homeless/past 90 (M ± SD)	30.7 ± 32.1		31.9 ± 32.2		32.6 ± 32.1		28.6 ± 31.9	
# days in institution/ past 90 (M ± SD)	54.6 ± 34.0		53.7 ± 32.7		49.4 ± 36.9		58.0 ± 33.7	
# of days housed/past 90 (M ± SD)	4.6 ± 13.4		4.4 ± 12.9		7.9 ± 19.2		3.3 ± 9.9	
<b>Psychiatric Diagnosis</b>								
Schizophrenia	27	6	13	7	7	8	7	4
Other psychiatric disorder	19	4	9	5	3	3	7	4
Mood disorder	140	31	46	26	31	34	63	34
PTSD from combat	67	15	23	13	16	18	28	15

<b>Table</b>								
<b>Baseline Socio-Demographic Characteristics</b>								
	<b>Total Sample</b>		<b>HUD-VASH</b>		<b>ICM Only</b>		<b>Standard Care</b>	
	N = 460		N = 182		N = 90		N = 188	
	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>%</b>
Alcohol abuse/dependency	323	71	121	67	63	70	139	74
Drug abuse/dependency	301	66	115	64	57	63	129	69
Serious thoughts of suicide (past 30 days)	41	9	14	8	7	8	20	11
Suicide attempt (past 30 days)	2	.4	2	1	0	0	0	0
<b>Alcohol and Drug Use</b>								
# of days intoxicated/past 30 (M ± SD)	5.4 ± 9.9		5.0 ± 9.4		5.0 ± 9.9		5.9 ± 10.4	
# of days of drug use/past 30 (M ± SD)	5.6 ± 9.8		5.2 ± 9.4		5.5 ± 9.8		6.1 ± 10.2	
Substance abuse expenditures/past 30 days (M ± SD)	\$239 ± \$537		\$202 ± \$364		\$266 ± \$631		\$262 ± \$622	
% income spent on substances/past 30 days (M ± SD)	31% ± 41%		32% ± 41%		26% ± 39%		31% ± 42%	
<b>Medical, Legal, and Quality of Life</b>								
Quality of Life- Overall satisfaction (M ± SD) <sup>1</sup>	3.9 ± 1.5		4.0 ± 1.6		3.7 ± 1.5		4.0 ± 1.5	

\* p<.05

<sup>1</sup> Possible scores range from 0 to 7, with higher scores indicating greater overall satisfaction with life.

<b>Table</b>								
<b>Baseline Social Network Characteristics</b>								
	<b>Total Sample</b>		<b>HUD-VASH</b>		<b>ICM Only</b>		<b>Standard Care</b>	
	N = 460		N = 182		N = 90		N = 188	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Total Network Size<sup>1</sup> (M ± SD)</b>	10.3 ± 9.0		10.7 ± 9.1		10.1 ± 8.4		10.0 ± 9.2	
<i>Family</i>								
Any close family members	375	82	149	82	77	86	149	79
Number of close family members <sup>2</sup> (M ± SD)	5.7 ± 5.6		6.1 ± 5.8		5.8 ± 5.6		5.3 ± 5.3	
Family of origin (M ± SD)	2.4 ± 2.6		2.7 ± 2.8		2.1 ± 2.4		2.3 ± 2.5	
Family of procreation (M ± SD)	1.6 ± 2.0		1.7 ± 2.1		1.9 ± 2.0		1.5 ± 1.9	
Extended/Other family (M ± SD)	1.6 ± 2.7		1.7 ± 2.8		1.8 ± 2.8		1.5 ± 2.6	
<i>Peers</i>								
Any close peers	309	67	128	70	62	69	119	63
Number of close peers <sup>3</sup> (M ± SD)	3.6 ± 4.5		3.7 ± 4.4		3.3 ± 4.4		3.5 ± 4.6	
Veterans (M ± SD)	1.4 ± 2.3		1.5 ± 2.4		1.4 ± 2.1		1.4 ± 2.2	
Non-veteran friends (M ± SD)	1.8 ± 2.5		1.9 ± 2.6		1.7 ± 2.5		1.7 ± 2.4	
Co-workers other than friends and veterans (M ± SD)	.3 ± 1.2		.3 ± 1.1		.2 ± .8		.4 ± 1.4	
<i>Providers</i>								
Any close providers	180	39	70	39	36	40	74	39
Number of close providers <sup>4</sup> (M ± SD)	1.0 ± 1.8		.9 ± 1.6		1.0 ± 1.6		1.2 ± 2.1	
<b>Frequency of Contact</b>								
Total contact index <sup>5</sup> (M ± SD)	27.8 ± 30.3		29.8 ± 232.1		25.4 ± 25.8		27.1 ± 30.5	
Family contact index (M ± SD)	13.3 ± 17.4		14.3 ± 18.2		12.7 ± 15.4		12.8 ± 17.5	
Peer contact index (M ± SD)	11.7 ± 17.8		12.8 ± 19.3		9.9 ± 16.6		11.4 ± 16.8	
Provider contact index (M ± SD)	2.8 ± 6.0		2.7 ± 6.0		2.8 ± 5.2		2.9 ± 6.5	
<b>Amount of Support</b>								
Total Support Index <sup>6</sup> (M ± SD)	6.8 ± 4.8		6.9 ± 4.5		7.0 ± 5.4		6.6 ± 4.7	
Tangible Support (M ± SD)	1.4 ± 1.6		1.4 ± 1.5		1.4 ± 1.8		1.4 ± 1.7	
Instrumental Support (M ± SD)	2.1 ± 1.7		2.2 ± 1.7		2.2 ± 1.9		2.0 ± 1.6	
Emotional Support (M ± SD)	3.3 ± 2.3		3.3 ± 2.3		3.3 ± 2.4		3.2 ± 2.4	
<i>By Source of support<sup>7</sup></i>								
Family Members (M ± SD)	2.8 ± 3.0		2.8 ± 2.8		2.9 ± 3.5		2.6 ± 2.9	
Peers (M ± SD)	1.7 ± 1.8		1.9 ± 1.7		1.7 ± 1.9		1.6 ± 1.7	
Providers (M ± SD)	1.3 ± 1.3		1.3 ± 1.4		1.3 ± 1.3		1.3 ± 1.3	
Others (M ± SD)	1.0 ± 1.0		.0 ± 1.0		1.0 ± .9		1.0 ± 1.0	

Table								
Baseline Social Network Characteristics								
	Total Sample		HUD-VASH		ICM Only		Standard Care	
	N = 460		N = 182		N = 90		N = 188	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Satisfaction with Support<sup>8</sup></b>								
QOL-Social (M ± SD)	3.6 ± 1.3		3.6 ± 1.3		3.6 ± 1.1		3.5 ± 1.3	
QOL-Family (M ± SD)	4.0 ± 1.6		4.2 ± 1.6		3.8 ± 1.6		4.0 ± 1.5	

<sup>1</sup>Total Social network size was determined by the number of people the respondent considered “close” in 10 different relationship categories. The maximum number allowed per category was 8, such that possible scores on Total Network Size could range from 0 to 80, with higher numbers indicating a greater number of close network members identified.

<sup>2</sup>Number of close family members was determined by the number of people the respondent considered “close” in 6 different family relationship categories (possible scores range from 0 to 64): family of origin (parents, grandparents, and siblings, possible scores ranging from 0 to 24), 2) family of procreation (children and spouse/significant other, possible scores ranging from 0 to 16), and 3) extended family (other family, possible scores ranging from 0 to 8). Higher numbers in each category indicates a greater number of close network members identified.

<sup>3</sup>Number of close peers was determined by the number of people the respondent considered “close” in 3 different peer relationship categories (possible scores ranging from 0 to 24): other veterans, non-veteran friends, and coworkers. In each peer category, the total possible scores range from 0 to 8. Higher numbers in each category indicates a greater number of close peer network members identified.

<sup>4</sup>Possible scores range from 0 to 8, with higher numbers indicating a greater number of close providers identified.

<sup>5</sup>Contact indices are determined by the number of persons in each category x maximum frequency of contact with any individual in the category. Frequency of contact was assessed by a 0 to 6 Likert scale with higher scores indicating more frequent contact. Possible scores for contact indices range from 0 to 480 for total contact index, 0 to 384 for family contact index, 0 to 144 for peer contact index, and 0 to 48 for provider contact index. Higher scores indicate a greater amount of contact with close network members.

<sup>6</sup>Total support index was determined by the sum of the number of relationship categories that were perceived as available sources of tangible (i.e., a small loan), instrumental (i.e., a ride), and emotional support (i.e., someone to talk to if feeling depressed or suicidal). Possible scores range from 0 to 10 for each category. Total scores range from 0 to 30, with higher scores indicating greater availability of sources for multiple types of support.

<sup>7</sup>Amount of support by source of support was determined by the number of specific relationship categories identified within each domain as providing tangible, instrumental, or emotional support. Possible scores for each relationship group range from 0 to 15 for family members, 0 to 9 for peers, 0 to 3 for providers, and 0 to 6 for others, with higher scores indicating a greater number of specific relationships providing tangible, instrumental, and emotional support

<sup>8</sup>Total scores for each subscale range from 0 to 7, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with social and family relationships.

<b>Table</b>									
<b>Main Effects for Time</b>									
	<b>Baseline</b>		<b>6 Months</b>		<b>12 Months</b>		<b>18 Months</b>		
	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SE</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SE</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SE</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>SE</b>	<b>p</b>
<b>Total Network Size<sup>1</sup></b>	10.2	.3	11.8	.4	12.3	.4	12.7	.4	<.001
<i>Family</i>									
Number of close family members <sup>2</sup>	5.6	.2	5.4	.2	5.6	.2	5.8	.2	<.001
Family of origin	2.4	.1	2.3	.1	2.4	.1	2.5	.1	<.001
Family of procreation	1.6	.1	1.6	.1	1.6	.1	1.7	.1	<.001
Extended/other family	1.6	.1	1.5	.1	1.5	.1	1.6	.1	<.001
<i>Peers</i>									
Number of close peers <sup>3</sup>	3.5	.2	4.7	.2	5.1	.2	5.3	.2	<.001
Veterans	1.4	.1	2.2	.1	2.2	.1	2.3	.1	<.001
Non-veteran friends	1.8	.1	2.0	.1	2.1	.1	2.3	.1	<.001
Co-workers other than friends and veterans	0.3	.1	0.6	.1	0.8	.1	0.7	.1	<.001
<i>Providers</i>									
Number of close providers <sup>4</sup>	1.1	.1	1.7	.1	1.7	.1	1.6	.1	<.001
<b>Frequency of Contact</b>									
Total contact index <sup>5</sup>	27.1	1.4	38.6	1.6	40.8	1.5	41.1	1.6	<.001
Family contact index	12.9	.6	14.2	.7	15.0	.7	15.5	.7	<.001
Peer contact index	11.3	.9	18.5	1.0	19.8	1.0	20.3	1.0	<.001
Provider contact index	2.9	.3	6.0	.4	6.0	.4	5.3	.4	<.001
<b>Amount of Support</b>									
Total Support Index <sup>6</sup>									
Tangible support	1.4	.1	2.0	.1	1.9	.1	2.0	.1	<.001
Instrumental support	2.1	.1	2.2	.1	2.2	.1	2.2	.1	<.001
Emotional support	3.2	.1	3.4	.1	3.4	.1	3.3	.1	<.001
<b>Satisfaction with Support<sup>7</sup></b>									
QOL-Social	3.6	.0	4.3	.1	4.3	.1	4.3	.1	<.001
QOL-Family	4.0	.1	4.3	.1	4.3	.1	4.5	.1	<.001

<sup>1</sup>Total Social network size was determined by the number of people the respondent considered “close” in 10 different relationship categories. The maximum number allowed per category was 8, such that possible scores on Total Network Size could range from 0 to 80, with higher numbers indicating a greater number of close network members identified.

<sup>2</sup>Number of close family members was determined by the number of people the respondent considered “close” in 6 different family relationship categories (possible scores range from 0 to 64): family of origin (parents, grandparents, and siblings, possible scores ranging from 0 to 24), 2) family of procreation (children and spouse/significant other, possible scores ranging from 0 to 16), and 3) extended family

(other family, possible scores ranging from 0 to 8). Higher numbers in each category indicates a greater number of close network members identified.

<sup>3</sup> Number of close peers was determined by the number of people the respondent considered “close” in 3 different peer relationship categories (possible scores ranging from 0 to 24): other veterans, non-veteran friends, and coworkers. In each peer category, the total possible scores range from 0 to 8. Higher numbers in each category indicates a greater number of close peer network members identified.

<sup>4</sup> Possible scores range from 0 to 8, with higher numbers indicating a greater number of close providers identified.

<sup>5</sup> Contact indices are determined by the number of persons in each category x maximum frequency of contact with any individual in the category. Frequency of contact was assessed by a 0 to 6 Likert scale with higher scores indicating more frequent contact. Possible scores for contact indices range from 0 to 480 for Total Contact Index, 0 to 384 for Family Contact Index, 0 to 144 for Peer Contact Index, and 0 to 48 for Provider Contact Index. Higher scores indicate a greater amount of contact with close network members.

<sup>6</sup> Total Support Index was determined by the sum of the number of relationship categories that were perceived as available sources of tangible (i.e., a small loan), instrumental (i.e., a ride), and emotional support (i.e., someone to talk to if feeling depressed or suicidal). Possible scores range from 0 to 10 for each category. Total scores range from 0 to 30, with higher scores indicating greater availability of sources for multiple types of support.

<sup>7</sup> Total scores for each subscale range from 0 to 7, with higher scores indicating greater satisfaction with social and family relationships.