



# Consumers and Housing

## Type of Housing

- Own home: Own apartment/house
- Family: Relative's house/apartment
- Supervised: Supervised housing, group home, nursing home, or board and care
- Other: Friend's house/apartment, boardinghouse room, hotel room, YMCA/YWCA room, shelter, on the street
- Missing: Missing data

Type of Housing	Time 1 - 1991	Time 2 - 1992	Time 3 - 1993	Time 4 - 1995
Own Home	53% (172/323)	58% (187/323)	56% (182/323)	63% (203/323)
Family	16% (53/323)	16% (51/323)	17% (53/323)	14% (45/323)
Supervised	18% (57/323)	15% (47/323)	17% (56/323)	19% (61/323)
Other	9% (29/323)	8% (27/323)	6% (20/323)	4% (14/323)
Missing	4% (12/323)	3% (11/323)	4% (12/323)	0

## Stability of Housing Across SIS/LCO

- There was a significant increase in the number of consumers living on their own across the 4 years of the study ( $Q = 15.77, p < .01$ ).
- There was no significant change in the number of consumers living with family across the 4 years of the study ( $Q = 2.28, p > .05$ ).
- There was no significant change in the number of consumers living in supervised housing across the 4 years of the study ( $Q = 6.65, p > .05$ ).
- There was a significant decrease in the number of consumers living in other housing across the 4 years of the study ( $Q = 8.21, p < .05$ ).

HOUSING CHANGES		
Type of Change	n	% of total
<b>No Change (same housing each year)</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>60</b>
Own home	124	44
Live with family	21	7
Supervised housing	26	9
<b>More Independent</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>22</b>
Supervised housing to Own home	16	6
Live with family to Own home	41	14
Supervised housing to Live with family	5	2
<b>More Dependent</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>18</b>
Own home to Supervised housing	17	5
Own home to Live with family	30	11
Live with family to Supervised housing	5	2

## Type of Housing in Relation to Demographics

For all 4 years of the study. . .

### Gender

- Males were more likely to live with family, less likely to live in own home.
- Females were more likely to live in own home, less likely to live with family.

### Minority Status

- Minorities were more likely to live with family members.

### Age

- 18 - 30 year olds were more likely to live with family, less likely to live in their own home.
- 46 - 65 year olds were more likely to live in own home, less likely to live with family.
- 66 + year olds were more likely to live in supervised housing (nursing homes) and less likely to live in their own home.

### Marital Status

- Married individuals were more likely to live in their own home, less likely to live with family.

### Primary Diagnosis

- Individuals with schizophrenia were more likely to live in supervised housing, less likely to live in own home.

### Board Area

- Individuals in Montgomery and Trumbull Board areas (urban sites) were more likely to live with family.
- Individuals in 4-County and ALS areas (rural sites) were less likely to live with family, more likely to live in own home.

## Type of Housing in Relation to Housing Tenure

### Length of Residence

- The average length of residence was approximately 10 years for consumers living with family, 5 years for consumers living in their own home, and 3 years for consumers in supervised housing.
- For Time 2 - Time 4, consumers living with family had been at their current residence significantly longer than consumers living on their own and consumers in supervised housing.

### Number of Other Places Lived in the Past Year

- There was no significant relationship between type of housing and the number of other places lived in the past year.

### Desire to Move - Time 4 Results Only

- 57% (185/323) of the consumers wanted to stay where they were currently living.
- 29% (93/323) wanted to move elsewhere.
- 14% (45/323) responded conditionally, stating that moving or staying was dependent upon certain conditions being met.
- Older consumers wanted to stay at their current place of residence while younger consumers wanted to move elsewhere.
- There was no significant relationship between type of housing and desire to move.

## Type of Housing in Relation to Service Variables

### Having a Case Manager

- At Time 1, a larger proportion of consumers living in their own home reported that they did not have a case manager.
- At Time 4, a larger proportion of consumers living in their own home reported that they did not have a case manager while a larger proportion of consumers in supervised housing reported having a case manager.

### Frequency of Meeting with Case Manager

- At Time 1 and Time 2, consumers in supervised housing reported seeing their case manager more frequently than consumers living in their own home and consumers living with family.

### Number of Hospitalizations

- At Time 1, consumers in supervised housing reported more hospitalizations than consumers living in their own home.

## Type of Housing in Relation to Service Empowerment

### Sufficiency of Contact

- There was no significant relationship between type of housing and consumers' reports of having enough contact with people from the mental health agency.

### Say in Services

- There was no significant relationship between type of housing and consumers' reports of having enough say in the services that they receive.

## Type of Housing in Relation to Housing Choice

### Housing Choice

- At Time 1, Time 2, and Time 3 consumers were asked how much choice they had in where or with whom they lived. They could respond "none", "some", or "a lot". The results showed:
  - At Time 1 and Time 2, consumers living in their own home reported having more choice than consumers living with family and consumers in supervised housing.
  - At Time 3, consumers living in their own home reported more choice than consumers in supervised housing.
- At Time 4, consumers were asked different questions concerning housing choice. They were asked how much choice they had over who they lived with, where they would like to live if they had their choice, and how important it was to them to have a choice over who they lived with and where they lived. The results showed:
  - With regard to choosing who they live with, , ,
    - Consumers living in their own home reported having more choice over who they lived with than consumers living with family and consumers in supervised housing.
    - Consumers living with family reported having more choice over who they lived with than consumers in supervised housing.
    - Choice over who consumers lived with was significantly more important to consumers living in their own home than consumers in supervised housing.
  - With regard to choosing where to live. . .
    - 84% (266/316) would choose to live in their own apartment/house.
    - 4% (14/316) would choose to live with their family.
    - 7% (21/316) would choose to live in supervised housing.
    - 5% (15/316) would choose to live in other housing.
    - Consumers in the different housing groups reported that they would live in the same type of housing if they had a choice. For example, consumers living with family would choose to live with their family significantly more often than consumers living with family or in supervised housing.
    - A lower percentage of older consumers preferred to live in their own home than younger consumers.
    - A significant percentage of consumers with affective disorders preferred to live in their own home while a significant percentage of consumers with schizophrenia preferred to live with family.
    - Choice over where consumers lived was significantly more important to consumers living in their own home and consumers living with family than consumers in supervised housing.

## Type of Housing in Relation to Subjective Quality of Life Ratings

### Housing Quality of Life

- There was no significant relation between type of housing and consumers' rating of housing quality of life.

### Leisure Quality of Life

- At Time 1 - Time 3, consumers living in their own home felt worse about their leisure quality of life than consumers living with family and consumers in supervised housing.

### Family Quality of Life

- At Time 3, consumers in their own home felt worse about their family quality of life than consumers living with their family.

### Financial Quality of Life

- At Time 1, consumers living in their own home felt worse about their financial quality of life than consumers in supervised housing.
- At Time 2 - Time 4, consumers living in their own home felt worse about their financial quality of life than consumers living with family and consumers in supervised housing.

### Global Quality of Life

- At Time 1, consumers living in their own home felt worse about their quality of life in general than consumers in supervised housing.

## **Children at Home in Relation to Housing - Year 4 Only**

### **Type of Housing**

- Significantly fewer consumers in supervised housing had children living with them than consumers living in their own home,

### **Desire to Move**

- No significant relationship between having children at home and the desire to move to a different residence.

### **Number of Other Places Lived in the Past Year**

- No significant relationship between having children at home and the number of other places lived in the past year.

### **Help Needed, Help Received, and Importance - Finding and Keeping Housing**

- No significant relationship between having children at home and needing help, receiving help, and importance with regard to finding and keeping housing.

### **Subjective Housing Quality of Life Ratings**

- Consumers whose children live with them sometimes felt better about the amount of freedom they had than consumers whose children live with them all of the time and consumers who live with some but not all of their children.

## **Summary**

- The number of consumers living on their own has increased across the years of the study.
- Gender differences in housing support employment and income results. Males tend to live with family and tend to be more satisfied with their financial situation while women tend to live on their own and are less satisfied with their financial situation.
- Living with family tends to be more long-term than living alone or in supervised housing.
- Most consumers want to stay where they are currently living.
- Consumers in supervised housing tend to have case managers and to see their case managers more often than consumers living in their own home. This may suggest the need for more community programs to reach consumers who live on their own or it may indicate that consumers living on their own need fewer case management services than consumers in supervised housing.
- Consumers living in their own home reported having more choice with regard to housing and reported that having a choice in housing was more important to them than consumers living with family or in supervised housing.
- In earlier years, consumers living on their own tended to report lower levels of satisfaction in various areas of life, including leisure, family, financial, and global. However, at Time 4, consumers living in their own home only felt worse than consumers living with family and consumers in supervised housing with regard to financial quality of life. It seems that efforts to improve social interaction and the ability of consumers living on their own to structure their own lives may be having an impact on perceptions of quality of life. Still, quality of life issues need to be examined further with regard to different housing groups.
- Having children at home does not seem to be related to many housing variables.