

Coding Manual for “What Will it Take to End Homelessness?”

Jill Palzkill Woelfer and David G. Hendry
University of Washington
The Information School
Box 352840
Seattle, WA 98195-2840

UW Information School Technical Report
IS-TR-2013-01-07

January 7, 2013

Abstract

This technical report presents a coding manual for analyzing a body of material related to the causes or explanations of homelessness, opportunities and solutions for addressing homelessness, or related aspects. The coding manual, which shows good inter-rater reliability, consists of three major codes, namely “Structural Factors,” “Individual Factors,” and “Not Possible to End Homelessness,” along with 16 sub-codes. The technical report also includes a summary of the development of the coding manual and measures of reliability, all 109 excerpts that were used in the construction of the manual, a summary of the codes applied to the excerpts, and a tutorial on the calculation of Cohen’s Kappa.

Keywords

Homelessness; Homeless Young People; Structural and Individual Factors; Coding Manual; Cohen’s Kappa

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Structure: The Top-level Codes.....	2
Suggestions for Use.....	2
The Manual: What Will it Take to End Homelessness	3
Development and Experience with the Coding Manual	5
Acknowledgements	7
Appendix A: Application of the Codes	8
Appendix B: Introduction to Calculating Cohen’s Kappa.....	9
Appendix C: Standard Coding	13
References	17

Introduction

This coding manual is intended to be used to identify the causes of homelessness and the solutions for ending homelessness. The coding manual was developed to analyze responses to the following question: “What do you think are the three most effective steps that can be taken to end homelessness?” Accordingly, this coding manual might be used to analyze material related to homelessness – causes and explanations, opportunities and solutions, or similar aspects.

In this technical report we present the coding manual, describe its development, and report on its reliability. In addition, we present a brief tutorial for computing Cohen’s Kappa in Appendix B.

Structure: The Top-level Codes

The manual consists of three main codes, the first two of which contain sub-codes:

I. STRUCTURAL FACTORS	13 sub-codes
II. INDIVIDUAL FACTORS	3 sub-codes
III. NOT POSSIBLE TO END HOMELESSNESS	no sub-codes

In addition, the manual contains one other top-level code:

IV. NOT CODEABLE	no sub-codes
-------------------------	--------------

Suggestions for Use

To “code” – the verb – means to assign one or more codes to a text excerpt, typically a phrase, a sentence, a couple of sentences, or a paragraph. Each code listed in the manual below includes a unique identifier, a label, a description of the code’s meaning, and example excerpts for which the code applies.

Each code has a different meaning, as follows:

Select the code **Structural factors** or the code **Individual factors** if an excerpt offers a way to end homelessness.

Select the code **Not possible to end homelessness** when the excerpt indicates that homelessness cannot be ended.

Select the code **Not codeable** to indicate that the excerpt lacks clarity or is so ambiguous that no code can be applied. Often, single word responses are **Not codeable**.

When coding, follow these rules:

The top-level codes are mutually independent. Accordingly, you should select one – and not more than one – top-level code.

Always select the most specific codes possible. That said, if you cannot find an appropriate specific code, you should select a general code, either **Structural factors** or **Individual factors**.

You may need to select more than one sub-code for an excerpt.

See examples below for the application of the codes and sub-codes to the excerpts.

The Manual: What Will it Take to End Homelessness

I. STRUCTURAL FACTORS

Applies to statements which indicate that the causes and solutions of homelessness originate from the structure or nature of society. Included in this category are statements that indicate that solutions for ending homelessness originate in institutions, such as in programs provided by the government, for example, education and housing programs, in non-profit entities such as those that provide life-skills training, and so on. Note: This code may be applied without a sub-code. Examples: "Help them out with programs" and "more resources."

- A. **Community involvement** – Increase community involvement which could include:
 - i) **Shift away from negative attitudes** - A shift away from negative attitudes held by individuals and communities toward homeless people. Example: "Don't automatically judge those who have less than you, As you do not know their entire situation."
 - ii) **Increased awareness** - Increased awareness of homelessness and available resources for homeless people. Example: "Raising awareness about the resources that are available to homeless."
 - iii) **Increased monetary support** - Increased monetary support and material donations to homeless people. Example: "Give what you can to those in need."
- B. **Housing** – Build more housing and subsidize the costs to make it affordable to people. Provide people with assistance, training, and support for finding housing. *Assistance* refers to any form of material aid such as help with paying a security deposit or first month's rent. *Training* refers to the development of life skills for living in housing. *Support* means help with issues that might arise after housing is secured. Examples: "Give a apt [apartment] to everyone to have for themselves" and "lower cost of rent."
- C. **Education** – Provide people with better education, schools, or training. Example: "Better education despite class, race or location."
- D. **Intergenerational homelessness** – Prevent the next generation of children from experiencing homelessness. Example: "Pre-emptive work. Stop homelessness at the roots. Most homeless children come from broken homes. Fix the home before they become homeless."
- E. **Economic or policy improvements** – Systemic changes in federal or state policy or in the economy that leads to more opportunities, improved health, and so forth. Example: "Money towards effective sources not like...certain non-effective things."
- F. **Employment** – Create more jobs suitable to unskilled and low-skilled employment. Provide people with assistance, training, or support for finding and keeping employment. *Assistance* refers to any form of material aid such as providing bus tickets. *Training* refers to classes in employment related life-skills. *Support* refers to any form of guidance or counseling. Example: "Helping youth gain + keep employment through supportive relationship."
- G. **Personal finance** – Provide people with assistance, training, and support regarding financial issues. *Assistance* refers to any form of material aid such as rent subsidies or reductions. *Training* refers to classes related to personal finance. *Support* refers to any

form of one-on-one guidance or counseling related to personal finance. Example: "elimination of financial debts."

- H. **Foster care** – Strengthen the foster care system by providing support beyond age 18. Example: "Strengthening foster care supports beyond 18. No one is completely cut off at 18 and succeeds: why do we think it is different for Foster Kids."
- I. **Incentives** – Programs that provide incentives for homeless people to make changes in their lives. Example: "Effective means of motivation."
- J. **Welfare** – Increase welfare support. Example: "Welfare actually being enough to survive on. Food stamps \$200 a month is \$6 a day or 1 sandwich."
- K. **Mental health** – Provide people with assistance and support for mental health problems. *Assistance* refers to material aid in the form of subsidized medical programs. *Support* refers to any form of guidance or counseling. Example: "Early intervention for mental health and more supports for mental health."
- L. **Substance abuse** – Provide people with assistance and support for substance abuse problems. *Assistance* refers to any form of material aid in the form of subsidized drug treatment. *Support* refers to any form of guidance or counseling. Example: "Helping youth overcome addiction with the help of supportive relationship."
- M. **Service agencies** – More service agencies that provide for basic needs or more funding to service agencies. Example: "more droppins like places with shower/laundry/bus fare/ and help to find housing."

II. INDIVIDUAL FACTORS

Applies to statements which indicate that the causes and solutions to homelessness originate within the homeless individual. Included in this category are statements regarding self-improvement, virtue, and generally overcoming adversity, such as saving money to rent an apartment.

- A. **Substance abuse** – Overcoming substance abuse. Example: "more addiction counseling so people can help there recovery."
- B. **Virtue** – Becoming more virtuous or putting aside vices. Example: "Responsibility/Values (work ethic, accountability & etc.)"
- C. **General self-improvement** – General self-improvement related to housing, employment, and other steps for leaving homelessness. Example: "1. Take care of you.; 2. Come into contact with your resource and move along with it.; 3. Set goals but don't ignore the ones that you are able to help out."

III. NOT POSSIBLE TO END HOMELESSNESS – Applies to statements which indicate that homelessness cannot be addressed or is inherent to human nature or the nature of society. Example: "There will always be homeless some people prefer to be outside."

IV. NOT CODEABLE – Applies to statements where the 1) statement is "no response," 2) the statement is incomplete, or 3) the statement is made in a way that does not allow interpretation. Example: "no response", "More of ...", "Don't Hate-Appreciate" (it is not possible to tell if this is a statement about society's attitude toward homeless people (structural) or if this is a statement about a homeless person's attitude towards others or society in general (individual)).

Note: Example excerpts are verbatim with spelling and grammatical errors uncorrected.

Development and Experience with the Coding Manual

Introduction

To develop the coding manual we began with two key, opposing concepts from the homelessness literature, namely that homelessness arises either from *individual* or from *structural* factors (Main, 1998). Under the view that homelessness arises from individual factors, such as laziness, lack of willingness to work, inability to integrate into society, alcoholism, and so on the individual is seen as being at fault and therefore in control of his or her homelessness. Under the view that homelessness arises from structural factors, homelessness arises from societal forces beyond an individual’s control, such as limited economic opportunities, wars, natural disasters, injury, lack of affordable housing, and so on. Structural and individual conceptualizations of homelessness have been more or less popular in the history of the United States, leading to opposing framings and solutions to the problem of homelessness (Koegel, 2004; Kusmer, 2002, pp. 71-97.) Indeed, the majority of homelessness researchers and subsequently the responses to homelessness in the last half of the 20th century in the US have either taken structural or individual views of homelessness, with structural views being somewhat more influential (for an example of a predominately structural account, see Dear & Wolch, 1987; for an example of a predominately individual account, see Karabanow, 2004). In his summary of a review of the homelessness literature and using the work of Spradley (1970) and Snow & Anderson (1993) as particular examples, Main (1998) proposes that neither the structural view nor the individual view are adequate and argues that the nature of homelessness lies in “the necessary interaction between structural and individual factors” (p. 52).

The interaction between structural and individual factors of homelessness was taken up by Martha Burt and her collaborators (Burt, Aron, Lee, & Valente, 2001; Burt, 2001) in seminal research that provided the rationale during the past ten years for housing policies and provision of low-cost housing throughout the United States. In this research, Burt, et al. investigated the question: “What will it take to end homelessness?” Data for answering this question came partly from the *National Survey of Homeless Assistance Providers and Clients* (Burt, et al. 1999). This survey collected data via telephone and mail surveys from nearly 12,000 homeless assistance programs from 76 sampling frames throughout the United States and via face-to-face interviews with over 4,000 clients of these programs chosen through randomized sampling. Additionally, for purposes of examining characteristics of the U.S. homeless population over time, data from the NSHAPC were compared to data from the *1987 Urban Institute Estimates of Homeless People Identified for Interview in Shelters and Soup Kitchens in Central Cities* (Burt & Cohen, 1989). Finally, NSHAPC data were augmented with data from U.S. Census household telephone surveys and data collected from homeless shelter databases.

Answering the question, “What will it take to end homelessness?” requires responses framed as solutions. However, causes and solutions of homelessness are necessarily interconnected. Simply speaking, Burt et al. (2001) needed to identify causes of homelessness before they could consider how homelessness might be ended. The overarching structural cause identified was, somewhat obviously, an inadequate supply and therefore a lack of access to, affordable housing. The overarching individual cause of homelessness was extreme poverty (i.e., incomes at less than half the federal poverty level) which is linked both to the lack of access to housing and is “... the platform upon which all other individual factors play out, towards the potential of homelessness” (Burt, et al., 2001, p. 320).

The coding manual was developed in a 4-stage process, as follows:

Stage #1: The preliminary coding manual

From the work of Burt et al. (2001), the following structural and individual solutions to ending homelessness were identified, leading to the *preliminary coding manual*:

I. STRUCTURAL

1. Increase community involvement which could include:
 - A shift away from negative attitudes held by individuals and communities toward homeless people
 - Community-led initiatives to provide housing and support
2. Build more housing and subsidize the costs to make it affordable to people with incomes below the poverty level
3. Help more people afford housing, by providing them with
 - Better schools
 - Better training
 - Better jobs
4. Prevent the next generation of children from experiencing homelessness

II. INDIVIDUAL

1. Reduce extreme poverty (incomes at less than half the federal poverty level)
2. Reduce adverse childhood experiences, including
 - Physical and sexual abuse by family members
 - Removal from one's home to be placed in foster care or other institutions
3. Reduce the incidence of and provide assistance and support to treat alcohol or drug abuse among teenagers
4. Reduce the incidence of and provide assistance and support to treat current alcohol or drug abuse among adults
5. Provide assistance and support for mental health problems
6. Provide assistance and support for chronic physical problems
7. Provide assistance and support for those who have experienced incarceration

III. CODING MANUAL DOES NOT CONTAIN APPLICABLE CODE

IV. NOT CODEABLE

Stage #2: First assessment of the coding manual

The preliminary coding manual was used by the authors to independently code a total of 109 written responses to the question: What do you think are the three most effective steps that can be taken to end homelessness?

These responses comprise data from two different studies, involving a total of 44 participants (homeless young people, $n = 37$; service providers, $n = 4$; and community members; $n = 3$). Data from all participants was considered when constructing this coding manual.

The application of each of the codes for all 109 responses was discussed by the authors. In addition responses that could not be coded with the predetermined codes in the preliminary coding manual were used to develop new categories or sub-categories.

For the four primary categories assessed individually. Using Cohen's kappa agreement was .81 for *Structural*, .74 for *Individual*, .80 for *Coding manual does not contain applicable code*, and .79 for *Not codeable*. When agreement was measured across the four primary categories, the overall Cohen's kappa was .81. Scrutiny of the codes and focused discussion of their application to the 109 responses

led to numerous changes to the preliminary coding manual, resulting in *Version 1.0* of the coding manual.

Stage #3: Assessing Version 1.0.

Working with *Version 1.0* of the coding manual, the authors again independently coded each of the 109 written responses.

Version 1.0, which is not shown here, consisted of the four top-level categories: Structural factors; Individual factors; Not possible to end homelessness; and Not codeable. The first two categories -- structural and individual factors -- contained subcategories.

For the four primary categories assessed individually, agreement was .70 for *Structural*, .78 for *Individual*, .74 for *Not possible to end homelessness* and .57 for *Not codeable*. When agreement was measured across the four primary categories, the overall Cohen's kappa was .68

As in Stage #2, the application of each of the codes for all 109 responses was discussed by the authors, and the coding manual was again revised, leading to the final version of the coding manual as shown above (pages 3-4). In addition, definitive decisions on the codes for all 109 responses were made. See Table 2 in Appendix C for a list of responses and corresponding codes.

Stage #4: Assessing the Final Version

To assess the final version of the coding manual, a volunteer was asked to use the manual to code all 109 responses. The volunteer was a graduate student in a Masters of Library and Information Science program, with prior experience in using coding manuals, but with no involvement with this project and no experience with the coding manual.

The volunteer was asked to read the coding manual carefully. Then, she was asked to apply one or more codes to each of the 109 responses. It took about 53 minutes to code all responses.

A summary of code applications and calculations of agreement between the standard and the volunteer rater are given in Table 1. Since Cohen's kappa applies to calculations of agreement across mutually exclusive categories, the coding of one excerpt was not considered since it had been coded as both *Structural* and *Individual*. Of the 23 categories and sub-categories, 22 were used, with the category II.A *Substance abuse* not being used. For the four primary categories assessed individually, agreement was .76 for "*Structural*," .93 for "*Individual*," .66 for "*Not possible to end homelessness*," and .60 for "*Not Codeable*." Across the four primary categories, the overall Cohen's kappa was .74.

Note on Interpreting Cohen's kappa, a measure of inter-rater reliability between two raters

Two commonly referenced benchmarks for interpreting the values of Cohen's kappa are Fleiss, Levin, & Paik (2003), who rate any value of κ over 0.75 as excellent agreement, between 0.40 and 0.75 as intermediate to good, and below 0.40 as poor; and Landis & Koch (1977), who rate a κ of 0.81 to 1.00 as "almost perfect" and between 0.61 and 0.80 as "substantial" agreement.

Acknowledgements

Sincere thanks to the homeless young people, service providers, and other community members for participating in this research. This technical report is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 1018008.

Appendix A: Application of Codes

Table 1 is a summary of the application of the codes, both definitive codes of the standard and the volunteer codes (Stage #4). *Note: One excerpt was coded as both *Structural* and as *Individual*. This excerpt is not considered in the analysis in Table 1, leaving 108 excerpts.

Table 2, found in Appendix C, shows the list of all 109 excerpts and the definitive codes (Stage #3).

Table 1. *Summary of code applications.*

Code	No. Applied		Inter-rater Agreement			
	Standard	Volunteer	Agree	Disagree	Percent Agreement*	Kappa
I. STRUCTURAL FACTORS	83	77	75	10	0.91	0.76
I. A. Community involvement	8	7	6	3	0.97	0.79
I. A. i. <i>Shift away from negative attitudes</i>	5	5	3	4	0.96	0.58
I. A. ii. <i>Increased awareness</i>	2	1	1	1	0.99	0.66
I. A. iii. <i>Increased monetary support</i>	1	1	1	0	1.00	1.00
I. B. Housing	29	22	22	7	0.94	0.82
I. C. Education	5	7	3	5	0.94	0.47
I. D. Intergenerational homelessness	5	3	3	2	0.98	0.74
I. E. Economic or policy improvements	7	8	5	5	0.95	0.64
I. F. Employment	18	13	13	5	0.95	0.81
I. G. Personal finance	3	3	2	2	0.98	0.66
I. H. Foster care	1	1	1	0	1.00	1.00
I. I. Incentives	1	1	1	0	1.00	1.00
I. J. Welfare	3	2	2	1	0.99	0.80
I. K. Mental health	2	1	1	1	0.99	0.66
I. L. Substance abuse	5	5	4	1	0.99	0.79
I. M. Service agencies	2	11	2	9	0.92	0.29
II. INDIVIDUAL FACTORS	7	7	7	1	0.99	1.00
II. A. Substance abuse	0	0	0	0	0	Not defined
II. B. Virtue	2	3	2	1	0.99	0.80
II. C. General self-improvement	5	4	4	1	0.99	0.88
III. NOT POSSIBLE TO END HOMELESSNESS	4	2	2	2	0.98	0.66
IV. NOT CODEABLE	14	22	12	12	0.89	0.60

*Note: Percent agreement is calculated as (Total N – Disagreement)/N.

Appendix B: Introduction to Calculating Cohen's Kappa

Cohen's kappa is a measure of inter-rater agreement (Sim & Wright, 2005; Viera & Garrett, 2005; Fleiss, Levin & Paik, 2003; Landis & Koch, 1977). It is a conservative statistical measure because unlike the percentage agreement between two coders Cohen's kappa takes into account agreement beyond that expected by a chance. As a basic illustration, note that in Table 1 the statistics of percent agreements are always higher than the corresponding kappa statistics, with the exception of perfect agreement. When the agreement between two raters is perfect, percent agreement and kappa are both equal to 1.0.

Two commonly referenced benchmarks for interpreting the values of Cohen's kappa are Fleiss, Levin, & Paik (2003), who rate any value of κ over 0.75 as excellent agreement, between 0.40 and 0.75 as intermediate to good, and below 0.40 as poor; and Landis & Koch (1977), who rate a κ of 0.81 to 1.00 as "almost perfect" and between 0.61 and 0.80 as "substantial" agreement.

The kappa statistic is calculated with the following formula:

$$k = \frac{\text{observed agreement} - \text{chance agreement}}{1 - \text{chance agreement}}$$

And, in symbols:

$$k = \frac{P_o - P_c}{1 - P_c}$$

Where P_o is the proportion observed agreement and P_c is the proportion of agreement expected by chance.

To illustrate the steps for computing kappa we shall assume that: (1) we have N items; (2) the rater's task was to review each item, one by one, and decide if a single code should be assigned or not; and (3) each item has been definitively coded; that is, we have a standard. Given this set-up our goal is to compute a measure of agreement between the volunteer rater and the standard.

Given these assumptions, to compute kappa the first step is to create a contingency table which shows the tallies of agreement and non-agreement between the volunteer rater and the standard. The contingency table takes the following form:

		RATER		Total
		Yes	No	
STANDARD	Yes	a	b	g_1
	No	c	d	g_2
Total		f_1	f_2	N

Cells a and d show the number of times that both the rater and the standard agreed, either to apply or to not apply a code. Cells b and c tally the disagreements between the rater and the standard. The marginal totals, f_1 and f_2 , tally the number of times that the rater applied or did not apply the code ($f_1 = a + c$; $f_2 = b + d$). Similarly, the marginal totals, g_1 and g_2 , show the number times that the standard applied and did not apply the code ($g_1 = a + b$; $g_2 = c + d$). Finally, the cell N shows the total number of items that were coded ($N = f_1 + f_2 = g_1 + g_2$).

Given this contingency table, the observed agreement (P_o) and the chance agreement (P_c) can be computed as follows:

$$P_o = \frac{a + d}{N}$$

$$P_c = \frac{\frac{f_1 \times g_1}{N} + \frac{f_2 \times g_2}{N}}{N}$$

We now work an example by hand. Consider the code I.F. Employment which was applied 18 times by the standard and 13 times by the volunteer rater (see Table 1). Given that 109 items were coded by the rater (and that the standard consists of definitive codes for all 109 items) we can fill in the contingency table as follows:

		RATER		Total
		Yes	No	
STANDARD	Yes	a	b	18
	No	c	d	g_2
	Total	13	f_2	109

And from this we can calculate the marginals, f_2 and g_2 , as follows:

		RATER		Total
		Yes	No	
STANDARD	Yes	a	b	18
	No	c	d	91
	Total	13	96	109

Since the rater applied the code 13 times and he or she agreed with the standard 13 times (see Table 1) we know that the value for cell a is 13. Furthermore, we can compute the value of cell b because we know that the code was applied 18 times by the standard. Thus, cell b is 5, that is, $a + b = 18$. In other words, the rater did not apply the code to 5 items where the code was in fact applied by the standard. So now the table appears as follows:

		RATER		Total
		Yes	No	
STANDARD	Yes	13	5	18
	No	c	d	91
	Total	13	96	109

From this table we can calculate the values of cells c and d, yielding the final contingency table:

		RATER		Total
		Yes	No	
STANDARD	Yes	13	5	18
	No	0	91	91
	Total	13	96	109

With the tallies in the contingency table calculated we can compute the observed agreement (P_o) and chance agreement (P_c) as follows:

$$P_o = \frac{a + d}{N} = \frac{13 + 91}{109} = 0.9541284$$

$$P_c = \frac{\frac{f_1 \times g_1}{N} + \frac{f_2 \times g_2}{N}}{N} = \frac{\frac{13 \times 18}{109} + \frac{96 \times 91}{109}}{109} = \frac{2.1467889 + 80.1467889}{109} = 0.7549869$$

Finally, we can compute the Kappa statistic as follows:

$$k = \frac{P_o - P_c}{1 - P_c} = \frac{0.9541284 - 0.7549869}{1 - 0.7549869} = \frac{0.1991415}{0.2450131} = 0.8127789$$

This concludes the example, illustrating how one code was assessed for inter-rater agreement using Cohen’s kappa.

Percent Agreement

Percent agreement is a calculation of the total number of agreed ratings divided by the total number of ratings made.

$$\text{Percent Agreement} = \frac{a + d}{N} = \frac{13 + 91}{109} = 0.9541284$$

Working Spreadsheet

To explore these calculations further, and to calculate Cohen’s kappa for your own projects, a spreadsheet, shown on the next page, is available.

The spreadsheet can be used to represent (1) a coding manual; and (2) the coding results from two coders, say a volunteer and a standard.

Using this input, the spreadsheet computes the contingency table, observed agreement (P_o), chance agreement (P_c), kappa (k), and percent agreement which is observed agreement.

To use the spreadsheet it is recommended that you follow the following steps:

1. Represent your coding manual by Names and Ids – short labels for each of your codes
2. For each excerpt enter the excerpt ID and the code that was used by coder-1 and the code that was used by coder-2
3. Enter the number of excerpts that are being coded. This value goes after the N= in cell B4. The number of excerpts will likely be different than the number of “coded excerpts” because an excerpt can be coded more than once (eg., see excerpt 1 and excerpt 3).
4. Copy the row, from F7 to U7, downwards generating a new row for each code in the coding manual.

This spreadsheet can be used to compute KAPPA and percent agreement (see "Coding Manual for 'What it will take to end homelessness?'" Technical Report, Updated DG Hendry (January 7, 2013))

CODING DATA			CODING MANUAL	TALLIES (COMPUTED)			CONTINGENCY TABLE (COMPUTED)								INTER-RATER AGREEMENT (COMPUTED)					
N= 10				MARGINALS			CELLS				KAPPA			Percent						
Excerpt	Coder-1	Coder-2	Name	ID	Agree	Coder 1	Coder 2	f1	f2	g1	g2	N	a	b	c	d	Obsv'd	Chance	Kappa	Agree
1	A	A	Code A	A	1	2	1	2	8	1	9	10	1	1	0	8	0.9	0.74	0.615385	0.9
2	A	NEW	Sub-code #A.1		1	1	1	1	9	1	9	10	1	0	0	9	1	0.82	1	1
3	B	B	Sub-code #A.2		0	0	0	0	10	0	10	10	0	0	0	10	1	1	1	1
3	B.1	B.1	Code B	B	6	7	6	7	3	6	4	10	6	1	0	3	0.9	0.54	0.782609	0.9
3	C	C	Sub-code EB.1		1	1	1	1	9	1	9	10	1	0	0	9	1	0.82	1	1
4	XXX	XXX	Code C	C	1	1	2	1	9	2	8	10	1	0	1	8	0.9	0.74	0.615385	0.9
5	B	B	New Code	NEW	0	0	1	0	10	1	9	10	0	0	1	9	0.9	0.9	0	0.9
6	B	B	Not code at	XXX	1	1	1	1	9	1	9	10	1	0	0	9	1	0.82	1	1
7	B	B	1	1	1	1		1			1	0	0					
8	B	B																		
9	B	B																		
10	B	C																		
...																		
			Region	Description																
			CODING DATA	Enter the 'raw' coding data in these three columns, indicating how coder 1 and coder 2 (which could be a standard) coded each excerpt Excerpt - The ID of the excerpt that is being coded Coder-1 - The code that coder 1 used for the excerpt Coder-2 - The code that coder 2 used for the excerpt																
			N	Enter the total number of excerpts here - this value needs to be inputted because excerpts can be coded multiple times (e.g., see excerpt 1 and 3)																
			CODING MANUAL	The coding manual is represented in these two columns. Enter this data: Name - Enter a descriptive label for the code ID - Enter a short symbolic label which stands for the code																
			TALLIES	These formulas tally the number of applications of the code -- that is, how many times coder 1 and 2 used a code and how many times they agreed Agree - The number of agreements between coder #1 and coder #2 Coder 1 - The number of times this coder used this code Coder 2 - The number of times this coder used this code																
			CONTINGENCY TABLE	These formulas draw on the tallies and value of N to compute the contingency table																
			INTER-RATER AGREEMENT	These formulas draw on the contingency table to compute the KAPPA and the percent agreement statistics																

Appendix C: Standard Coding

Table 2 shows all 109 responses and corresponding codes. These responses were collected from 44 participants to the question "What do you think are the three most effective steps that can be taken to end homelessness?"

Table 2. *Participant type, excerpts and codes applied by the Standard. HYP = Homeless young person, CM = Community member, SP = Service provider. *Note: One excerpt was coded as both Structural and as Individual.*

Type	Response	Applied Code(s)
HYP	Help from the Government and not their self	I. Structural
HYP	Help them out with programs	I. Structural
HYP	more resources	I. Structural
HYP	support groups more of them	I. Structural
SP	Deliberately develop community that makes stable, "normal" life worth living.	I. Structural
SP	Reduction of "age out" services so there is more consistency of care + development of trust.	I. Structural
HYP	Educating people as a whole, that the way they dress or what they own does define a person's worth or character.	I. Structural ; I. A. Community involvement I. A. i. Shift away from negative attitudes
HYP	Awareness of what causes people to become homeless.	I. Structural ; I. A. Community involvement I. A. i. Shift away from negative attitudes
HYP	Don't automatically judge those who have less than you, As you do not know their entire situation.	I. Structural ; I. A. Community involvement I. A. i. Shift away from negative attitudes
HYP	Social awareness education	I. Structural; I. A. Community involvement I. A. i. Shift away from negative attitudes
HYP	Equality of all people; if employers were not biased to those without a hom [sic], a lot more homeless [sic] would have jobs and homes.	I. Structural ; I. A. Community involvement I. A. i. Shift away from negative attitudes I. F. Employment
HYP	Society as a whole ACTUALLY caring and being concerned and wanting to do something about it and doin [sic] it	I. Structural ; I. A. Community involvement I. A. ii. Increased awareness
CM	Raising awareness about the resources that are available to homeless	I. Structural ; I. A. Community involvement I. A. ii. Increased awareness
HYP	Give what you can to those in need	I. Structural ; I. A. Community involvement I. A. iii. Increased monetary support
HYP	Abandon the idea of paying rent.	I. Structural ; I. B. Housing
HYP	aftercare into permanent housing	I. Structural ; I. B. Housing
HYP	better housing programs	I. Structural ; I. B. Housing
HYP	Build housing for impoverished people.	I. Structural ; I. B. Housing
HYP	Build more low income housing	I. Structural ; I. B. Housing
HYP	Cheap housing	I. Structural ; I. B. Housing
HYP	Cheaper housing or more rental help. I need it.	I. Structural ; I. B. Housing
HYP	Give a apt to everyone to have for themselves.	I. Structural ; I. B. Housing
HYP	Give a homeless person a house	I. Structural ; I. B. Housing
HYP	giving people places to live a night and day	I. Structural ; I. B. Housing
HYP	Have a place for homeless people that a good place to stay at nice a clean	I. Structural ; I. B. Housing
HYP	lower cost of rent	I. Structural ; I. B. Housing
HYP	Massive affordable housing incentives	I. Structural ; I. B. Housing
HYP	more affordable permanent housing	I. Structural ; I. B. Housing
HYP	more government housing - AKA Section Eight	I. Structural ; I. B. Housing
HYP	More help with getting into housing	I. Structural ; I. B. Housing
HYP	More inexpensive housing	I. Structural ; I. B. Housing
HYP	more shelter all ages	I. Structural ; I. B. Housing

HYP	more transitional housing so people can go to school or work and have a safe place to relax at the end of the day.	I. Structural ; I. B. Housing
HYP	spend money on shelters instead of advertisements for political people	I. Structural ; I. B. Housing
HYP	supportive housing	I. Structural ; I. B. Housing
CM	increase affordable and/or subsidized housing stock in the city.	I. Structural ; I. B. Housing
SP	Helping youth access housing through + with supportive relationship	I. Structural ; I. B. Housing
SP	Make wholistic [sic] & relevant support service more available to faolks [sic] in need. This includes housing for those readt [sic] and willing to enter housing.	I. Structural ; I. B. Housing
HYP	Quit building prisons or turn them into shelters. Christina gregoire [sic] is too busy trying to lock everyone up and cutting G.A.U. (General Assistance – Unemployable)	I. Structural; I. B. Housing I. E. Economic or policy improvements I. J. Welfare
HYP	Reason; a lot of homeless individuals feel it is hopeless to try. Without a home, a job, or money, an individual has difficulty succeeding in our society.	I. Structural; I. B. Housing; I. F. Employment
SP	increase in low barrier services for individuals; housing treatment, life skills, job training/readiness	I. Structural; I. B. Housing; I. F. Employment I. L. Substance abuse
CM	Provide integrated support system to those in need. (Combined ongoing Housing, financial [sic] life skills, etc.).	I. Structural; I. B. Housing; I. G. Personal finance
HYP	more droppins [sic] like places with shower/laundry/bus fare/ and help to find housing	I. Structural; I. B. Housing; I. M. Service agencies
HYP	Better education despite class, race, or location.	I. Structural; I. C. Education
HYP	Education, training, and patience.	I. Structural; I. C. Education
HYP	Free education.	I. Structural; I. C. Education
HYP	School Improvement	I. Structural; I. C. Education
HYP	Balanced upbringing [sic]; a vast majority of homeless [sic] individuals were not cared for as children and adolescence and resorted to drug use or crime.	I. Structural; I. D. Intergenerational homelessness
HYP	Pre-emptive work. Stop homelessness at the roots. Most homeless children come from broken homes. Fix the home before they become homeless.	I. Structural; I. D. Intergenerational homelessness
CM	Early intervention. If someone is headed down the wrong road that should be better/more resources to get people back on track.	I. Structural; I. D. Intergenerational homelessness
CM	increase support for early childhood programs - by support + subsidies, training, family/parent support for families in early childhood programs.	I. Structural; I. D. Intergenerational homelessness
SP	Strengthening the family core. Keeping kids in homes & out of foster care	I. Structural; I. D. Intergenerational homelessness
HYP	Better Economy (but that's obvious) (universal healthcare too!)	I. Structural; I. E. Economic or policy improvements
HYP	Get a government that cares.	I. Structural; I. E. Economic or policy improvements
HYP	Money towards effective sources not like....certain non-effective things	I. Structural; I. E. Economic or policy improvements
HYP	They need to be put first on the national level	I. Structural; I. E. Economic or policy improvements
HYP	Stop decreasing government funded SSI and GAU checks	I. Structural; I. E. Economic or policy improvements I. J. Welfare
HYP	Drug Law/Policy reform. Education/Treatment vs. Jail	I. Structural; I. E. Economic or policy improvements I. L. Substance abuse
HYP	Actual Equal opportunity jobs other than Major corporations.	I. Structural; I. F. Employment
HYP	Available employment	I. Structural; I. F. Employment
HYP	Comprehensive, individualized Training/Labor programs.	I. Structural; I. F. Employment
HYP	helping with finding a job, after the other top two are handled	I. Structural; I. F. Employment
HYP	Interesting Jobs (homeless people are usually disinterested in boring occupations)	I. Structural; I. F. Employment
HYP	Job creation	I. Structural; I. F. Employment
HYP	Job retention	I. Structural; I. F. Employment
HYP	More "no experience needed" jobs / working programs	I. Structural; I. F. Employment

HYP	More jobs	I. Structural; I. F. Employment
HYP	more jobs or job training programs so people that have next to nothing can afford simple necessities	I. Structural; I. F. Employment
HYP	more work for actual Americans	I. Structural; I. F. Employment
CM	increase employment opportunities and services to assist people seeking employment.	I. Structural; I. F. Employment
CM	Training and coaching on finding & keeping employment.	I. Structural; I. F. Employment
SP	Assist people interested in working to obtain and keep good jobs. ("Good" meaning consistent [sic], safe, human jobs that earn a living wage)	I. Structural; I. F. Employment
SP	Helping youth gain + keep employment through supportive relationship	I. Structural; I. F. Employment
HYP	elimination of financial debts	I. Structural; I. G. Personal finance
HYP	money management	I. Structural; I. G. Personal finance
SP	Strengthening foster care supports beyond 18. No one is completely cut off at 18 and succeeds: why do we think it is different for Foster Kids	I. Structural; I. H. Foster care
HYP	Effective means of motivation	I. Structural; I. I. Incentives
HYP	Welfare actually being enough to survive on. Food stamps \$200 a month is \$6 a day or 1 sandwich	I. Structural; I. J. Welfare
SP	Early intervention for mental health and more supports for mental health	I. Structural; I. K. Mental health
CM	Substance abuse support/program & mental health support.	I. Structural; I. K. Mental health; I. L. Substance abuse
HYP	More proactive addiction help	I. Structural; I. L. Substance abuse
SP	Helping youth overcome addiction with the help of supportive relationship	I. Structural; I. L. Substance abuse
*HYP	more addiction counseling [sic] so people can help there recovery	I. Structural; I. L. Substance abuse II. Individual; II. A. Substance abuse
HYP	Funding [sic] going to the right providers for legitimate reasons.	I. Structural; I. M. Service agencies
HYP	Responsibility/Values (work ethic, accountability & etc.)	II. Individual; II. B. Virtue
HYP	stop quitting [sic], a lot of homeless people give up on everything once they become homeless	II. Individual; II. B. Virtue
HYP	1. Awareness within self; 2. a goal; 3. and a procedure	II. Individual; II. C. General self-improvement
HYP	1. set healthy goals; 2. Be a part of the community; 3. To feel the best about how and what is accomplished toward a happy and healthy future.	II. Individual; II. C. General self-improvement
HYP	1. Take care of you; 2. Come into contact with your resource and move along with it.; 3. Set goals but don't ignore the ones that you are able to help out.	II. Individual; II. C. General self-improvement
HYP	get yourself into transitional housing.	II. Individual; II. C. General self-improvement
HYP	save up some money and get apartment/room [sic]	II. Individual; II. C. General self-improvement
HYP	if I knew I'd Not Be Homeless	III. Not possible to end homelessness
HYP	I don't know if there are any steps	III. Not possible to end homelessness
HYP	In my opinion, you can't really rid of homelessness -- I say that because America classifies people by income -- and plus it's the government that deals with taxes and all that income. Rhetorical question -- it's life.	III. Not possible to end homelessness
HYP	There will always be homeless some people prefer to be outside.	III. Not possible to end homelessness
HYP	Attention	IV. Not codeable
HYP	Don't Hate-Appreciate :-)	IV. Not codeable
HYP	employment	IV. Not codeable
HYP	Get the shit beat out of you (LOL)	IV. Not codeable
HYP	More of...	IV. Not codeable
HYP	More Workshops	IV. Not codeable
HYP	No Response	IV. Not codeable
HYP	No Response	IV. Not codeable
HYP	No Response	IV. Not codeable
HYP	Opportunity	IV. Not codeable

HYP	Reexamine the status quo.	IV. Not codeable
HYP	Unity	IV. Not codeable
CM	Education	IV. Not codeable
SP	Education	IV. Not codeable

References

- Burt, M., Aron, L. Y., Douglas, T., Valente, J., Lee, E., & Iwen, B. (1999). Findings of the national survey of homeless assistance providers and clients: Technical report. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute. Retrieved from:
http://www.huduser.org/portal/publications/homeless/homeless_tech.html
- Burt, M. (2001). *What will it take to end homelessness? Policy brief*. Retrieved from:
<http://www.urban.org/publications/310305.html>
- Burt, M. Aron, L. Y., Lee, E., & Valente, J. (2001). *Helping America's homeless: Emergency shelter or affordable housing?* Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press.
- Burt, M., & Cohen, B. E. (1989). *America's homeless: Numbers, characteristics, and the programs that serve them*. Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute Press.
- Dear, M. J., & Wolch, J. R. (1987). *Landscapes of despair: From deinstitutionalization to homelessness*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Fleiss, J. L., Levin, B., & Paik, M. C. (2003). *Statistical methods for rates and proportions* (3rd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Karabanow, J. (2004). *Being young and homeless: Understanding how youth enter and exit street life*. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing, Inc.
- Koegel, P. (2004). Causes of homelessness: Overview. In *Encyclopedia of Homelessness* (Vol. 1, pp. 50-58). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kusmer, K. L. (2002). *Down and out, on the road: The homeless in American history*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Landis, J., & Koch, G. (1977). The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics*, 33, 159-174.
- Main, T. (1998). How to think about homelessness: Balancing structural and individual causes. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless*, 7(1), 41-54.
- Sim, J., & Wright, C. C. (2005). The Kappa statistic in reliability studies: Use, interpretation, and sample size requirements. *Physical Therapy*, 85, 257-268.
- Snow, D. & Anderson, L. (1993). *Down on their luck: A study of homeless street people*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Spradley, J. P. (1970). *You owe yourself a drunk: An ethnography of urban nomads*. Boston, MA: Little, Brown and Company.
- Viera, A. J., & Garrett, J. M. (2005). Understanding interobserver agreement: The Kappa statistic. *Family Medicine*, 37(5), 360-363.