



EUROPEAN  
COMMISSION

Community research

## **EU RESEARCH ON SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES**

### ***Constructing Understandings of Homeless Populations***

***CUHP***

## **Interested in European research?**

**Research\*eu** is our monthly magazine keeping you in touch with main developments (results, programmes, events, etc.). It is available in English, French, German and Spanish. A free sample copy or free subscription can be obtained from:

European Commission  
Directorate-General for Research  
Communication Unit  
B-1049 Brussels  
Fax (32-2) 29-58220  
E-mail: [research-eu@ec.europa.eu](mailto:research-eu@ec.europa.eu)  
Internet: <http://ec.europa.eu/research/research-eu>

## **EUROPEAN COMMISSION**

Directorate-General for Research  
Directorate L — Science, economy and society  
B-1049 Brussels  
Fax (32-2) 2994462

<http://ec.europa.eu/research/social-sciences>  
[http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/cooperation/socio-economic\\_en.html](http://cordis.europa.eu/fp7/cooperation/socio-economic_en.html)

# **EU RESEARCH ON SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES**

## **Constructing Understandings of Homeless Populations**

**CUHP**

**Final report**

HPSE-CT-2002-50014

**Funded under the Key Action  
'Improving the Socio-economic Knowledge Base' of FP5**

**DG Research  
European Commission**

Issued in  
Detail not available

**Coordinator of project:**  
Institut national d'études démographiques  
Paris, France  
Maryse Marpsat  
[www.cuhp.org](http://www.cuhp.org)

**Partners:**  
Metropolitan Research Institute Ltd, Budapest, HU, Ivan Tosics  
Politecnico di Milano, Dipartimento di Architettura e Pianificazione, IT, Antonio Tosi  
Nederlands Institute voor Zorg en Welzijn (NIZW), Centre for Social Policy, Utrecht, NL,  
Lia van Doorn  
Danish National Institute of Social Research, Department for Social Policy, Copenhagen,  
DK, Tobias Boerner Stax  
Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Facultad de Psicología, ES,  
Manuel Muñoz, Carmelo Vasquez  
Centre for Housing and Community Research, Staffordshire University, Stoke-on-Trent,  
UK, Joan Mary Smith

***EUROPE DIRECT is a service to help you find answers  
to your questions about the European Union***

Freephone number(\*):  
**00 800 6 7 8 9 10 11**

(\* Certain mobile telephone operators do not allow access to 00 800 numbers  
or these calls may be billed

## **LEGAL NOTICE**

Neither the European Commission nor any person acting on behalf of the Commission is responsible for the use which might be made of the following information.

The views expressed in this publication are the sole responsibility of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Commission.

A great deal of additional information on the European Union is available on the Internet.  
It can be accessed through the Europa server (<http://europa.eu>).

Cataloguing data can be found at the end of this publication.

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities, 2007

ISBN 978-92-79-07568-1

© European Communities, 2007

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

*Printed in Belgium*

PRINTED ON WHITE CHLORINE-FREE PAPER

## **Preface**

Within the Fifth Community RTD Framework Programme of the European Union (1998-2002), the Key action 'Improving the Socio-economic Knowledge Base' had broad and ambitious objectives, namely: to improve our understanding of the structural changes taking place in European society, to identify ways of managing these changes and to promote the active involvement of European citizens in shaping their own futures. A further important aim was to mobilise the research communities in the social sciences and humanities at the European level and to provide scientific support to policies at various levels, with particular attention to EU policy fields.

This Key Action had a total budget of EUR 155 million and was implemented through three Calls for proposals. As a result, 185 projects involving more than 1 600 research teams from 38 countries have been selected for funding and have started their research between 1999 and 2002.

Most of these projects are now finalised and results are systematically published in the form of a final report.

The calls have addressed different but interrelated research themes which have contributed to the objectives outlined above. These themes can be grouped under a certain number of areas of policy relevance, each of which are addressed by a significant number of projects from a variety of perspectives.

These areas are the following:

- ***Societal trends and structural change***  
16 projects, total investment of EUR 14.6 million, 164 teams
- ***Quality of life of European citizens***  
5 projects, total investment of EUR 6.4 million, 36 teams
- ***European socio-economic models and challenges***  
9 projects, total investment of EUR 9.3 million, 91 teams
- ***Social cohesion, migration and welfare***  
30 projects, total investment of EUR 28 million, 249 teams
- ***Employment and changes in work***  
18 projects, total investment of EUR 17.5 million, 149 teams
- ***Gender, participation and quality of life***  
13 projects, total investment of EUR 12.3 million, 97 teams
- ***Dynamics of knowledge, generation and use***  
8 projects, total investment of EUR 6.1 million, 77 teams
- ***Education, training and new forms of learning***  
14 projects, total investment of EUR 12.9 million, 105 teams
- ***Economic development and dynamics***  
22 projects, total investment of EUR 15.3 million, 134 teams
- ***Governance, democracy and citizenship***  
28 projects; total investment of EUR 25.5 million, 233 teams
- ***Challenges from European enlargement***  
13 projects, total investment of EUR 12.8 million, 116 teams
- ***Infrastructures to build the European research area***  
9 projects, total investment of EUR 15.4 million, 74 teams

This publication contains the final report of the project 'Constructing Understandings of Homeless Populations', whose work has primarily contributed to the area 'Societal and individual well being: social trends, the implications of structural changes and of technological development'.

The report contains information about the main scientific findings of CUHP and their policy implications. The research was carried out by seven teams over a period of three years, starting in January, 2003.

The abstract and executive summary presented in this edition offer the reader an overview of the main scientific and policy conclusions, before the main body of the research provided in the other chapters of this report.

As the results of the projects financed under the Key Action become available to the scientific and policy communities, Priority 7 'Citizens and Governance in a Knowledge-based society' of the Sixth Framework Programme is building on the progress already made and aims at making a further contribution to the development of a European Research Area in the social sciences and the humanities.

I hope readers find the information in this publication both interesting and useful as well as clear evidence of the importance attached by the European Union to fostering research in the field of social sciences and the humanities.

J.-M. BAER,

Director

## Table of contents

<b>Preface</b>	<b>v</b>
<b>I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>1. Objectives, composition and organization of the network</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>2. Definitions, methods and national contexts</b>	<b>14</b>
2.11 The main divisions in the development of the definitions	15
2.2. First division: a legislation on homelessness	15
2.3. Second division: the linkage between the definition and social housing allocation	15
2.4. Third division: a multidimensional definition or not	16
2.5. Fourth division: classifying housing, household or individual situations?	16
2.6. Hidden homelessness	16
2.7. Towards a European classification system	17
<b>3. Methodology</b>	<b>18</b>
3.1. Qualitative methods	18
3.2. Complementarity between quantitative and qualitative methods	18
3.3. Classification of methods	20
3.4. Point-in-time quantitative data	24
3.5. Longitudinal statistical data	26
3.6. Questions in surveys on the general population	28
3.7. Conclusion: adapting the method chosen to questions, resources, and national context	28
<b>4. Theoretical, ethical and structural issues</b>	<b>29</b>
4.1. Theoretical issues	29
4.2. Ethical issues	30
4.3. Structural issues	30
<b>5. NGO perspectives</b>	<b>31</b>
5.1. Housing needs and homelessness	32
5.2. New homeless populations	33
5.3. Homelessness among immigrant populations	33
5.4. Changing services for the homeless	34
5.5. Services and the use of volunteer workers	35
5.6. Other issues	35
5.7. Research issues and NGOs	36
5.8. Conclusion	36
<b>6. Policy implications</b>	<b>37</b>

6.1. Prevention and early intervention strategies	37
6.2. Acting upon socio-economic factors and legislation	38
6.3. A few remarks on services	38
<b>7. Dissemination and exploitation of results</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>II. BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>1. The CUHP: a European “thematic network”</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>2. Composition of the network</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>3. Main aims of the network</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>II. SCIENTIFIC DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT RESULTS AND METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>1. The organization of the network</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>2. The deliverables</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>3. Day 1: Methodological, theoretical and ethical issues in research</b>	<b>50</b>
3.1. Definitions, methods and national contexts	50
3.2. Point-in-time surveys (PIT) and further questions on the classification of methods	54
3.3. Longitudinal analysis	56
3.4. Qualitative methods	59
3.5. Hidden homelessness	62
<b>4. Day 2:NGO perspectives</b>	<b>65</b>
4.1. NGOs, the State and homeless services	66
4.2. Perspectives on housing need and homelessness	70
4.2.1. Homeless populations, describing homelessness and legal definitions of homelessness	70
4.2.2. The Right to Housing	76
4.2.3. Special housing for homeless people	78
4.2.4. Meeting the demands of multiple systems	80
4.2.5. Conclusions	81
4.3. New homeless populations	82
4.3.1. Family policy and homelessness	82
4.3.2. Homelessness among immigrant populations	84
4.3.3. Homelessness among Women	89
4.3.4. New Populations: the Homeless Working Poor	93
4.3.5. Conclusions	93
4.4. Changing services for the homeless	94
4.4.1. The development of emergency services on the street – What is appropriate?	95
4.4.2. Changes in Shelter Provision and ways of working	101

4.4.3. Services and the use of volunteer workers	103
4.4.4. Advice Services for all homeless populations	105
4.4.5. Organisations of the Homeless	105
4.4.6. Working to influence the wider community	107
4.4.7. Conclusions: The Human Rights of homeless people	109
4.5. Research issues and NGOs	110
4.5.1. Prioritising Research Questions	110
4.5.2. Research that changes the perspective on homelessness	114
4.5.3. Researching homelessness from the perspective of the homeless person	115
4.5.4. Research and its uses	117
4.5.5. Conclusion	118
<b>5. The final conference: "Research on homelessness in comparative perspective"</b>	<b>119</b>
5.1. The framework of the conference	120
5.2. Definitions	122
5.3. Theories: Social capital, risk and social exclusion	124
5.4. Methodology: quantitative, qualitative and complementarity	126
5.5. Experience from other countries	134
5.6. Round table	137
<b>IV. CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS</b>	<b>138</b>
<b>1. Definitions</b>	<b>138</b>
1.1. The main divisions in the development of the definitions	139
1.2. First division: a legislation on homelessness	139
1.3. Second division: the linkage between the definition and social housing allocation	139
1.4. Third division: a multidimensional definition or not	140
1.5. Fourth division: classifying housing, household or individual situations?	140
1.6. Towards a European classification system	141
<b>2. Methodology</b>	<b>142</b>
2.1. Complementarity between quantitative and qualitative methods	142
2.2. Classification of statistical sources	144
2.3. Point-in-time data	145
2.4. Longitudinal data	149
2.5. Qualitative methods	150
2.6. Questions in surveys of the general population	151
2.7. Conclusion: adapting the method chosen to questions, resources, and national context	151

<b>3. Policy implications</b>	<b>153</b>
3.1. Prevention and early intervention strategies	153
3.2. Acting upon socio-economic factors and legislation	154
3.3. A few remarks on services	154
<b>V. DISSEMINATION AND EXPLOITATION OF RESULTS</b>	<b>156</b>
<b>VI. REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>160</b>
<b>VII. ANNEXES</b>	<b>161</b>
<b>1. Map of competencies</b>	<b>161</b>
<b>2. List of all partner organisations (2005)</b>	<b>187</b>
<b>3. List of members CUHP network</b>	<b>190</b>
<b>4. Final conference programme</b>	<b>194</b>
<b>5. CUHP website</b>	<b>201</b>

## **Abstract**

CUHP (Constructing Understandings of Homeless Populations) is a thematic network on homelessness, funded by the European Commission and coordinated by the French National Institute of Demographic Studies (INED), during the period January 2003-December 2005. It has brought together seven teams with multidisciplinary expertise in the field of homelessness research, from the Cities Institute of the London Metropolitan University (LMU), the Danish National Institute of Social Research (SFI), the Dipartimento di Architettura e Pianificazione of the Politecnico di Milano (DiAP), the Facultad de Psicología, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, the French Institut National d'Études Démographiques (INED), the Hungarian Metropolitan Research Institute (MRI), and the Nederlands Instituut voor Zorg en Welzijn (NIZW).

The main purpose of the network was to describe and map various methodological approaches to the study of homelessness, examining the relationship between methodology and policy context, and between methodology and theory. With help from representatives of NGOs and public agencies in five cities, it has also explored priorities for research in relation to different homeless populations. Most of the works were discussed and presented during five workshops, which were held place in different cities (Paris and Madrid in 2003, Copenhagen and London in 2004, Milan in 2005), and the most important conclusions were presented at the concluding conference in Brussels on November 3-4, 2005. The papers delivered during this 3-year period and some other relevant documentation can be found on the website [www.cuhp.org](http://www.cuhp.org) <sup>1</sup>.

The final report presents CUHP's reflections on the issues of definition, ethics, and theoretical approach (social capital, risk, social exclusion...), as well as methodological recommendations on quantitative and qualitative methods. The network proposes a classification of research methods, and gives guidelines for adapting methods to questions and resources: it deals in particular with the choice between point-in-time or longitudinal statistical data, qualitative or quantitative approaches, and with questions for inclusion in surveys on the general population. It also relates methodological and policy experience from other countries, and integrates the preoccupations of NGOs and policy makers. Finally, some policy implications are developed, particularly on the issue of prevention strategies.

---

<sup>1</sup> These papers were directly communicated to the European Commission through 7 separate deliverables.

## **I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **1. Objectives, composition and organization of the network**

The CUHP thematic network contributes on “homeless populations”, while giving the research an operational purpose. The angle of approach chosen is that of methodology. If the “main objective of the network is to create focused discussions on methodological procedures that produce robust results when used to research homeless populations”, this finds concrete expression primarily in “a guide to methods<sup>2</sup> that can be replicated in other countries or at the national level, and are adequate to answer particular policy questions and improve scientific knowledge”. For this it is necessary to establish conditions for comparison, to study the possibility of developing a common definition, and to acquire an understanding of the homelessness issue in the various national contexts. Hence the second objective of the network is to produce “a focused discussion on the different definitions of homelessness employed by researchers, NGOs and policy makers in different member states” in order to “provide a framework for comparative research across member states”, while the third seeks “to share the substantive findings of research teams in different nation states, and for those research teams to also summarise the important policy issues that have emerged in their nation states”<sup>3</sup>.

The network comprises about twenty partners belonging to seven research institutes each in a different country: the Institut national d'études démographiques (France), the Danish national institute of Social Research (Denmark), the Facultad de Psicología of the Universidad Complutense de Madrid (Spain), the Dipartimento di Architettura e Pianificazione of the Politecnico di Milano (Italy), the Metropolitan Research Institute Ltd (Hungary), the Nederlands Instituut voor en Welzijn (Netherlands), and the Housing and Community Research Centre of Staffordshire University, later the London Metropolitan University (United Kingdom). It is to be noted that several members of the network have direct links with the European Observatory of Homelessness, which is part of FEANTSA.

The teams of the CUHP thematic network have two common characteristics. One, which by definition forms the network, is their previous experience in the field of research on homeless populations. The other is that of having worked with voluntary sector organizations, and of accepting to participate in the elaboration or evaluation of measures for the homeless at the level of public policy or of voluntary sector practice.

---

<sup>2</sup> Implemented in Europe or in the United States.

<sup>3</sup> Unless otherwise indicated, the quotations used in the Executive summary come from the Technical Annex of the contract.

Beyond these two fundamental common characteristics, the teams were heterogeneous between themselves with respect to several domains: disciplinary backgrounds, methods used, theoretical references... Since the final objective was knowledge of research methods and modes of intervention for the homeless across the European Union, that required inclusion of different situations: diversity of countries from the different geopolitical areas of the Union; diversity of methods, qualitative or quantitative, and within this, diversity of survey types (longitudinal, point in time, life history, etc.); diversity of disciplines also, so as to include several fields of knowledge on the homeless. Disciplines from which network participants are drawn include demography, statistics, sociology,, psychology, social work and economics.

The role of coordinator for the CUHP was held by INED (FR), though the scientific coordination was shared with the UK partner.

The scientific works of the network were divided into six "workpackages". Each of these was organized around a six-monthly meeting. The meetings were of two types: five workshops, followed by a final conference. Each workshop explored a specific aspect of the network's theme, i.e. "particular methodologies in relation to specific policy questions". Each one was held in a different city of the participant countries, lasted two days, and reflected the dual scientific and applied character of the work: the first day "with the scientific discussion of methodologies" between researchers; the second with the "policy-makers and the NGOs research strategists" working directly with the homeless, on "policy issues and discussions in relation to the outputs of previous research findings" and more particularly "in relation to the substantive findings of the network".

The responsibility for each workshop was given to a number of researchers from the network, including the researchers of the host country, who were chosen on the basis of research interests or special experience on the methodological issue considered.

The Final Conference was held in Brussels, under the title "Research on homelessness in a European comparative perspective", in November 2005 (3<sup>rd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup>), with about 50 persons attending. It was open to the public (researchers, PhD students, EC officials, policy makers, heads or members of NGOs or other actors working with homeless people), who were to be presented with "the findings of the network in relation to particular theoretical and policy issues", and "good practice guides to methodologies".

The speakers were the members of CUHP, plus guest researchers from countries not participating in CUHP, namely the USA and Bulgaria. The conference was introduced by Francis Wurtz, M.P., after a few words of welcome by Myria Vassiliadou from the DG

Research; the different sessions were chaired by members of NGOs and of the European Commission.

In order to avoid single country monographs, each presentation by the CUHP members had to deal with at least two different countries, and/or be presented by at least two different teams. Discussants were selected from countries other than those of the authors and, whenever possible, from countries not participating in CUHP. The purpose was to promote discussions between researchers from the various countries of the European Community (including future members) and with researchers from the USA.

In addition to these meetings, the programme included two other longer-term initiatives: construction of a website and of a bibliography. The website was conceived as a medium for disseminating the network's works: the deliverables, and other kinds of outputs (papers on ethics, etc.). Responsibility for constructing and maintaining the site was given to the UK team, from a desire to share tasks between the authors of the proposal (France and UK).

**Table 1.** The CUHP meetings

<b>Meetings</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>Title</b>
<b>WS1</b>	March 2003	Paris	Methods and national contexts
<b>WS2</b>	October 2003	Madrid	Surveys and demographics of homeless populations
<b>WS3</b>	April 2004	Copenhagen	Longitudinal analyses
<b>WS4</b>	October 2004	London	Recording the lives and voices of the homeless
<b>WS5</b>	April 2005	Milan	The life cycle, hidden homelessness and housing vulnerable populations
<b>Final conference</b>	November 2005	Brussels	Research on homelessness in comparative perspective

## **2. Definitions, methods and national contexts**

The list of Laeken indicators, a basis for the Open Coordination Method, does not include an indicator of homelessness, but a recommendation to move towards one was made by the Social Protection Committee in its 2001 report. Creating such an indicator and thus a common definition of homeless people where there is no common policy for them, with reference to different national legislative provisions, when data are collected by a wide range of methods that are themselves dependent on specific social policies and a specific framing of the problem, is fraught with difficulties.

Construction of a classification system requires an equivalence to be established between the objects (people, situations) classified within the same rubric of that system. But where homeless people are concerned, national classification systems already exist based on different principles and referring to different legislation and social policies. These policies create equivalences for each country which either draw together or distinguish between some of the elements classified.

Depending on the country, a woman victim of violence, for example, might be deemed homeless or be the subject of protective measures in some other capacity, which could result in her living in a refuge but not being regarded as homeless. Also, availability of places in such provision will dictate the numbers of women who can leave home to take shelter there. The social policy pursued will therefore dictate the number of women counted as homeless. A supranational definition cannot square with all national practices, albeit trying to reconcile the maximum number of aspects.

### **2.11 The main divisions in the development of the definitions**

Some characteristics reflect essential differences in national definitions: the existence or lack of legislation on homelessness, the linkage between the definition and allocation of social housing, whether it is a multidimensional definition or not, and whether it defines housing situations, households or persons. These differences are partly explained by the history of the genesis of these definitions and of their uses.

### **2.2. First division: a legislation on homelessness**

The existence of a statutory definition, conferring different rights on people according to whether they fall within the definition of homeless or not, often results in the other definitions used by the different actors being developed by reference (including in opposition) to the statutory definition, as is the case in the United Kingdom.

### **2.3. Second division: the linkage between the definition and social housing allocation**

Another question concerns the linkage between social housing allocation policy and the definition of homeless people. There is a direct linkage in the case of the United Kingdom, where the Homelessness Act defines the statutory homeless, i.e. those people whom local authorities must accommodate in social housing (owned by the local authority or by a housing association) or in temporary accommodation in the private sector, the others being helped by the voluntary sector.

#### **2.4. Third division: a multidimensional definition or not**

Italy is a defining case where multiple dimensions are taken into account simultaneously to define homeless people: being unhoused and socially marginalized. However, use of a definition based uniquely on the housing dimension does not prevent agreement that homelessness is multidimensional in both causes and consequences or that it stems from macroeconomic factors no less than from the life course factors of those concerned. The elements used in the definition must therefore be distinguished from those used in the analysis of the causes and consequences of homelessness.

Indeed, the meaning of the term "housing" may vary between definitions. In the French definition, housing is defined by its material aspects and occupancy status, considered in a housing market perspective; in the British definition, where the housing condition includes situations of potential violence and imminent eviction, the emphasis is more on the social function of housing (home rather than housing), as a place that one can inhabit with a sense of security. This meaning related to the social and psychological roles of housing is also found in the Italian term *dimora*.

#### **2.5. Fourth division: classifying housing, household or individual situations?**

The different definitions of *sans-domicile*, homeless, statutory homeless, *mal-logé*, *senza dimora*, etc., may relate only to housing situations - any other household in the same situation would then be classified in the same way; or to characteristics of the household or its members. Thus, a victim of violence in the United Kingdom would be classified as homeless regardless of their housing situation.

#### **2.6. Hidden homelessness**

One issue raised at the Milan workshop was that of extending the category of homeless people. Different countries approached this differently. In the French case, where the definition refers exclusively to the housing situation, so too does the extended definition. This produces situations that are different but similar - like living in someone else's home or an overcrowded house - which are not seen as increasing the probability of becoming homeless, although homeless people have often experienced such situations. In the United Kingdom or Italy, where the basic definition includes factors relating to the household or the individuals that comprise it, the same goes for extending the category, with a higher probability, a greater "risk", of becoming homeless, when other, non-housing dimensions are taken into account. Thus the methods for extending the categories refer back to their formative principles.

## 2.7. Towards a European classification system

An interesting approach could be to build a classification that can be used to describe all housing situations (not just those concerning homeless people), as was done by the National Council for Statistical Information<sup>4</sup> (CNIS) in France and by the FEANTSA, and to base this classification on several independent dimensions (physical domain, occupancy status...). By combining these dimensions, various situations of housing hardship could be defined. From the statistical point of view, the main difficulty seems to be the compromise to establish between countries in favour of taking into account a social dimension of housing, or individual characteristics such as domestic violence, mental illness or social marginality.

The temporal dimension must also be considered (is homelessness defined as the situation at a given point in time or at some point during a given period). Another question that must be mentioned concerns the difference between defining a population (the homeless), with the risk of delimiting a group cut off from mainstream society, and defining a situation (homelessness) that people may find themselves in for limited periods.

To sum up, various segments of the population experiencing housing hardship may thus be defined, and estimated with varying degrees of difficulty. Double counts must be avoided, or estimated when they do occur (for example, how many persons are simultaneously doubling up with family or friends and living in an unfit dwelling). This requires a detailed questionnaire.

This theoretical definition being agreed upon, it remains to establish the equivalences already mentioned. Housing situations need to be equalized between countries: for example, by classing together types of housing that do not coexist in a country by reference to principles that have to be worked out but on which a measure of consensus exists and that are possible to operationalize. But the extreme diversity of forms taken by such housing (transitional housing, supported housing, logement passerelle, baux glissants, centri di accoglienza, alloggi protetti, comunità-alloggio, etc.) complicates this equalization and the explanation of its principles. Likewise, differences between legislation require classes of equivalence to be devised for occupancy status.

---

<sup>4</sup> The French National Council for Statistical Information provides a forum for producers and users of public statistics. As coordinator of government statistical activities, it prepares a medium-term program, and -within that framework- an annual program incorporating all public surveys.

Finally, these classifications must be adopted only after consulting with researchers, NGOs and national and European statisticians.

### **3. Methodology**

Method(s) must be chosen according to the questions to be researched, and under the constraint of the resources available, as regards either staff (number, type of training) or funding. The national context must also be considered, in particular the level of development of services targeting the homeless and the possible type of partnership with the NGOs.

#### **3.1. Qualitative methods**

Qualitative methods can take various forms: observation, in-depth interviews of service providers or homeless people, life history approaches and the writings of homeless people themselves. These methods are particularly adapted to deepen understanding of different aspects of homeless people's lives, their perceptions of time and space, the background to their situations, their hopes and aspirations, and their own representations of their situation. They are also of use for investigating little known practices (such as homeless activism), and in studying the functioning system of the services, and the interactions between services and homeless people.

#### **3.2. Complementarity between quantitative and qualitative methods**

Quantitative (sample surveys, use of register data) and qualitative (in-depth interviews, participant observation) methods are complementary and contribute to a better knowledge both of homelessness and of homeless people's life courses.

Besides providing an estimate of the number of homeless people, quantitative research can inform (according to the method chosen) about their characteristics - including in comparison with the general population or a fraction of the low-income housed population - their previous trajectories, and be used to estimate flows in and out of homelessness, and to evaluate programs. Qualitative research collects the point of view of the homeless, the detail of their life histories, and studies the way their everyday life is organized, as well as the service system. Their contributions are thus complementary. Such research can be used either side-by-side or articulated (e.g., collection of in-depth interviews from some of the people answering a survey questionnaire).

Thus the preliminary interviews held before a survey is conducted can suggest new lines of inquiry, which may lead to the elaboration of hypotheses that the researcher did not have at the outset. When questioning homeless people about their employment histories,

for example, the INED researchers were struck by the large numbers of single men who had been employed in occupations which involved "moving around" (such as lorry drivers, soldiers, sailors, workers on itinerant construction sites). Consequently, in the 1995 statistical survey of the homeless in Paris, a question was introduced on forms of employment that might have required the respondent to move from place to place. The results from this question were extremely interesting, since 28 % of men (compared with hardly any women) were found to have had this kind of work.

Qualitative methods can also improve the interpretation of the results of quantitative analysis. For example, analysing the results of the survey on homeless people in Paris revealed a high proportion of men who reported becoming homeless as a consequence of family breakdown, the couple's separation being cited as the event that set in train the changes that caused the respondent's life to "fall apart". Evidence from the in-depth interviews provides a corrective to this interpretation that individuals give of their own experience but which tends to obscure the complexity of the sequence of events and factors in this life experience, many of which stretch right back to childhood and may have contributed to the respondent's present situation. The fact of having questionnaires and interviews from the same individuals means that they can be cross-checked to show how the narrative of their life is constructed and given meaning differently, according to the method used to collect the information: "Whether it be as answers to a questionnaire or in a life story, respondents tend to take over the framework that is offered for recording the specificity of their own history" (Battagliola et al., 1993). "Every respondent does seem set on producing a self-presentation, on giving meaning to his or her life, an objective which takes tangible form as a message structuring the narrative and the answers to questionnaires" (Ferrand and Imbert, 1993).

Another issue is that of phenomena which are both rare and important. A phenomenon that is present to a very small degree in the population being studied (and which thus produces only non-significant results in small samples) may be much more important from another point of view (social, media, etc.). In our area of interest, this is the case of the French NGO DAL (Droit au logement) and other movements working with the homeless, whose activists have an organizational influence on the homeless milieu out of proportion to their number. Similarly, a few homeless people come from relatively well-off backgrounds. These atypical experiences are hard to apprehend with statistical analysis (see however Koegel et al., 1995, who conclude in favour of the role of family breakdown during childhood, and Marpsat, 1999) but still need to be explained. Qualitative analysis is thus essential for a better understanding of the milieu under examination. (For more examples of the complementarity between quantitative and qualitative data see Marpsat, 2001 and Quaglia, paper for the CUHP conference).

On the other hand, quantitative methods can complete or trigger qualitative approaches. The “contextual data” that practitioners of exclusively qualitative methods too often see as the only interest of quantitative methods are useful for identifying the specificities of people replying to interviews and of their behaviour, by situating them in a broader context. Some quantitative results can produce hypotheses that are later validated or not by qualitative research. The results of quantitative analyses can also diverge from what homeless (or other) people express, hence helping to differentiate between the representations of a situation and some aspects of social reality. E.g. the two widespread representations according to which, for the first, most homeless people are mentally ill or, for the second, anybody can become homeless. Statistical surveys show that a majority of the homeless come from modest backgrounds and have experienced poverty, while only a minority suffers from mental illnesses if depression is excluded.

### **3.3. Classification of methods**

Though more adapted to quantitative methods, this classification pointed up their proximities to qualitative methods on issues such as, for example, the tracking of interviewees. Besides the qualitative or quantitative nature of the data, the first criterion was the nature of the source (interviews of service providers or use of record-based data, interviews of homeless people, interviews of the general population); the second was their temporal coverage (point-in-time data; data over time). As in the case of the definition, national context should be taken into account to understand the conditions in which methods were developed and their fields of application.

Each type of method can be used to answer certain questions —but not others—and presents its own specific difficulties and limits. Their ease of implementation depends on factors which differ between countries: e.g. the way services are managed, especially shelters; or whether a country uses population registers for its statistics, as opposed to the countries which usually conduct sample surveys. This is the reason why, in the present state of diversity of the European countries, it seems unwise to recommend a single type of data collection for quantitative data.

In addition, these methods can be combined: e.g., to obtain “point-in-time” figures, and study their evolution, one can conduct a sample survey at regular intervals (e.g., every 5<sup>th</sup> year), with a detailed questionnaire, and in between use more summary register data, the quality of which should be improved as much as possible and the weaknesses identified; one can also, in some national contexts where shelter registers are widely used, such as Denmark, conduct sample surveys from time to time from a sample of registered persons, who will be interviewed to obtain complementary data.

Finally, the geographical scale must be taken into account. A number of complex methods which require a strong commitment of the interviewers over a long period (a panel survey, for example, where the respondents must be re-interviewed at regular intervals) are possible under certain conditions, in a city or even a small country, but not at the national level in large countries (in the United States, for example, panel surveys have only been employed locally).

**Table 2.** A classification of methods for collecting data on homelessness and homeless people, with some examples

	<b>Interviews of service providers, use of service files (record-based data) or administrative data</b>	<b>Interviews of homeless people</b>	<b>Interviews of the general population</b>
Point-in-time data (or very short period), including retrospective questions	<p>Quantitative data: surveys or files (record-based data) on homeless users of one service or a list of services, without direct interviews of the people concerned. If the person concerned can use several services during the data collection period, double counting is possible and must be corrected by using an identifier, for example.</p> <p>Applications: to know the number and basic characteristics (age, sex, etc.) of service users; to collect data on the services they use.</p> <p>Qualitative data: makes it possible to take into account the point of view of the people interviewed and functioning system of the services.</p>	<p>Quantitative data: surveys of service users, with computation of weightings to correct the overrepresentation of people using several services.</p> <p>Applications: to know the characteristics, background, living conditions, etc. of homeless people at the time of the survey. The questionnaire can collect detailed data on the past and present of homeless people, but nothing on their future.</p> <p>Qualitative data: helps take into account the point of view of the people interviewed, the connections between the situations in which they have found themselves, and is of help for investigating little known practices.</p>	<p>Quantitative data: surveys of the housed population, in which respondents are asked, for example, if they have experienced a homeless episode or if they are housing someone (the rest of the questionnaire can deal with completely different issues). Related to this kind of survey are those about public opinion on homelessness, on the building of a service (shelter, day centre etc.) in the neighbourhood etc.</p> <p>Applications: to know how many people have experienced homelessness in the general population and their characteristics (these persons exited homelessness); to know how many persons are housed by their family or friends and their characteristics.</p> <p>Qualitative data: applicable to questions of opinion.</p>
Longitudinal data (collected about the same persons over a long period)	<p>Quantitative data: follow-up over a long period of files or records, either of persons using one service, or of persons using a list of services. In the latter case, people who have used several services over the period are on the records of those services, hence an identifier is</p>	<p>Quantitative data: after a baseline survey which gives the basic characteristics of people, several follow-up surveys interview the same persons sometimes over a total period of several years. Difficulty: to recontact the interviewees.</p>	<p>In Europe, the European panel could in theory be used, but the 'attrition' (the loss of interviewees in the course of the study) is greater in the case of people with housing difficulties, and the sample size is small for any given country.</p>

	<p>needed to eliminate double-counting.</p> <p>Applications: to know the number and characteristics of people according to their type of trajectories in homelessness (chronical, episodic, transitional), and the type of services they use.</p> <p>Qualitative data: more adapted in this case for studying the services than for studying the persons using them.</p>	<p>Applications: to know which type of trajectory is the most frequent for a given type of person; to evaluate a program by comparing a group having benefited from the program with a control group.</p> <p>Qualitative data: follow-up across time of a group of homeless people, giving detailed information on their practices and their adaptations to changes in their resources and the constraints that weigh on them.</p>	<p>Applications: to document episodes of homelessness (in a narrow or wide sense) and their outcomes (rehousing, moving to an institution etc.)</p> <p>Qualitative data: not applicable.</p>
--	--	--	--

### 3.4. Point-in-time quantitative data

These data from either surveys or registers are used (according to the level of detail of the questionnaire or of the registers): to produce an estimate of the number of homeless people at a given point in time; to determine their characteristics, life histories, opinions, living conditions; to identify factors associated with homelessness (but not necessarily causes) by comparing them with poor housed people<sup>5</sup>.

\* In the case of countries (or regions or cities) where programs (accommodation, soup kitchens, clothes...) are well developed, surveys of service users (e.g.: national surveys in the USA and in France, local surveys in Madrid and Paris etc.) can be conducted. Their main characteristics are:

- the survey principle is to draw a sample of services and then to interview the individuals who use these services;
- the data gathering can be spread over several weeks but the results relate to a shorter period, for example an average day or an average week in the survey period;
- a number of housed people also use these programs, and are thus surveyed. It is interesting to analyse these limit cases of people who are housed but often very poor, and may have already experienced homelessness (as shown in various countries such as the USA or France). They can be compared with homeless people, and if the questionnaire includes questions about the previous periods of homelessness, one can exhibit factors associated with exits from homelessness or returns to homelessness after a housed episode.

For this kind of survey (based on a sample of service users) it is necessary to elaborate weightings which adjust for the probability of the user being in different sampling frames, that is for the fact that the same person may use several services (shelter and food kitchen, for example).

---

<sup>5</sup> See on [www.cuhp.org](http://www.cuhp.org) the French paper "Point-in-time statistical surveys of the homeless population" for the Madrid workshop, and the paper presented by the Danish and the Spanish teams at the Brussels conference, "Quantitative methods in Homelessness Studies: A critical guide and recommendations".

To weight the data, several methods are possible, but the “weight sharing” method used by the French national institute of statistics (INSEE) for its national 2001 survey of homeless people gives a simple formula for the weightings<sup>6</sup>.

\* In some countries, shelters have computerized registers which can be used<sup>7</sup>. The main characteristics of this type of investigation are the following:

- in order to estimate a number of persons and not a number of services, and get data on all shelter users in a given area, it is necessary to have an identifier (national identity number or ad hoc number) to unduplicate the data. In some countries, this can lead to ethical problems (confidentiality, anonymity);
- the coverage of the homeless population by these registers is not complete since there are unregistered people who sleep rough or in various emergency shelters where similar data are not gathered (e.g., in Denmark, the “night cafés”, places opened during the night -usually by NGOs- where homeless people can stay unconditionally);
- the data thus gathered are of a limited nature, mostly socio-demographical data, except if use is made of other files merged with the previous one using an identifier (as in the Danish example), but this may cause confidentiality problems;
- the issue of cost is not straightforward. It might be thought that because the data from these records exist already they are cheap. However, the records have been elaborated to meet administrative, not research needs, and must be carefully checked before use and edited if necessary, which can be costly;
- by contrast, this method gives results regularly, and these results can be « at a given date », « in the course of the previous year » etc., thus estimating flows and stocks.

\* What should be done when programs are not much developed, and when there are no registers and no possibility of conducting a survey of service users that gives adequate coverage of the homeless population? One possibility is to conduct a survey

---

<sup>6</sup> For more details, see the French paper for the Madrid workshop, “Point-in-time statistical surveys of the homeless population”.

<sup>7</sup> See “Possibilities and Limitations in Longitudinal Analysis of Homelessness Based on Information From Official Registers” presented by the Danish team at the Copenhagen workshop and “Quantitative methods in Homelessness Studies: A critical guide and recommendations”, on the website.

in public space, or add one to a service survey when a few services do exist. This raises the question of how surveys can be conducted in public spaces.

In the case of large cities, areas can be sampled with unequal probabilities: each area is classified as low, medium, or high density area according to the number of homeless people expected to be found in it, and sampled accordingly. But this classification of areas (with the help of various experts, such as NGO members, police, the homeless themselves etc.) is a difficult task, since the occupation of a place may vary between daytime and night-time or between different dates, depend on police harassment etc.

In the street itself, questionnaire length has to be short, and homeless people are sometimes difficult to identify (they do not necessarily look different from other passers-by). Many homeless people keep out sight, and to take into account only those who are visible and sleeping or preparing to sleep can lead to a serious underestimate. It is also possible to try to enter abandoned buildings, but this can be dangerous for the interviewers. So conducting a survey in public space must only be done as a last resort, or a complement to a service users survey.

The Hungarian team thus presented such a research in the case where services are little developed<sup>8</sup> (Madrid workshop).

\* Generally speaking, non-shelter services surveys are the best way to reach the homeless who do not use shelters but are not visible in the street because they sleep in a hidden place<sup>9</sup>.

### **3.5. Longitudinal statistical data**

\* These data, gathered over a period of time, are used to measure the length of homeless episodes, to understand the factors that facilitate exits from homelessness, or returns to homelessness after an exit from it. They can also be used to evaluate a program, to measure the effects of social policy interventions (for example the introduction of a new benefit) through use of a control group.

\* As PIT data, longitudinal data follow two types of methods<sup>10</sup>: sample surveys (or panel surveys) where (homeless) respondents are interviewed several times, and register data with the use of an identifier to control double counts.

---

<sup>8</sup> See “The demographics of the homeless population in Hungary” on [www.cuhp.org](http://www.cuhp.org).

<sup>9</sup> See *A guide to counting unsheltered homeless people*, published by the US Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Qualitative methods have also explored this issue<sup>11</sup>.

\* Sample surveys: the method, which is not unique to studies of homelessness, has two components. First, a preliminary survey is carried out, to provide socio-demographic information on respondents and elements of their history up to the date of the survey. Next, the people surveyed in the first round, or at least those that agreed to participate in the panel, must be located for several more waves, each within a specified time frame. In subsequent survey waves, the respondents are asked for further information on their new situation and their trajectory since the last visit from the interviewer.

These surveys can use a complex questionnaire, but they also suffer from a problem of attrition (an important proportion of the respondents cannot be found again after the initial survey). To combat attrition, various strategies are employed to ensure the consistent participation of respondents, but these strategies can be expensive.

\* For register data: administrative records created by different social service agencies are pooled, and all records for each individual can be merged using an identifier (in the Danish case, the national identity number, but it could be an ad hoc number, created just for this purpose and based on sex, birth date etc.). It is thus possible to work with individuals rather than services provided, and to capture the movement of individuals between different social services.

But these data only give limited information, unless used with other administrative files, and various precautions are needed to ensure confidentiality of the data. As for « point-in-time » register data, these data are not gathered for research purposes, and may need editing (because of missing or unreliable data) which can also be costly and give only approximate results.

---

<sup>10</sup> See on [www.cuhp.org](http://www.cuhp.org) the papers of the Copenhagen workshop: “Possibilities and Limitations in Longitudinal Analysis of Homelessness Based on Information From Official Registers” presented by the Danish team (about register data), “Follow-up studies in Spain” presented by the Spanish team (about panel surveys), and “Longitudinal perspectives on homelessness: some French and American examples” by the French team (an overview of the two methods, their rewards and challenges).

<sup>11</sup> See for example in the same workshop “A follow-up study in The Netherlands” (about in-depth interviews) presented by the Dutch team.

### **3.6. Questions in surveys on the general population**

Another (inexpensive) way of obtaining information on homelessness is to insert questions in surveys on the general (housed) population. For example:

- people doubling-up with family or friends (but it is difficult to measure the degree of constraint in this situation). One can interview the accommodated persons about their wish to find independent housing, but also the accommodating households about their desire to continue or not with this situation;
- previous homeless episodes. However, since these questions are asked to the general housed population, the previously homeless people who answer them are those who have exited homelessness to a new dwelling, and this gives no information on the persons who are deceased, or institutionalized (old people's home, foyer, prison), or still homeless (and are most probably different from those who exited homelessness);
- public opinion on the homeless issue, the NIMBY<sup>12</sup> syndrome, representations that housed people have of the homeless (as victims of circumstances or of economic problems, or as responsible for their situation).

### **3.7. Conclusion: adapting the method chosen to questions, resources, and national context**

\* The choice of a method for data gathering must take into account the research questions to be addressed, the resources available (funding but also the kind of training of the team available to work on the issue), and the national context (in particular, the development and organization of the research partners, the NGOs network and the public authorities).

Indeed, in countries where register data are developed and where the merging of files, though controlled, is not too problematic, as seems to be the case in Denmark, the use of such data (possibly completed by, or as a complement to, survey data) will be easier than in countries where the tradition is to conduct sample surveys and where public opinion is not very positive about the merging of files.

Besides, register-based methods and sample survey methods necessitate close partnership with the NGOs. This partnership will be easier in countries where there is a

---

<sup>12</sup> "Not in my backyard".

dense and well-organized (e.g. federated) associative network. It will take a different form depending on the existence of computer files of the NGOs service users, and on whether these files are harmonized or not. In countries where the level of services is less developed, it may be necessary to conduct counts of the homeless in public spaces, with all due precautions.

What was gained from this international work in the CUHP research network? It permitted an examination of various concrete cases at close range, and for each country of the network an exploration of the articulation between theories underlying research, methods employed, organisation of homeless services, structuration of the NGOs network, the relations between researchers, NGOs, public agencies and central government, and finally, the national histories of the construction of the homeless issue as a social problem.

All the methods that have been adopted elsewhere in the world (in particular in the United States) have also been experimented in Europe, with more or less sophistication according to the national context. For each method it is thus possible to find one or several European research products of good quality, which can provide an example for other member states, so far as they can be replicated in these countries' national contexts, since not all methods are easily reproduced in all countries.

#### **4. Theoretical, ethical and structural issues**

##### **4.1. Theoretical issues**

Researchers presented the conceptual tools guiding their own research or that in their country. For example, the Italian team showed how life history (or textual) approaches analyse marginalization as a cumulative process with downward or upward trajectories, and discussed the relationship between the micro- and macro-levels. The Dutch team related how Irving Goffman's analyses have been used to interpret the experience of becoming homeless. The French team examined the contribution that the notions of social field and social capital, as developed by Pierre Bourdieu, have made to homelessness surveys. Finally, the UK team discussed the theory of social exclusion, and its relationship to the concepts of risk and moral order and to that of social capital, the latter with a meaning different to that used by Bourdieu. In the case of the UK, structuration theory and risk society theory, also received a fuller exposition.

The interpretative concepts referred to were those of "causes", now increasingly replaced by that of "triggers" and associated with "risk theory", that of "social capital", and Goffman's concept of "career" derived from "symbolic interactionism".

The Hungarian team addressed the question of why research on homeless people in Hungary makes no reference to a particular theoretical framework or to explicit concepts, whereas studies on poverty do. The Spanish team, by contrast, undertook a more general research on the theoretical frameworks used by surveys on the homeless referenced in certain on-line databases, most of them in the health field and from the English-speaking world.

#### **4.2. Ethical issues**

Ethical issues were included in the network's activity, by attributing part of the discussion and a section of the website to the subject<sup>13</sup>. Among the issues raised by research activity, ethical issues were evoked in particular over, first, the margin for action of interviewers when dealing with people who request things and who need help, and second, the use of unique identifiers (as in Denmark) in order to access, among others, the services provided for the homeless. The latter allows researchers to link together several attributes of people using these services, but it can be seen as establishing a situation that some would consider as potentially incompatible with the principles of a free society, especially if the people surveyed are not aware of this use of data concerning them.

#### **4.3. Structural issues**

Homelessness is increasingly seen as a complex and multi-dimensional problem, resulting from a combination of housing and social exclusion processes. Structural and personal factors combine and strengthen each other in exclusion processes. This is reflected in changing national approaches. In several Western European countries, personal problems and conflicts were for long considered to be the main cause of homelessness, but structural causes have recently received more attention. Meanwhile, in other countries (e.g. Germany, Finland) homelessness is exclusively viewed as the consequence of functional problems in the housing market, namely that

---

<sup>13</sup> See "Is it legitimate to carry out surveys on the homeless? An ethical and scientific question", by Firdion Jean-Marie, Marpsat Maryse, Bozon Michel, [www.cuhp.org](http://www.cuhp.org).

And in French: Firdion Jean-Marie, Marpsat Maryse, Bozon Michel, « Est-il légitime de mener des enquêtes statistiques auprès des sans-domicile ? Une question éthique et scientifique », in Marpsat Maryse, Firdion Jean-Marie, eds, 2000, *La rue et le foyer. Une recherche sur les sans-domicile et les mal-logés dans les années 90*, Paris: PUF/INED.

this offers too few options. The more comprehensive perception of the causes of homelessness which sees it as a result of both structural factors (the failure of housing and labour markets, insufficiently targeted welfare subsidies etc) and individual factors (family and personal reasons, addictions, illnesses etc), has led to more differentiated homeless policies. It is also possible to question the distinction made between individual and structural causes, since, for example, the end of foster care (which can be seen as a personal issue) may or may not be a step towards homelessness depending on national social policies (a structural issue).

Such broader approaches to homelessness, supported by several research outputs revealing its dynamic and cyclical character, have triggered more comprehensive policies focusing on (1) prevention, (2) early intervention, and (3) complex reintegration programmes.

Housing policies obviously have a crucial role in preventing or ending homelessness since they provide housing or improve access to it for the homeless, but the important recognition behind the new policy lines is that housing and other social services and often medical services have to be provided for homeless people or people at risk of becoming homeless.

## **5. NGO perspectives**

Part of the work of the CUHP Thematic Network was to understand the context in which NGOs worked with the homeless, and their perspective on definitions of homelessness and new homeless populations. Therefore the second day of each workshop included representatives of local NGOs and local authorities and/or ministries with a particular interest in homelessness. The purposes of these meetings were three-fold:

- to understand the issues facing policy makers and NGOs in different countries in dealing with homelessness;
- to understand their perspectives on homelessness (definitions of homelessness/housing need), new homeless populations and new ways of working;
- to understand their priorities for future research.

The importance of NGOs in the work of social welfare for the homeless, whether in advanced welfare states or in states where the family welfare model was still effective, emerged clearly in all our workshops<sup>14</sup>.

### **5.1. Housing needs and homelessness**

The relationship between housing policies and homelessness was pointed to on several occasions. Current developments in housing markets across Northern and Central Europe include the privatization of social housing and a greater reliance on owner-occupation to house the population, coupled with housing allowances to support the most vulnerable. Discussions at the Copenhagen and London workshops reported these developments as having huge implications; in both capital cities there was a crisis for low-income families.

Some differences were also perceived. One of the most important divisions in relation to a legal definition of homelessness was the situation of women facing domestic violence. In Copenhagen the Ministry of Social Affairs recognized no relationship between domestic violence and homelessness. The differences between welfare regimes showed most strongly over the availability of social housing. As explained at the Madrid workshop there was practically no social housing in Spain and 80% of households were owner-occupiers. One of the NGOs was attempting to bridge a housing gap for the homeless through renting. Housing problems were most acute in capital cities.

In some Northern countries special forms of housing have been created, at a standard below the national housing standard; this is true in both Denmark and the Netherlands. The implications of this were discussed. A member of the Dutch research team questioned whether this was a way forward for homeless people or whether it would create ghettos of homeless people.

The homeless issue can be dealt with either by housing departments or by health and social services. At various workshops the question of fitting homeless people into appropriate social boxes was raised. In many systems funding was based on identifying particular social problems experienced by homeless people. A problem arose when different social systems provided separate services. In Spain it was reported that the health and social work services had not worked with the homeless. Therefore new systems bringing all services together were being created. As to the

---

<sup>14</sup> See Joan Smith contribution to the final conference.

homeless themselves, it was observed that if left too long, a housing problem frequently becomes a social work problem.

## **5.2. New homeless populations**

There was considerable agreement among NGOs over the problem of the emergence of new homeless populations: young people, women, and immigrants. But there was also agreement that some of the underlying issues that had emerged with these populations should be considered in relation to other homeless populations.

The rise of youth homelessness was raised in all of the workshops by different NGOs. In Madrid and Milan agencies were especially concerned about the rise of youth homelessness and its relationship with the particular problems posed by the disappearance of the family welfare system in Spain and Italy. The rise of individualism posed particular problems for Continental/Family or Mediterranean welfare regimes.

In the UK, organisations working with the single homeless had also become aware of the issues of isolation in relation to older single homeless people.

## **5.3. Homelessness among immigrant populations**

Issues of homelessness and the country origins of immigrant populations and asylum seekers were also noted. The NGOs felt that immigrants had fewer problems of marginalisation than other homeless people, but this was no longer true after some time on the street. In various countries, not all services were accessible to illegal migrants because of their lack of papers. Several countries had specific approaches to facilitate work with immigrant homeless populations, either by including people from their home country in the mobile teams or at least people speaking the same language, or by having NGOs organised by people from the same country. Some negative consequences of the legislation on asylum seekers/refugees, particularly in UK, were discussed.

The issue of homelessness among women was seen as contradictory. On the one hand they were less likely to be seen on the streets and were more likely to have extensive welfare protection. On the other hand they were likely to be homeless in different ways and to use services specifically intended for them. One of the most important discussions in Copenhagen concerned the question of whether domestic violence could be classified as a homeless situation. Neither the spokesman of the Ministry of Social Affairs nor the Municipality of Copenhagen would classify women experiencing domestic violence as homeless, while in UK homelessness legislation has always

identified women with children as a priority need group and the definition of homeless situations includes situations of violence (domestic and racial). However, *in her speech to the London workshop, the speaker from Women's Aid, expressed concern that a lack of social housing, and an overall inadequate supply of housing was preventing women from leaving violent relationships.*

At several workshops the team from INED, France, raised the question of the working poor who were homeless. As well as looking at individual personal reasons for homelessness, they argued, it is also important to look at structural reasons, and this was discussed in several workshops.

#### **5.4. Changing services for the homeless**

During the workshops there were debates between NGOs and municipal officials, and between NGOs, on the shape of new services for the homeless. Are 'emergency' services appropriate? What changes are needed in the type of services and the provision of new services?

Some argued that the 'emergency model' of work was not a useful one, and believed that emergency work hampered long-term social work with clients.

The question was raised of the ethics of imposing social work upon homeless people who don't want it.

Having raised issues about the use of emergency services the important question was what happened once homeless people were contacted? How could mainstream services be mobilised to support the homeless person who required considerable support? This was a particular problem in Spain, where neither health nor social work services saw it as their role to work with the homeless. But even in Denmark accessing statutory services was considered a problem. A speaker from the Hungarian team said that this raised the question of whether there should be special services for the homeless.

A particular issue is the relationship between mental health services and emergency services.

The discussion of intensive co-ordination of homeless street services also raised the question of street management policies. UK NGOs were concerned about the introduction of these policies.

Several NGOs in many workshops reported changes in shelter provision. First *many NGOs* had broken down their large shelters into smaller institutions. Not only were shelters becoming smaller but across all the workshops NGOs reported a concern (new for some countries) with action-planning for homeless people and with the re-establishment of their social networks. *NGOs also reported that they were managing their facilities differently; in some countries it was reported that homeless people were involved in the management of the agencies, as a French NGO speaker put it, there is 'une logique participative' that embraced not only homeless people but also the volunteers that worked with them.*

### **5.5. Services and the use of volunteer workers**

An extensive discussion over the use of volunteers took place on several occasions. The use of volunteers is more or less widespread according to the country and the NGOs, ranging from most of the people involved with the homeless to hardly any volunteer labour except for certain exceptional events (Christmas etc.), organisations being mostly professionally staffed. Two issues were discussed, one being whether it was appropriate to use unemployed people as volunteers, the other concerning the new professional standards that all agencies had to meet. However, many agencies saw the use of volunteers as a way of also engaging the wider public in an understanding of homelessness.

### **5.6. Other issues**

Other issues were:

- how to prevent homelessness by running advice services for people who were in danger of losing their homes;
- organisations run by the homeless themselves and the unique contribution that such organisations made in relation to demands for citizenship rights;
- more generally, the human rights of homeless people;
- how to influence the wider community to be sympathetic towards the homeless and the issue of homelessness;
- street management policies.

## **5.7. Research issues and NGOs**

Several issues were raised by the NGOs:

- the question of research to improve prevention;
- the role of research in changing the NGOs' perspective on homelessness;
- the importance of the perspective of the homeless person, either through research undertaken by homeless persons or with their close involvement;
- there was considerable discussion about the relationship between research and political understanding, public opinion and political strategies;

## **5.8. Conclusion**

- 1) As Antonio Tosi remarked, there is a divide between countries where homelessness is considered as a housing problem, though ideas of social isolation may have been added later, and countries where homelessness is considered mainly as a social welfare problem, not within the competence of housing research or housing departments.
- 2) The characteristics of homeless people in each country depend on the efficiency of the safety net. In countries where most basic needs are covered, it is the most deprived who end up on the street, while in countries where the safety net is less effective, it is much easier to lose one's home.
- 3) The NGOs are preoccupied by the challenges in relation to what they perceive as new homeless populations and the difficulties of meeting new needs with fixed resources.
- 4) The issue of the human rights of homeless people, including the right to refuse help, was explored.
- 5) On the issue of their research needs, two messages were expressed by the NGOs: the necessity for research information that enabled them to work with the new problems of homelessness and move beyond their old understanding, and the necessity for the voice of the homeless themselves to be taken into account.

## **6. Policy implications**

Since this was the CUHP's main objective, its conclusions deal mostly with recommendations for methodological good practice, together with an attention to the preoccupations of NGOs. However, a number of results are similar in several countries, which can lead to recommend specific measures, especially of a preventative nature, as well as complementary investigations on these issues.

### **6.1. Prevention and early intervention strategies**

\* People who have spent time in an institution such as prison or the Army are overrepresented among the homeless. Two main factors may play a role: on the one hand, socio-economic factors, poverty, family difficulties, can have an influence on enlistment as well as on the adoption of delinquent behaviours which may lead to prison; on the other hand, exit from these institutions may be insufficiently prepared, and improving this preparation - as already happens in some countries - could contribute to reducing the number of homeless people.

\* In the same way, people who have been placed in foster care (either in a family or an institution) during their youth are overrepresented, particularly among the young homeless. In this case too, even if the difficulties leading to foster care may play a role, exit from foster care should be better prepared.

\* The UK paper in London reported on a study that identified particular risk factors in relation to youth homelessness that had been used to guide the provision of prevention services to young people at school.

\* Specific measures should be adopted according to the length of the homeless episode. In particular, it is important to identify the recent homeless among the homeless population, as this is a crucial moment for intervention. If marginalisation is analysed as a cumulative process, it implies that taking people off the streets will need greater resources the longer they have been there.

\* Some so-called "causes" of homelessness are in fact only "triggers" while other causes go back a long way and should also be taken into account for prevention strategies; factors which correspond to a higher probability of homelessness should be pinpointed to help policy decisions, but also factors which help prevent homelessness for people who are otherwise very close to it.

\* More generally, action on contextual factors such as the housing and labour markets should be adopted as a necessary part of prevention strategies.

## **6.2. Acting upon socio-economic factors and legislation**

Various discussions, notably that with the Danish NGOs on the issue of chronic homelessness, demonstrated that homelessness is not a given but is also related to the housing market in a given place.

The London NGOs also stressed the necessity for research to evaluate programs but also to examine the consequences of legislation regarding not only homelessness but also, for example, immigration (such as the fact that in France asylum seekers are not allowed to work and thus can't pay a rent, while there are not enough beds in hostels dedicated to them).

The Hungarian paper for the Brussels conference proposed various measures to improve the housing market at the European level<sup>15</sup>.

## **6.3. A few remarks on services**

How to deal with persons who have several kinds of difficulties (such as drug and mental health problems) and to avoid sending them from one service to another was a preoccupation of the NGOs and public authorities in Denmark. As in other countries, the diagnosis of a person's condition can assign him or her either to services for the homeless or to other services.

The Danish presentation in London was a study of the interactions between social workers and homeless people in a local welfare office and researched the way social work with homeless people is conducted, and could lead to recommendations on how to make them more effective. Of course, these recommendations cannot be the same everywhere, since the situation depends on the organisation of the services at national and local levels. In the case examined by Tobias Stax, he concluded: "it seems to me that there is an orientation towards the past [in the interaction between the client and the social worker], as something that must be significantly documented before action is taken, which means that action is often something that belongs to the future. This might pose a problem especially since the people that I follow to meetings with their social workers have shown a high degree of mobility. Thus, some of the tenants have

---

<sup>15</sup> See Part one of the paper "European values and homeless policies: Examining the broader and narrower policy lines".

left the shelter, and thereby moved out of the jurisdiction of the specific welfare office, before the past was documented and the time for intervention reached”.

The Dutch presentation in London stressed that qualitative studies had shown that after a long time on the streets, housing was not enough to provide a solution to some people’s difficulties. The Dutch paper was based on a study designed around three questions: how did people end up on the street (triggers); did they live on the street the whole time or come off and go back on; and how did they manage to get off the streets. This paper dealt more particularly with perceptions of time and space among the homeless and how these perceptions could hamper their regular contacts with agencies. It also made some recommendations: to reduce the goals to small steps for the long-term homeless and to take into account the difficulties they felt when finding themselves in a dwelling again (such as claustrophobia).

## **7. Dissemination and exploitation of results**

Dissemination of results has been mostly accomplished through the website; contacts during the workshops with local research teams, NGOs and public agencies; various presentations, and a number of publications.

## **II. BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES OF THE PROJECT**

In this section, we present the frameworks in which the CUHP network has operated and the evolution of its preoccupations and debates. We focus on 1) the terms and objective of the work, the membership of the CUHP network and the characteristics of the partners, and the organization defined by the proposal accepted by the Commission, and 2) the actual operation of the network and its evolution, with particular attention to the changes made to the original proposal, including the main lines of the debates, the points of agreement and disagreement, and the compromises produced.

### **1. The CUHP: a European “thematic network”**

CUHP (Constructing Understandings of Homeless Populations) is a thematic network funded by the Fifth Framework Programme for RTD launched by the European Commission for the period 1998-2002. The aim of the framework programmes, the first of which dates from 1984, was to facilitate the production of research with results of relevance to the European Community as a whole. The texts governing the framework programmes, the selection criteria and procedures, show that construction of this research environment presents two characteristics: one is that it implies a degree of standardization of subjects, methods and evaluation criteria across the member-states of the European Union; the other is that it gives preference to applied research, suitable for use in public policies, that are themselves subject to a similar process of standardization.

The aim of “thematic networks” — one of the possible “actions” of the Fifth Framework Programme<sup>16</sup> — is to “facilitate coordination of activities and transfer of knowledge”<sup>17</sup> relating to a subject. In other words, and in contrast to the “research and technological development projects” that are “designed to obtain new knowledge”<sup>18</sup>, a thematic network does not undertake primary research, but promotes the circulation of existing knowledge, by setting up a network of researchers working on a common subject in different countries of the Union. This characteristic has a direct incidence on the activities funded as part of a thematic network. These include the organization of seminars and workshops, but not data collection or conducting surveys, for example,

---

<sup>16</sup> Other “direct actions” include “RDT projects”, “demonstration projects”, and “support measures”.

<sup>17</sup> Decision no. 182/199/CE of the European Parliament and the Council of 22 December 1998. Annex IV, JO of European Community, 1 February 1999, p. L26/30.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid, L26/29.

although a network may produce a research proposal that can subsequently be undertaken as part of other programmes.

The CUHP thematic network contributes on a distinctive theme, that of “homeless populations”, while giving the research an operational purpose. The angle of approach chosen is that of methodology. If the “main objective of the network is to create focused discussions on methodological procedures that provide robust results when used to research homeless populations”, this finds concrete expression primarily in “a guide to methods that can be replicated in other countries or at the national level, and are adequate to answer particular policy questions and improve scientific knowledge”. For this it is necessary to establish conditions for comparison, to study the possibility of developing a common definition, and to acquire an understanding of the homelessness issue in the various national contexts. This is covered by the two other objectives of the network. The second aims to produce “a focused discussion on the different definitions of homelessness employed by researchers, NGOs and policy makers in different member states” in order to “provide a framework for comparative research across member states”, while the third seeks “to share the substantive findings of research teams in different nation states, and for those research teams to also summarise the important policy issues that have emerged in their nation states”<sup>19</sup>.

## **2. Composition of the network**

The network comprises about twenty partners belonging to seven research institutes each in a different country. These are: the Institut national d'études démographiques (France), the Danish national institute of Social Research (Denmark), the Facultad de Psicología of the Universidad Complutense de Madrid (Spain), the Dipartimento di Architettura e Pianificazione of the Politecnico di Milano (Italy), the Metropolitan Research Institute Ltd (Hungary), the Nederlands Instituut voor en Welzijn (Netherlands), and the Housing and Community Research Centre of Staffordshire University, later the London Metropolitan University (United Kingdom).

The teams of the CUHP thematic network present two characteristics in common. One, which by definition forms the network, is their previous experience in the field of research on homeless populations. The other is that of having worked with voluntary sector organizations, and of accepting to participate in the elaboration or evaluation of measures for the homeless at the level of public policy or of voluntary sector practice.

---

<sup>19</sup> Contract N° HPSE-CT-2002-50014, Technical Annex, p.1.

Beyond these two fundamental common characteristics, the teams were heterogeneous between themselves with respect to several domains: disciplinary backgrounds, methods used, theoretical references, statutes, funding arrangements, objectives pursued and nature of relations with the political, social and voluntary spheres<sup>20</sup>. This heterogeneity was to some extent actively sought during constitution of the network. The final objective was knowledge of research methods and modes of intervention for the homeless across the European Union, and that required inclusion of different situations: diversity of countries from the different geopolitical areas of the Union; diversity of methods, qualitative or quantitative, and within this, diversity of survey types (longitudinal, point in time, life history, etc.); diversity of disciplines also, so as to include several fields of knowledge on the homeless. Disciplines from which network participants are drawn include demography, statistics, sociology, psychology, social work and economics.

If, as we shall see when considering the debates within the network, this diversity can be interpreted as heterogeneity, this stems from the purpose of the network and its mode of constitution. Some countries have few researchers working on the homeless, which can result in collaboration between teams with very different approaches, since there are not necessarily any teams with comparable approaches.

### **3. Main aims of the network**

In addition to the two main aims mentioned above:

- 1) "create focused discussions on methodological procedures that provide robust results when used to research homeless populations";
- 2) "focused discussion on the different definitions of homelessness employed by researchers, NGOs and policy makers in different member states";

three other main aims were presented in the proposal<sup>21</sup>:

- 3) "to share the substantive findings of research teams in different nation states, and for those research teams to also summarise the important policy issues that have emerged in their nation states"
- 4) "to share knowledge of good practice in relation to reinsertion programmes in different member states"

---

<sup>20</sup> Some of these characteristics are reproduced in Annex 9.1. List of Members.

<sup>21</sup> Technical Annex, p.1.

- 5) to construct "a substantive research proposal in the field of homelessness in which the definitions of the homeless population, the research design, and the methodologies to be adopted are all precisely agreed and the results, therefore, comparable."

In the proposal, these general objectives were translated by the "specific aims<sup>22</sup>" and then by a "value to be achieved":

"Value to be achieved: The achievements of the objectives and specific aims of the network can be identified in precise value terms which include:

- 1) A report on good practice in relation to methodologies used to research homeless populations within European member and candidate states. More precisely, this guide includes:
  - a map of methodologies used to research different homeless populations in response to different policy questions;
  - guides to good practice in relation to different homeless methodologies and the cost-benefits of different methodologies;
  - guides to good practice in relation to the issue of the time of the homeless incident;
  - the production of questions to enable the measurement of homelessness in different forms that can be adopted and adapted for different national and pan-European surveys.
- 2) The demonstration of good practice in the integration of quantitative and qualitative analysis that will allow for the integration of the life experience of homeless people with statistical analysis and which can be adopted in different European research studies.
- 3) A taxonomy of homelessness to be discussed with other researchers and applied in future research studies by members of the team. This is particularly important in relation to the definition of homelessness of those 'hidden' from view, most frequently women. More precisely the production of a guide to an agreed working definition of homelessness.

---

<sup>22</sup> Technical Annex, p. 2.

- 4) An easily available guide to the substantive research findings of these teams, in relation to their knowledge of the characteristics of homeless populations in their countries, and the routes in and out of homelessness for different homeless populations.
- 5) A discussion of the use of research findings in relation to the provision of homelessness services in different member states. Much is now known and established and it is from this basis that further studies should be undertaken, both to test hypotheses established in one country in another country, and to use similar research methods in order that a meta-analysis of research findings in relation to a particular hypothesis is possible.
- 6) The theoretical understandings that the study of homelessness has led to among research teams active in this field for many years.<sup>23</sup>

These objectives thus lead in turn to a list of concrete tasks and documents, the different kinds of "scientific and technical outputs"<sup>24</sup> to be supplied to the Commission over the course of the seven "deliverables"<sup>25</sup>:

- a taxonomy of homelessness. This was to be the end result of the discussion on the different definitions of the homeless and suitable to "be discussed with other European researchers and organisations"<sup>26</sup>.
- a map of methodologies, "included those in use by researchers within European nation states, accessing states and internationally"<sup>27</sup>. This map is subdivided into a number of guides, dealing with: point in time surveys; panel surveys and service file data surveys; narrative interviews, life history and diary methods; survey questions.
- map of policy issues in the countries of the network's participants.
- map of competencies, i.e. the listing of the researchers in the social sciences with significant contributions in the field of the homeless<sup>28</sup>.

---

<sup>23</sup> Technical Annex, p. 3.

<sup>24</sup> Technical Annex, p. 3.

<sup>25</sup> Technical Annex, p. 3, 4 and 13 and the table p. 7.

<sup>26</sup> Technical Annex, p. 4.

<sup>27</sup> Technical Annex, p. 13.

<sup>28</sup> Technical Annex, p. 13.

## II. SCIENTIFIC DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT RESULTS AND METHODOLOGY

### 1. The organization of the network

The organization of the network was on two levels: the national level, that of the teams composing the network and of their base institutions<sup>29</sup>; then the level of the network as a whole. The role of coordinator for the CUHP was held by INED, though the scientific coordination was to be shared with the UK partner.

The scientific works of the network were divided into six “workpackages”. Each of these was organized around a six-monthly meeting. The meetings were of two types: five workshops, followed by a final conference. Each workshop explored a specific aspect of the network’s theme, i.e. “particular methodologies in relation to specific policy questions”<sup>30</sup>. Each one was held in a different city of the participant countries, lasted two days, and reflected the dual scientific and applied character of the work: the first day “with the scientific discussion of methodologies” between researchers; the second with the “policy-makers and the NGOs research strategists” working directly with the homeless, on “policy issues and discussions in relation to the outputs of previous research findings” and more particularly “in relation to the substantive findings of the network”<sup>31</sup>.

The responsibility for each workshop was given to a number of researchers from the network, including the researchers of the host country, who were chosen on the basis of research interests or special experience on the methodological issue considered. The topics, organizers, venues, and expectations in terms of results were defined in the proposal and reproduced in the contract. Below are the venues, calendar, organizers and topics as defined in “Table 3.1. Contents of workpackages”<sup>32</sup>.

---

<sup>29</sup> The official contracting parties of a thematic network are not individuals but legal entities (research or teaching institutes) with a financial and administrative apparatus that satisfies Commission rules.

<sup>30</sup> Technical Annex, p. 5.

<sup>31</sup> Technical Annex, p. 5 and 3.

<sup>32</sup> Technical Annex, p. 7 (from the table).

**Table 3.** Contents of workpackages

<b>Work package</b>	<b>Research methodology</b>	<b>Policy methodology</b>
<b>WP 1</b> Paris Month 4	Map of Methodologies (quantitative and qualitative) INED, FR	Case Studies in relation to different national states ALL PARTNERS
<b>WP 2</b> Madrid Month 9	Papers on point-in-time surveys (quantitative studies) Complutense, ES INED, FR	a) Demographics of homeless populations, past experience and present way of life. b) Citizenship issues in relation to mental health and substance misuse and access to services.
<b>WP 3</b> Copenhagen Month 16	Papers on dynamic surveys, quantitative and qualitative studies. NISR, DK Complutense, ES NIZW, NL	a) Profile of homeless populations in relation to length of time homeless. b) Identification of characteristics of chronic homeless
<b>WP4</b> London Month 21	Qualitative data — voice of the homeless. Integrating qualitative and quantitative data. NIZW, NL Staffs Univ, UK NISR, DK DIAP, IT	a) life histories of homeless population, understanding the life of homelessness b) identification of risk factors
<b>WP5</b> Milan Month 28	National survey questions Local surveys of homelessness MRI, HU INED, FR Staffs Univ, UK	a) identifying 'hidden homelessness' b) identifying incidence of homelessness in people's lifecycles c) using file data to establish prevalence and identify characteristics
<b>CONF</b> Brussels Month 33	<b>RESEARCHING HOMELESSNESS</b>	<b>SOCIAL CAPITAL, RISK AND EXCLUSION</b>  ALL PARTNERS

Within this framework, the host team drew up the detailed programme, in liaison with the coordinator, and invited the NGOs and other researchers or governmental agencies it considered appropriate. For each of these gatherings, preparations included two types of written contributions that were circulated before the meeting: long papers (10,000-30,000 words) and short papers (5,000 words). The long papers were prepared by those with the greatest experience in the domain, which was usually that of the host team. As well as the presentation of experience, the aim of the long papers was to set out the list of issues to be debated and the bases for the discussion.

The other teams prepared short papers giving initial feedback to the questions raised by the long papers and introducing the special experience of the other partners<sup>33</sup>. Together these were presented and discussed on the first day of the meeting.

This dual character of the contributions—and of their timetable—was intended to initiate a dialogue prior to the meeting and to enrich the discussion in it. Prior dialogue was desirable, first, because of the multinational membership of the network, whose researchers had only limited knowledge of the other national conditions; second, because of the desire for a collective scientific production, not a collection of unrelated contributions. The introduction of a procedure for revising the papers, after the discussion, and for their approval at the next meeting, once they had been circulated among the partners, attests to this desire for a collective commitment to the papers produced by the network. Furthermore, these papers were to be made public, via the network's website.

The Final Conference had a different form to the other meetings (it is also referred to as the sixth workpackage). Like them it took place over two days, but it was open to the public (researchers or other actors working with homeless people), who were to be presented with "the findings of the network in relation to particular theoretical and policy issues", and "good practice guides to methodologies"<sup>34</sup>. The title provisionally chosen placed the emphasis on the theoretical tools available for studying homeless populations: "Social capital, risk and exclusion", which were not included in the previous meetings, centred on methodology. This meeting was held in Brussels on November 2005, under the final title "Research on homelessness in a European comparative perspective".

In addition to these meetings, which is where the main part of the network's activities occurred, the programme included two other longer-term initiatives: construction of a website and of a bibliography. The website was conceived as a medium for disseminating the network's works. In particular it is the medium for publication of the deliverables<sup>35</sup>, and of other kinds of outputs (paper on ethics, etc.). Responsibility for constructing and maintaining the site was given to the UK team, from a desire to share tasks between the authors of the proposal (France and UK). This choice was also convenient, given that the website has to be in English (at least) and so English-speakers are far better placed to undertake its construction and maintenance.

---

<sup>33</sup> Technical Annex, p. 9.

<sup>34</sup> Technical Annex, p. 5.

<sup>35</sup> In "Table 3. Deliverables/Milestones" of the Technical Annex (p. 14), the publication on the web site of a deliverable is considered as "Deliverable level": "Public".

## **2. The deliverables**

Besides the reports, the other deliverables are related more particularly to the purpose of the network and were part of the proposal itself. They contain the outputs presented above: Taxonomy of homelessness, Map of methodologies, Map of policy issues and Map of competencies, to which must be added production of a “substantive research proposal in the field of homelessness identified by the members of the network”<sup>36</sup>. The deliverables are primarily the papers presented at the six-monthly workshop associated with them. These papers were then revised and approved in the following meeting and, in the month following this meeting, were to be published on the website and sent in report-format to the scientific officer of the Commission<sup>37</sup>.

In broad outline the organization and themes of the six-monthly meetings corresponded to the proposal accepted for the contract. In the course of the discussions, however, new themes emerged while others originally planned for inclusion were explored less than was planned. Some topics received special attention, while others brought to light divergences that led to compromises or, in a few cases, acknowledgments of disagreements. Besides the meetings, other sections of the work included construction and use of the website, the bibliography, the construction of a research project and of a map of competencies, and the development of recommendations on good practice for policy action. Though proposals for further research were evoked and are to be found at the end of this report, the network members did not elaborate any precise common research project. This reflected two considerations. First, the research that was identified as lacking in each country was not of the same kind, since existing research differs widely between countries. For example, the French already had a national point-in-time survey and were more interested in developing longitudinal surveys, which would have been premature for some other countries; similarly, the Danes run a system based on surveys completing register data and have no reason to adopt surveys based on service users. Second, the network found it useful to study instead the contextual issues related to research, for example the degree of development and coordination of the NGOs and their cooperation with the researchers, which is a condition of successful research.

The map of competencies has suffered from the somewhat small number of messages to the “contact us” facility on the website; but pooling the knowledge of the CUHP

---

<sup>36</sup> Technical Annex, p. 2.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Technical Annex, Table 3. Deliverables/milestones, p. 14.

members and their contacts about existing research on homelessness allowed construction of a map indicating the main persons in this field of research.

In what follows we first examine the organization and content of the first day of the workshops, the topics examined and the treatment they received. We attempt to present some characteristics of the network that may account for certain particularities of the discussions. A second part will present the content of the second day of the workshops (with the NGOs), and finally we give a summary of the conference presentations.

**Table 4.** The CUHP workshops

<b>Meetings</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>City</b>	<b>Title</b>
<b>WS1</b>	March 2003	Paris	Methods and national contexts
<b>WS2</b>	October 2003	Madrid	Point in time surveys and demographics of homeless populations
<b>WS3</b>	April 2004	Copenhagen	Longitudinal analyses
<b>WS4</b>	October 2004	London	Recording the lives and voices of the homeless
<b>WS5</b>	April 2005	Milan	The life cycle, hidden homelessness and housing vulnerable populations
<b>Final conference</b>	November 2005	Brussels	Research on homelessness in comparative perspective

### 3. Day 1: Methodological, theoretical and ethical issues in research<sup>38</sup>

#### 3.1. Definitions, methods and national contexts

The first workshop was held in Paris in March 2003, i.e. three months after the network started its work, and had the objective of laying the bases for subsequent work on the two key questions of the programme, namely the definition of the “homeless” and the methodologies used by research in this field.

##### **Long paper**

France (Maryse Marpsat): “Homeless research: definitional issues and first mapping of methodologies”

I. Definitional issues

II. Various methodologies used in research about homelessness

The long paper<sup>39</sup> classified the various definitions into two types on the basis of two parameters. The first type was based exclusively on housing situation; the second included in addition other social factors associated with situations of social exclusion or poverty. Discussion also considered the temporal dimension, and the broadening of these definitions to permit comparisons with the general population and with situations of housing hardship. An initial list of questions was also drawn up for discussion in subsequent meetings on the definition. Two other questions, in addition to those over the type of definition to be adopted, need to be mentioned. The first concerns the difference between defining a population (the homeless), with the risk of delimiting a group cut off from mainstream society, and defining a situation (homelessness) that people may find themselves in for limited periods. The second is over the need to know, in order to understand the use of the different types of definition, the context in which they were produced and previously used.

On methodology, the long paper presented the main features of the methods used in Europe and the USA for research into homeless populations, and classified them according to the data on which the studies were based. Though more adapted to quantitative methods, this classification pointed up their proximities to qualitative methods in such issues as, for example, the tracking of interviewees. Besides the

---

<sup>38</sup> The papers are available on the network website, [www.cuhp.org](http://www.cuhp.org).

<sup>39</sup> See <http://www.cuhp.org/parisworkshop.cfm>

qualitative or quantitative nature of the data, the first criterion was the nature of the source (interviews of service providers or use of record-based data, interviews of homeless people, interviews of the general population), the second was their temporal coverage (point-in-time data; data over time). This classification was then proposed as the basis for the map of methodologies. The paper also discussed the main research projects to have used these methods in Europe and the USA, the difficulties they encountered and the criticisms made of them, together with their principal findings. As in the case of the definition, the paper called for national context to be taken into account to understand the conditions in which methods were developed and their fields of application.

**Table 5.** A classification of methods for collecting data on homelessness and homeless people

	<b>Interviews of service providers, use of service files (record-based data) or administrative data</b>	<b>Interviews of homeless people</b>	<b>Interviews of the general population</b>
Point-in-time data (or very short period), including retrospective questions	<p>Quantitative data:</p> <p>Surveys or files (record-based data) on homeless users of one service or a list of services, without direct interviews of the people concerned. If the person concerned can use several services during the data collection period, double counting is possible and must be corrected by using an identifier, for example.</p> <p>Application:</p> <p>To know the number and basic characteristics (age, sex, etc.) of service users; to collect data on the services they use.</p> <p>Qualitative data:</p> <p>Makes it possible to take into account the point of view of the people interviewed and</p>	<p>Quantitative data:</p> <p>Surveys of service users, with computation of weightings to correct the overrepresentation of people using several services.</p> <p>Applications:</p> <p>To know the characteristics, background, living conditions, etc. of homeless people at the time of the survey. The questionnaire can collect detailed data on the past and present of homeless people, but nothing on their future.</p> <p>Qualitative data:</p> <p>Helps take into account the point of</p>	<p>Quantitative data:</p> <p>Surveys of the housed population, in which respondents are asked, for example, if they have experienced a homeless episode or if they are housing someone (the rest of the questionnaire can deal with completely different issues). Related to this kind of survey are those about public opinion on homelessness, on the building of a service (shelter, day centre etc.) in the neighbourhood etc.</p> <p>Applications:</p> <p>To know how many people have experienced homelessness in the general population and their characteristics (these persons exited</p>

	functioning system of the services.	view of the people interviewed, the connections between the situations in which they have found themselves, and is of help for investigating little known practices.	homelessness); to know how many persons are housed by their family or friends and their characteristics.  Qualitative data:  Applicable to questions of opinion.
Longitudinal data (collected about the same persons over a long period)	<p>Quantitative data: Follow-up over a long period of files or records, either of persons using one service, or of persons using a list of services. In the latter case, people who have used several services over the period are on the records of those services, hence an identifier is needed to eliminate double-counting.</p> <p>Applications:  To know the number and characteristics of people according to their type of trajectories in homelessness (chronical, episodic, transitional), and the type of services they use.</p> <p>Qualitative data:  More adapted in this case for studying the services than for studying the persons using them.</p>	<p>Quantitative data: After a baseline survey which gives the basic characteristics of people, several follow-up surveys interview the same persons sometimes over a total period of several years. Difficulty: to recontact the interviewees.</p> <p>Applications:  To know which type of trajectory is the most frequent for a given type of person; to evaluate a program by comparing a group having benefited from the program with a control group.</p> <p>Qualitative data:  Follow-up across time of a group of homeless people, giving detailed information on their practices and their adaptations to changes in their resources and the constraints that weigh on them.</p>	<p>In Europe, the European panel could in theory be used, but the 'attrition' (the loss of interviewees in the course of the study) is greater in the case of people with housing difficulties, and the sample size is small for any given country.</p> <p>Applications:  To document episodes of homelessness (in a narrow or wide sense) and their outcomes (rehousing, moving to an institution etc.)</p> <p>Qualitative data:  Not applicable.</p>

The short papers, for their part, reported on the two main questions of the workshop, that is, the definitions and research methods used in each partner country. It is noteworthy that the papers analysed the definitions using the same differentiation as in the long paper (FR), i.e. between housing situations and housing situations plus other social factors. The definitions were also analysed according to their source, i.e. whether they were statutory, academic or NGO definitions. Some papers also aimed to give the other teams an introduction to their national contexts, through a presentation of the problem's historical construction, the current context (notably in terms of public policy), and the principal results, particularly on the size of homeless populations, obtained by the research presented in the section on methodologies.

### **Short papers**

**Denmark** (Tobias Børner Stax): "Understandings of homelessness in Denmark – Definitions in the legislation and in research projects".

**France** (Jean-Marie Firdion, Maryse Marpsat): "Homeless research in France: definition of homelessness, research, and legislation and its latest developments".

**Hungary** (Iván Tosics, Sándor Erdősi Jr, Eszter Somogyi): "The analysis of homelessness in Hungary".

**Italy** (Antonio Tosi): "The construction of homelessness in Italy".

**Netherlands** (Lia van Doorn, Petra van Leeuwen): "Homelessness in Netherlands: number, definitions, research".

**Spain** (Manuel Muñoz, Carmelo Vázquez, Sonia Panadero, José Juan Vázquez): "Homelessness in Spain: definition, methodology, research".

**United Kingdom** (Joan Smith): "Defining and researching homelessness in the UK".

At the level of work follow-up, what emerged from this first meeting of the full network was a double effort to present the bases of the discussion (definitions, methods) and to present the participants: the researchers and their work, their base institutions, their national contexts. The discussion aimed to produce a consensual definition and considered preparation of an initial classification of methodologies. As of

this first meeting, however, the debates showed the existence of national divergences (cf. infra) and the obstacles to reaching such a consensus.

### **3.2. Point-in-time surveys (PIT) and further questions on the classification of methods**

The second workshop met in Madrid in October 2003 and was devoted to point in time surveys, and thus opened discussion of quantitative methods. As well as this methodological question, attention was also given to their principal results and in particular the demographic characteristics of the homeless populations in each country of the network<sup>40</sup>. The first long paper (FR) presented this type of method and the difficulties associated with its application. It then reported on the three different PIT methods used in the USA, which initiated use of such surveys on this population, with the findings from them. Next it presented the nationwide study conducted in France in 2001. The second long paper, reflecting the specificities of the organizing team (SP), focused on the scope this type of method affords for evaluating the psychological characteristics of homeless people. In particular, it presented the psychological assessment instruments most frequently used in PIT surveys on the homeless, referenced by PSYCinfo and Medline since 1985.

#### **Long papers**

**France** (Maryse Marpsat): "Point-in-time statistical surveys of the homeless population"

**Spain** (Manuel Muñoz, Carmelo Vázquez, Sonia Panadero, José Juan Vázquez): "Psychosocial assessment in point-in-time surveys: rationale and domains of evaluation"

The short papers presented in varying detail the different PIT methods used in each country and their main results, together with the institutional setting, where this had not been given in the papers at the first meeting. Beyond this common programme, other aspects of the problem were presented, reflecting the sensibilities of researchers and the national context. Thus Antonio Tosi (I) studied the social construction of the question of the homeless in Italy and examined the process of its inclusion in research on social exclusion. Joan Smith (UK) presented the PIT surveys in relation to the different categories of homeless people, the statutory definition in force in England and Wales having the effect of splitting the homeless into distinct categories that are

---

<sup>40</sup> The papers are available on the network website, [http://www.cuhp.org/madrid\\_workshop.cfm](http://www.cuhp.org/madrid_workshop.cfm).

treated differently. The French team described the current trends observed in the socio-demographic profile of the homeless to address the questions raised by French NGOs.

### **Short papers**

**Denmark** (Tobias Børner Stax): "Quantitative point-in-time analysis of homelessness in Denmark".

**France** (Martine Quaglia, Nicolas Razafindratsima, Anne Sirot): "Point-in-time statistical surveys of the homeless population in France".

**Hungary** (Sándor Erdősi Jr, Eszter Somogyi): "The demographics of the homeless population in Hungary".

**Italy** (Antonio Tosi): "Demographics and trends of the homeless population in Italy: point-in-time studies".

**Netherlands** (Lia van Doorn, Judith Wolf, Sarala Nicolas): "Quantitative point-in-time analyses of homelessness in the Netherlands".

**Spain** (Manuel Muñoz, Carmelo Vázquez, Sonia Panadero, José Juan Vázquez): "Point-in-time surveys: establishing the characteristics of homeless populations".

**United Kingdom** (Joan Smith): "Quantitative point-in-time surveys of homelessness in the UK".

The mapping of methodologies based on a classification of surveys by method and type of data used<sup>41</sup>, came under discussion in Madrid. The question of the classificatory criteria and choice of studies was raised again. So too was that of the geographical criteria for selecting the surveys: those in the countries of the network, European surveys, or the main surveys regardless of country? Within individual countries, which studies should be included: all, national- or local-level surveys, the main ones and in that case on what selection criteria? Parallel to this, the UK team

---

<sup>41</sup> Even before the second workshop, the coordinator (FR) had asked the teams to classify the surveys in each country of the network, using suitably designed tables.

expressed its wish to have the ethical issue included in the network's activity, by attributing part of the discussion and a section of the website to it<sup>42</sup>.

### 3.3. Longitudinal analysis

The third workshop, held in Copenhagen in April 2004, focused on longitudinal analyses using both quantitative and qualitative techniques, thus linking these two major methodological orientations. At the level of knowledge on homeless populations, this methodology was associated with the question of changes in the profile of the homeless over time. Three long papers were presented, each dealing with a different method and using a different type of data<sup>43</sup>. The paper by the Spanish team reported two surveys conducted in Madrid using questionnaires—including preoccupations with the psychological characteristics of the homeless populations—and presented a summary of the results. The Danish team reported on a survey conducted in Copenhagen (and another survey currently in progress) using register data; it discussed the results but also the possibilities and limitations. The Dutch survey, meanwhile, used qualitative data derived from in-depth interviews and observation.

#### Long papers

**Netherlands** (Lia van Doorn): "A follow-up study in The Netherlands" (about in-depth interviews).

**Spain** (Manuel Muñoz, Carmelo Vázquez, Sonia Panadero and Ana Isabel Guillén): "Follow-up studies in Spain" (about panel surveys).

**Denmark** (Tobia Børner Stax): "Possibilities and Limitations in Longitudinal Analysis of Homelessness Based on Information From Official Registers".

With the short papers, the network faced a dual constraint. First, longitudinal surveys on homeless people are rare or non-existent in some countries. Second, the authors who had reported their country's surveys in the long papers could not see the purpose of the short papers. Authors of long papers adopted three strategies for their short

---

<sup>42</sup> See on <http://www.cuhp.org/ethics.cfm>: « Is it legitimate to carry out surveys on the homeless? An ethical and scientific question », by Firdion Jean-Marie, Marpsat Maryse, Bozon Michel.

And in French: Firdion Jean-Marie, Marpsat Maryse, Bozon Michel, « Est-il légitime de mener des enquêtes statistiques auprès des sans-domicile ? Une question éthique et scientifique », in Marpsat Maryse, Firdion Jean-Marie, eds, 2000, *La rue et le foyer. Une recherche sur les sans-domicile et les mal-logés dans les années 90*, Paris: PUF/INED.

<sup>43</sup> Available on the website, <http://www.cuhp.org/copenhagen.cfm>.

papers: summarize the long paper (DK); give more detailed results of the surveys reported in the long paper (SP); report the results likely to influence practical activity, and make recommendations of value for organizations working with the homeless (NL). The only country using longitudinal surveys that had not prepared a long paper (UK), presented its surveys, classifying them by the methods used, and also attempted to relate them to questions over evaluation of measures and of the policies that had motivated them. The countries with few (or no) longitudinal surveys, after presenting what was available, took different directions. The French team presented longitudinal surveys and longitudinal register data from the US. The Hungarian team adopted a historical perspective to explore the reasons for the absence of this kind of survey but also considered the scope for their introduction. The Italian team, meanwhile, placed the question of longitudinal surveys in a theoretical perspective, by examining their treatment of the processes behind trajectories into and out of homelessness.

#### **Short papers**

**Hungary** (Eszter Somogyi and Iván Tosics): "The Possibilities of Longitudinal Researches on Homelessness and the dynamic aspects of the existing researches in Hungary" and "Possibilities for a Longitudinal Analysis of the Homeless in Hungary".

**Italy** (Antonio Tosi): "Dynamic perspective on homelessness: a few questions".

**Denmark** (Tobias Stax): "Longitudinal analyses of homelessness in Denmark".

**Spain** (Carmelo Vázquez, Manuel Muñoz, Ana Isabel Guillén, Sonia Panadero): "Longitudinal studies on the homeless in Spain: results".

**Netherlands** (Lia van Doorn): "Some outcomes of a longitudinal qualitative study: phases in the development of homelessness, in relation to institutional interventions".

**United Kingdom** (Joan Smith and Ann O' Sullivan): "Longitudinal Research and the Evaluation of Homelessness Interventions in the UK".

**France** (Isabelle Frechon, Maryse Marpsat): “Longitudinal Perspectives on Homelessness: some French and American Examples”.

Besides the papers written for the workshop there was also a presentation of a work in progress by Lars Pico Geerdsen and Inger Koch-Nielsen (SFI). This new study is based on interviews of people who have been in shelters; the sample is drawn from a personal register of homeless people based on CPR numbers (Central Personal Register).

Thus the teams responded to the lack of longitudinal surveys in some countries by diversifying their contributions in the three directions indicated in the previous discussions and in ways that were consistent with their attributes and interests: provide the actors working with (or for) the homeless the tools they need for their practical activity (including of a statutory nature); take into account the theoretical presuppositions of the research and hence its implications; and increase knowledge of the research in countries or indeed continents outside of the network. The variety that characterized the teams and their expectations and interests, resulted here in expanding the scope of the network’s activity to include various fundamental aspects of scientific research.

A number of preoccupations presented in previous meetings, not contained in the proposal approved by the Commission, were addressed. These were the ethical issues raised by research activity, and the theoretical approaches that underpin research. Ethical issues were evoked in particular over, first, the margin for action of interviewers when dealing with people who request things and who need help, and second, the use of unique identifiers (as in Denmark) in order to access, among others, the services provided for the homeless. The latter allows researchers to link together several attributes of people using these services, but it establishes a situation that some would consider potentially incompatible with the principles of a free society. As for the interest in the theoretical framework, it was decided to devote part of the short papers to this.

Another issue, the relationship of NGOs to research, though central to the work of the network as approved by the contract, was perceived in different ways. This could be related to the place of NGOs in the production of research in their country and in the work of individual researchers: researchers from countries where NGOs are not engaged in research, researchers whose work is funded by NGOs, researchers from countries that collaborate with NGOs while retaining their financial independence. The

discussion had a multiple conclusion that reflected the different points of view: observe the problems experienced by people working with the homeless, reflect on the methodologies and research questions that could provide them with elements of answers, and develop understanding of how NGOs shape the lives, perceptions and practices of the homeless, but also research.

Another question concerned the methodological recommendations that the network was required to formulate. Perspectives here were polarized between two positions. On the one hand, working in the perspective of European integration, recommendations were to be formulated that applied to all the countries. In the other approach, the recommendations made would take national differences into account without adopting a standardizing perspective. The French team formulated a proposal informed by the second perspective. This would involve studying the role of national differences in research on homelessness by taking into account the national context, i.e. historical process and current issues, in relation to three types of actors: public institutions, voluntary sector agencies, and the research community.

The discussions in Copenhagen showed the effort to develop collective working but also a continuing wish to readjust the work programme originally planned. Some such readjustment occurs in any research programme, since the initial planning cannot take the place of the research itself. In the case of CUHP, this readjustment concerns essentially a central point of the framework programmes, namely the relationship of research to public policy and social practice.

### **3.4. Qualitative methods**

The fourth workshop was held in London in October 2004 and had as theme "Recording the lives and voices of the homeless". The aim was to explore the qualitative methods used to deepen understanding of different aspects of homeless people's lives, the background to their situations, their hopes and aspirations, and their own representations of their situation. Four long papers were presented<sup>44</sup>. These reported research based on observation, in-depth interviews, and life history approaches. Thus it was possible to explore different situations (such as the interactions between services and homeless people, the latter's perceptions of time and space) and different sub-populations (notably youth and women).

---

<sup>44</sup> The papers are available on <http://www.cuhp.org/London.cfm>.

### **Long Papers**

**Denmark** (Tobias Børner Stax): "Observing the doing of social work (with homeless people)".

**United Kingdom** (Joan Smith, Megan Ravenhill): "Undertaking qualitative research amongst homeless populations in the UK - contrasting strategies".

**Italy** (Rossana Torri, Antonio Tosi): "Qualitative methods and the homeless: the biographical approach in Italian research".

**Netherlands** (Lia van Doorn): "Perception of time and space of (former) homeless people".

The short papers were divided into two types, as was decided at Copenhagen. Teams that had not prepared long papers used the short papers to present the qualitative surveys conducted in their countries, while the others transformed the short papers into theoretical papers on the conceptual tools guiding their own research or that in their country<sup>45</sup>. Among the former, the Hungarian and Spanish teams presented the small number of qualitative studies conducted in their countries, while the French team concentrated on another type of research (not covered by the other presentations) based on a web diary kept by a homeless person and using participant observation and textual analysis techniques. In the second type of paper, the Italian team showed how life history (or textual) approaches analyse marginalization as a cumulative process with downward or upward trajectories, and discussed the relationship between the micro- and macro-levels. The Dutch paper related how Irving Goffman's analyses have been used to interpret the experience of becoming homeless. A second French paper examined the contribution that the notions of social field and social capital, as developed by Pierre Bourdieu, have made to homelessness surveys (this paper was discussed in Milan due to a tight schedule). Finally, the UK paper discussed the theory of social exclusion, and its relationship to the concepts of risk and moral order and to that of social capital, the latter with a meaning different to that used by Bourdieu.

---

<sup>45</sup> The French team presented two papers, one methodological, one theoretical.

### **Short papers**

**Hungary** (Eszter Somogyi and Iván Tosics): "Qualitative researches on homelessness in Hungary".

**Spain** (Manuel Muñoz, Carmelo Vázquez, Sonia Panadero, José Juan Vázquez): "Qualitative studies of the homeless population in Spain".

**France** (Maryse Marpsat) "Study of a homeless person's online journal: The Panther's Tale".

**Netherlands** (Lia van Doorn): "The newly homeless and their first days on the streets".

**United Kingdom** (Joan Smith): "Risk, exclusion, moral order and social capital - a first theorizing of youth homelessness".

**Italy** (Antonio Tosi and Rossana Torri)- "Marginalisation as a process and the biographical approach".

**France** (Jean-Marie Firdion) "A 'capital' and 'social field' approach".

Theoretical choices seemed to be an important condition for the establishment of close or distant relations between the teams in the network. Making these choices explicit gave both expression and a degree of coherence to pre-existing divergences. The theories, or rather the interpretative concepts, referred to were those of "causes", now increasingly replaced by that of "triggers" and associated with "risk theory", that of "social capital", and Goffman's concept of "career" derived from "symbolic interactionism". Also evoked was the absence of theoretical reference, a position founded on the presumed objectivity of questionnaire devices, and the possibility of mixing several theories and lines of interpretation. How participants were distributed between these different concepts seemed to be linked to the mode of interpreting homelessness (by social or individual factors) and to the degree of determinism these concepts imply for the capacity of the homeless to escape from this situation. Another part of the discussion examined the question of generalization in qualitative research and the legitimacy that a theory can bestow on such generalizations, or in the opposite case, the risk of obscuring empirical findings behind theoretical

generalizations. The possibility of integrating quantitative and qualitative surveys or data was also examined.

Preparations for the final conference also began in London.

### **3.5. Hidden homelessness**

The last six-monthly workshop, held in Milan in April 2005, had the title "Identifying Hidden Homelessness". Its aim was to explore the situations on the frontier of homelessness that, depending on the definition adopted, may or may not appear in the categories of the homeless. Included with it was the question of the vulnerability of certain housing situations that can lead to (or be considered as) homelessness. A third question was planned that adopted a longer-term perspective to examine the incidence of homelessness on the life cycle of individuals. Three long papers were presented. The papers all analysed the question of hidden homelessness in relation to that of definitions of homelessness. If all three papers presented the question in their respective countries (definitions used, classifications, statistical visibility, impact on public policy and the work of NGOs, etc), those by the Hungarian and French teams situated the question at the European level, with a presentation and discussion of the criteria governing other classifications and the problems experienced. The UK and French papers looked in particular at the relationship of hidden homelessness with the question of housing deprivation. The former also discussed the contribution of the notion of "risk" used to identify and avert certain conditions that increase the likelihood of transitions from one situation to another, while the latter considered the "norm" induced by classifications and definitions of hidden homelessness.

#### **Long papers**

**United Kingdom** (Joan Smith): "Hidden Homelessness and definitions of Homelessness in the UK - some issues for European definitions of homelessness".

**Hungary** (Eszter Somogyi, Ivan Tosics, with the coll. of Peter Gyori): "Hidden homeless. An overview of the concept, statistics and policy implication".

**France** (Maryse Marpsat): "Beyond literal homelessness".

The short papers followed the orientation decided in the last meetings of looking at the theoretical bases of research on the homeless. This had been specifically requested by the Italian team organizing the meeting—whose wish to situate the questions

examined in a broader theoretical and contextualized framework had been clear since work started. In its Guidelines it proposed that the short papers be devoted to “theoretical approaches”. But the Guidelines left open other possibilities, including mixing hidden homelessness and theoretical approaches.

#### **Short papers**

**Italy** (Antonio Tosi and Rossana Torri): “Extending the concept of Homelessness”.

**Denmark** (Ivan Christensen and Inger Koch-Nielsen): “Danish research on homelessness with a focus on Hidden Homelessness”.

**Spain** (Manuel Muñoz, Carmelo Vázquez, Sonia Panadero, Aida de Vicente): “Theoretical models in the homeless population”.

**Netherlands** (Lia van Doorn and Petra van Leeuwen): “Theoretical approaches in recent academic studies into homelessness in the Netherlands”.

**United Kingdom** (Megan Ravenhill): “British homelessness: theoretical perspectives”.

**France** (Maryse Marpsat) “A few notes about the context of homeless research in France”.

This theoretical orientation gave coherence to the short papers, even if the treatment it received varied. The Italian short paper placed the question of hidden homelessness in a theoretical perspective. The Italian team considered the question of homelessness as a social construction and discussed the theoretical and methodological implications of broadening the definition—which can be approached in different ways—and the related problems and the historical circumstances that raise the question of a broader definition. The case of homeless women in Italy supplied an example. The other papers studied the theoretical approaches behind research either in their own country (NL, UK, HU) or at a more general level. In the case of the UK, two of them, structuration theory and risk society theory, received a fuller exposition. The Hungarian team addressed the question of why research on homeless people in Hungary makes no reference to a particular theoretical framework or to explicit concepts, whereas studies on poverty do. The Spanish team, by contrast, undertook a more general research on the theoretical frameworks used by surveys on the homeless referenced in certain on-line databases, most of them in the health field and

from the English-speaking world. The paper of the French team adopted the framework set down after the workshop in London in view of the Brussels Conference. These guidelines incorporated the proposal made in London and subsequently discussed at more length with some teams for the preparation of papers taking a contextual approach to research on homeless people: theories, relationship with research in other countries (or at a European level), relationship between methods and theories, public policy framework, etc.

Somewhat different to these papers was that by the Danish team, whose membership had changed following the departure of Tobias Stax in January 2005. The new teamleader was Lars Benjaminsen, whose research was on a topic not previously included in CUHP: routes out of homelessness. His paper reported this research and situated it in relation to Danish preoccupations and theoretical orientations, and went on to discuss statistical definitions of the homeless in Denmark and how the question of hidden homelessness is perceived and analysed.

The question of hidden homelessness to which the first morning was devoted led to continuing the discussion about definitions. The contributors explored the possibilities and criteria for a common definition or for patterns that definitions would need to include. Following the discussions in the first two workshops, division was over acceptance of either a broad definition, based just on housing situation, or a narrow definition, that included other social factors over and above housing situation. Other criteria for delimiting the coverage of these definitions were considered, in particular the question of prevention, in which case it is necessary to include also certain risk situations, whether housing situations (such as doubling up) or social situations (such as domestic violence). A consensus emerged on two points: of not treating different housing situations as a continuum along which individuals move from one to another in a cumulative process; and of not approaching homelessness without taking into account structural as well as individual factors. Beyond these positions of general principle, however, opinions varied widely as to the relative importance of structural versus individual factors. In fact, as the French team pointed out, an examination of the arguments and examples deployed by the teams suggests that the differences between the teams regarding the type of definition defended are determined by the purpose for which the definition is intended. Considering just housing situations is to adopt a research work perspective, in which the social characteristics are the research finding; if other social characteristics besides housing situation are considered, the perspective is that of practical administration of the issue, of public policy responses, and the aim is to identify more clearly the populations needing support. The Italian team's proposal to consider the definition as a social construction takes this difference

into account. However, the difficulty of an agreement led the French team to propose a paper on the issue of definitions for the Brussels final conference.

Another question discussed at Milan was that of the housing stock and related policies. The Hungarian team (that observed the construction of the homeless question following the change in political regime and hence the upheaval in the housing market) drew attention to the refusal of the European Union to include a policy on housing among its priorities at the same time as supporting the privatization of social housing. It should be noted here that if the relationship of housing context to homelessness had not been overlooked so far<sup>46</sup>, it was not a question on which the network took position during the workshops. However, this issue was dealt with in the final conference, through the Hungarian team's contribution.

Much of the meeting was devoted to preparation of the final conference in Brussels. The line adopted in Milan was close to the terms of the contract, though not without some distancing. Thus the Conference had to present the results of the CUHP's work on the central topics of the contract (definitions, methods, public policy questions). The question of theoretical backgrounds was included but it no longer provided the conference title<sup>47</sup>. The conference participants and audience were to be drawn from among researchers and from among public and voluntary sectors actors, depending on the orientation of the work.

#### **4. Day 2:NGO perspectives**

Part of the work of the Thematic Network CUHP was to understand the context in which NGOs worked with the homeless, and their perspective on definitions of homelessness, and new homeless populations. Therefore the second day of each workshop included representatives of local NGOs and Municipal Councils and/or Ministries with a particular interest in homelessness<sup>48</sup>. The purposes of these meetings were three-fold:

- to understand the issues facing policy makers and NGOs in different countries in dealing with homelessness;

---

<sup>46</sup> The Hungarian team's papers, in particular, often referred to this relationship; it was also discussed during the second day of the workshops in Copenhagen and London as well as during the final conference.

<sup>47</sup> The title given in the Technical Annex of the contract (Table 3, p. 14) was "Social capital, risk and social exclusion".

<sup>48</sup> See Joan Smith's contribution to the final conference.

- to understand their perspectives on homelessness (definitions of homelessness/housing need), new homeless populations and new ways of working;
- to understand their priorities for future research.

#### **4.1. NGOs, the State and homeless services**

In our workshops the importance of NGOs in the work of social welfare for the homeless became apparent.

For example, Spain is a country that has a Continental/Family welfare state that, it was emphasized, was in the process of change as the family welfare model became less effective. In Madrid the work of the NGOs was particularly important as they filled a gap that housing services did not see as belonging to them. It seems it was the same in Hungary:

Besides local government, the role of Non Profit Sector is very significant - half of all services are run by NGOs, Church organisations, who also get normative grants. In many cases local government contracts out these services to NGOs.

As I mentioned this system was elaborated in a very short time – a crisis management for the problem. Of course problems then appeared. This system cannot manage the problems of the different groups of homeless people – namely the young homeless people, the problem of homeless families – there are not really homes for families, night shelters are for single people, even couples can't live there. The small number of rehabilitation centres are for those who are ready to leave the homeless life. The other problem is that those who are in a bad condition – physically or mentally – they can't get enough care because the number of nursing homes, mental health homes is very low. There is also no prevention for those who are at risk of becoming homeless, there are no preventative policies for them. (Eszter Somogyi, Hungary)

However, in relation to homelessness services, NGOs were important even in the advanced welfare states of Denmark, France, Holland and the UK. In Copenhagen the speaker from the Ministry of Social Affairs argued for close relations with the NGOs and local government:

I just want to give some comments. Thank God we have the close co-operation between government bodies, regional bodies and the institutions. We hear what is going on in the institutions and then we start thinking. We have information about young people in shelters and then we started projects for young people. When we hear about young people smoking hash or taking cocaine and the increasing problem it creates then we act. Right now Parliament is discussing an action plan for young people and drugs; and right now is working on an action plan for people from Greenland, to improve their situation. (Ministry of Social Affairs, Denmark)

At the Paris workshop it was argued that France had well balanced partnerships. For example, the Association des Cités du Secours Catholique undertakes social tasks in twelve centres (nine of them situated in the Ile de France region). These offer shelters, work centres, social residences and apartments. Half of this work is publicly funded and includes work with the homeless, the mentally ill, women with children, single men, young people, sick people and their families. Paris also has a Centre d'Action Sociale de la Ville de Paris (CASVP) created in 1995, dependent on the Municipality of Paris, with a Board of Directors and Presided over by the Mayor of Paris; there are fifteen members of the Paris Council and fifteen members of NGOs and other social work institutions. This follows the 'social partnership' method predominant in France.

In the UK the relationship between government and NGOs has become particularly strong but principally through funding mechanisms: first through the establishment of the Rough Sleepers' Unit that funded some agencies to provide centralised services; the second through the new funding stream of 'Supporting People' that requires quarterly returns reporting outputs and under which funding is only renewed through Government approval. Some agencies are concerned about the power these funding streams give to Government over the work of the agencies.

Agencies are finding that the Audit Commission, the government, the Treasury feel that they need to change, there needs to be a step-change again and the government's answer to this is to say 'Well we are going to stop work on the street and we are going to try things that have been tried perhaps elsewhere in the United States, we are looking a bit at Philadelphia and again at New York, but about signposting people off the street'. The government is taking what's called a street management approach where it's the police, the

wardens, the cleansing authorities that are looking at where they find people, saying "You can't be here, you need to go over there into this hostel, into the day centre".(NGO, Single homeless, London)

(The issue of street management approaches is discussed further in Section III 4.4.)

### **Homeless services and local connection**

In most of the countries that held workshops, homelessness is a responsibility of local services and services are provided for those with a 'local connection'. In Paris it was reported that if a housed person was from an Arrondissement (city district) of the Ville de Paris then they received their services in that Arrondissement. Being without an address, homeless people have to attend at one of the four 'permanences' (offices) according to age, sex and the presence of children, as each catered for a different group of clients.

In Madrid services were also local, but many areas within Greater Madrid did not offer services to homeless people, who therefore travelled into the centre. The same point was made for Copenhagen, by the representative from the Ministry for Social Affairs

It is important to realise that Denmark is a localised society; there are 13 regional, 271 local authorities and both types of council are entitled to raise taxes. We provide the framework for action and the local and regional authorities fill in the framework. Our legislation is broad and flexible therefore it does not require amendment – we issue guidelines but local and regional authorities are responsible for the services. Cash assistance, housing and benefits are provided at the local level. Regional governments are responsible for reception centres, shelters, boarding houses. But they may leave the running of these to voluntary organisations and this happens in 50% of cases under contract. Only rarely does a local or regional authority fail to meet its obligation.

A representative from the Church Army in Copenhagen pointed out that if people wanted to move to another area where they might possibly get a house there were difficulties because they could not transfer their welfare entitlement.

It is not possible to just move to another area – suburbs or elsewhere in Copenhagen. A person can't get social welfare from other municipalities, unless you renounce your social welfare entitlement in the other place.(Church Army, Copenhagen)

A Dutch researcher of the CUHP network argued that the problem of establishing a local connection is that homeless people who move around the country could be excluded from the system.

I have two questions. The first is what is the effect of the decentralisation of the homeless process from the national to the local level? In the Netherlands we are in the process of being decentralised and what we see is that there are a lot of advantages but there might be risks. An advantage of course is that at the local level, the municipal can get a better idea of what local group of homeless and what programme fits, a better match between needs and what is provided. But there are risks also – what we see is that in local areas there is a tendency that local institutions will leave out homeless people who come from other parts of the country out of their institutions. They provide the care for ‘their own homeless’ and not for people who move around and come from other places and there might be complications then. (Lia van Doorn, NIZW, Netherlands)

A similar issue arises in the UK. As part of the tests established under homeless legislation, applicants must prove a local connection. However, because in the UK Homelessness Legislation applies to all local authorities, every local authority must have a homeless strategy. This was not the case in Spain or Italy. At Madrid it was reported that services in Barcelona were much less well developed than in Madrid for example (800 beds for 8000 street homeless in 2003), and services in the local areas around Milan varied in relation to local support.

A member of the network from the Italian team reported on the different ways that homelessness was approached as a policy comparing the UK and other European nations.

If I understand that the problem working with street homeless persons here (in London) was in some way to try to add them to the accommodation complement, and to add to the programme the idea of social relations and social isolation. You know in many other European countries this kind of the problem was really some way the reverse, because street homeless was and still is defined as a problem of poverty and as a problem of extreme poverty or marginalisation. So the problem was to convince social workers,

policy makers and so on that accommodation, the housing part of the programme was important, is important.

I don't think that the two stories are converging. ... In the case of southern countries, South Europe countries in general, there the prevailing image of homelessness is as a policy problem. Even today, for instance, housing research is not open to consider homelessness as a problem within its competence and housing departments, housing policies are not open to view homelessness as something within their competence. It is passed completely to social welfare. (Antonio Tosi, Politecnico di Milano, Italy)

## **4.2. Perspectives on housing need and homelessness**

Current developments in housing markets across Northern and Central Europe have included the privatisation of social housing and greater reliance on owner-occupation to house the population, with housing allowances to support the most vulnerable. Discussions at the Copenhagen and London workshops reported these developments had huge implications; in both capital cities there was a crisis for low-income families.

### **4.2.1. Homeless populations, describing homelessness and legal definitions of homelessness**

There was a surprising discussion in Copenhagen as a speaker from the Municipality of Copenhagen reported that their Law distinguished between 2 groups:

- ordinary people without homes, and for these people the Municipality is responsible for finding housing<sup>49</sup>.
- for homeless people with heavier social or mental and/or abuse problems, the State pays half the price of the shelters. Copenhagen has half the shelters in Denmark and about 2000 persons go through the system. There are 600 beds and the budget is 19 million euros per year.

These two groups were described by the Danish as the 'houseless homeless' and the 'homeless homeless' and this classification provoked an extensive discussion.

---

<sup>49</sup> As seen below, the municipality has an obligation to find a place to stay in cases of acute loss of dwelling, but in all other cases (people without homes who do not have mental health or abuse problems) the responsibility rests in practice on the individual (especially in places where the housing market is tight).

The distinction between the normal homeless and the 'homeless homeless' fits the Danish situation. We have to get the imminent homeless out of homelessness, through an immediate response to the housing issue and then more in-depth policies for the long-term 'homeless homeless'. (Representative, National Council for Socially Marginalized and Excluded in Odense)

The policy is that the houseless have their own responsibility to get their own flat, house, if they can – the Municipality does not have responsibility for the houseless; housing is the person's own responsibility. We might provide a hotel room for a short period of time, but not a house. The houseless are not the same as the 'homeless homeless', the rough sleepers; we have a responsibility towards them. (Ministry of Social Affairs)

A member of the Danish research team from SFI reported that the 'houseless homeless' had found it increasingly hard to access social housing as the housing crisis in Copenhagen had worsened.

The distinction between the houseless and the homeless homeless category is not a given. There has been an increasing restriction. There has been an increasing demand to document the social problems of families; it is not enough to say that social housing is necessary to prevent homeless homeless. Therefore there is a lack of prevention now – now people have to get closer to the shelter before they are assigned to housing.

We seem to have three types of housing problem:

- houseless;
- homeless Homeless;
- Freak housing for the freaks – people you don't have to put in real housing.

(Tobias Stax, SFI, DK)<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> The final reference was to the building of housing that was below standard for particular 'homeless homeless' people (see below).

The response from NGOs attending the Copenhagen meeting demonstrated similar concerns:

The 'homeless homeless' have other issues besides homelessness. It is as if workers are scared to check on people who might not have other problems. A lot of people who on the surface do not have other problems, do have other problems and there is a problem if workers are scared to interview them if the problems are not obvious and surfacing...There is now a vicious circle of housing – we are no longer placing people quickly because people have to have the right luggage, the right sack on their back before they get the support they need. (Representative, Church Army, Copenhagen)

One comment today was about housing in Copenhagen. If you have an apartment through the municipality then you have to have certain problems. But from our shelter we have some people going to the apartments and some not. If you look at the map you can see that we have some people with severe social problems and they go out to supported housing. But here you have people who can go out to an apartment; they are co-operating with the shelter and the municipality to get an apartment. Then on the top level we have the homeless, or the houseless homeless, who cannot get an apartment, or any house. My point is that this level is moving all the time because of political changes, and how many houses you have. It is always moving depending on how many houses you have and on politics. For our shelter you can see it, a couple of years ago, the level was somewhat higher. (Speaker, Railways Night Shelter)

Members of the INED team, France, objected to the distinction between the 'houseless homeless' and the 'homeless homeless' arguing that the distinction was unwarranted.

I am embarrassed by this position and I don't understand it. It is one thing to classify the housing situations that homeless people find themselves in at a given time, but it is another thing to classify the persons, the people, as if they were stuck in this situation for ever, as if they didn't go from one place to another, from one position of health to another, or from one classification to another, and I think the classification itself is stigmatising and it can worsen the situation. (Maryse Marpsat, INED, Fr)

In Paris the term used by the INED research team is 'sans domicile', corresponding to a definition of homelessness developed by the CNIS (the French national council of statistical information) with NGOs, based on a four-fold classification of housing situations. However, another member of the INED team reported that the application system used by families to access social housing does not employ this definition. In practice, therefore, it was not clear how different the Paris and Copenhagen situations were in relation to separate housing routes for different homeless populations.

In the UK the terminology is different – as explained at the London workshop of CUHP. The term 'single homeless people' is one used by all agencies working with those homeless people living in hostels and on the streets without dependent children or other family members. It identifies those homeless people who largely did not, and mostly still do not even after the 2002 legislation, have specific rights of re-housing under the homeless legislation because they are not in 'priority need groups'.

I don't know what the law is in other parts of Europe but in the United Kingdom we use our legislation to ration our housing and to control who gets housing and who is homeless. In 1977 when the legislation was introduced the decision was made that there are certain groups of people who are more important than others and the people who are more important are the people *who* have children, families essentially. As a consequence much of the voluntary sector emerged to fill a gap, to plug the hole, and to help those people who weren't getting support from their local authorities. And Crisis since 1977 has been focused around helping single homeless people.  
(Crisis NGO, London)

The speaker from the Greater London Council also emphasised this point:

Well homelessness as we have already learnt this morning is defined in several ways, and counted in several ways. We have those who are declared as homeless under the legislative framework, this was set out in the Housing Act of 1996 which was amended in 2002. In England and Wales if there is not accommodation they have the right to occupy, or accommodation that it is not reasonable that they should occupy, so that would include those who are fleeing domestic violence or harassment, it is unreasonable to return to their properties, then people are homeless according to the law. To be classified as statutory homeless an applicant needs to apply to one of

their local authorities in London and it's up to that authority to interpret the law in making this decision, so it's quite subjective. And even if somebody is homeless as you've heard this morning being homeless is not enough to benefit from the services that local authorities can offer, an authority only has a duty to rehouse you if you are seen to be a priority need and in general that is for applicants who have dependent children or who are pregnant and single people who may be considered vulnerable. Vulnerability often relates to an illness – physical or mental illness – and in some categories age and has been broadened recently to incorporate some other categories. (Greater London Council, London)

The speaker from the London Borough of Tower Hamlets confirmed this argument. His words can be summarised here. There are five tests: 1) Is the person eligible for assistance (what is their national/immigrant status?); 2) Are they homeless or potentially homeless (do they have to leave their accommodation in 28 days? Or have they already left?); 3) Is the household a priority need household (pregnant women, families with dependent children, 16/17 years of age, ex-institutional care), and are they vulnerable? (do they have specific physical or mental health housing needs?); 4) Are they intentionally homeless?; 5) Are they local?

A specific term is used in the UK for those living on the streets, which is 'rough sleepers':

I think the most significant change in terms of policy in the United Kingdom has been a massive investment, a massive focus in the early part of this Labour government on dealing with rough sleeping and as a consequence of the huge investment and massive effort from the voluntary sector and from government we have seen a relative decline in the numbers of people on the street and I stress the relative. Rough sleeping is still a significant problem in this country, there are still thousands of people who experience rough sleeping in the United Kingdom every year, it's gone down, from the peak period of the early Nineties but it's still there. On the other hand, overall homelessness is going up, if you look at the broader figures. (Speaker, CRISIS, UK NGO)

The definition of homeless people used in the UK therefore is closely tied to legislation (especially for the victims of violence, domestic or otherwise) and to specific services (homeless, single homeless, rough sleepers).

The two workshops held in Italy and Spain (in Milan and Madrid) demonstrated the different approaches in Continental/Family Welfare states<sup>51</sup> compared with Northern and Central European societies. In these societies the definition of homelessness is largely restricted to people who are street homeless.

In neither society were housing services responsible for homeless people. The team from Spain agreed with the distinction between the 'houseless homeless' and the 'homeless homeless' but believed that it had different connotations in different countries; in Spain there was very little social housing.

At the meeting in Milan, it was argued that in Italy, NGOs and researchers were more likely to describe homeless people as 'marginal' or 'vulnerable' people.

I am responsible for the social service in Bergamo for the reception of homeless. ...As well as the local approach to marginality, we have a specific aim to work with people to enhance their personal abilities to gain control over their lives....

We have arrived at a definition that we call – Severe Adult Hardship. The term 'Adult Hardship' defines the social/cultural frame. (Nuovo Albergo Popolare, Bergamo)

The speaker went on to describe the fact that terminology is important in accessing particular services:

The three main concepts that help to bring in services, to give assistance to people are: Senza Dimora – means something very specific, and is different; Chronic persons – normally gives right to medical assistance; Poor people– which is more related to religious intervention.

---

<sup>51</sup> Here, reference is made to the four predominant systems that several writers have described:  
- Nordic / Scandinavian model  
- Cooperative / continental model  
- Liberal model or Atlantic/Beveridge model  
- Mediterranean welfare states or Continental/Family welfare systems.

These definitions were important in relation to advocacy and legal aid; lawyers working for the homeless in Bergamo needed a legal definition of the homeless because they were not allowed to give free help to the poor of their area, only the homeless. Another NGO representative in Milan used the concept of vulnerability to describe the same phenomena:

We have to start from a concept of 'vulnerability'. This is connected to the problems of precariousness, life style in general (family, work, house). It is difficult to find differences from the young person who comes from the South of Italy, and the immigrant from Romania, for example. They live and work in the same place. This means it is very difficult to find a single and simple definition of the homeless person. (Speaker, Associazione Amici di Piazza Grande, Bologna)

One of the most important divisions in relation to a legal definition of homelessness was the situation of women facing domestic violence. In Copenhagen the Ministry of Social Affairs did not recognize a relationship between domestic violence and homelessness (see below).

#### **4.2.2. The Right to Housing**

The differences between welfare regimes showed most clearly in relation to the availability of social housing. As was explained at the Madrid workshop there is practically no social housing in Spain, where 80% are owner-occupiers. One of the NGOs was attempting to bridge a housing gap for the homeless through renting.

A main pillar would be the question of housing or accommodation ... Housing is very expensive for people with a stable income so imagine what it is for those without income. Since 1994 we have been supporting financially and technically the creation of shared flats. Nowadays this is also becoming impossible not only with the economic circumstances of the project, it has become very expensive to rent rooms or flats, economic resources are always insufficient and there is a scarcity of places to rent so this is getting worse and worse. A useful instrument to favour the autonomy of certain people is becoming something impossible nowadays. The way to solve it is to have a true public answer to the problem.

.... In Madrid we only have very cheap pensions where you can rent a room and that is all we have really – hostels or inns – and we

discovered a world where you no longer know who is the owner of the hostel, or who is living in the hostel, and that doesn't contribute to stability and improvement of the lives of the people. (Realides Association, Madrid)

A 'true public answer to the problem' has become increasingly difficult under the European Commission's drive to increase competition and to strengthen the private sector (both Sweden and the Netherlands have been criticised for the size of their remaining social sector). Nevertheless the French NGOs are pursuing the possibility of using their social housing sector to support the homeless. FNARS reported that they were pursuing the right to housing in the courts through a question of whether it can be a 'droit opposable'. FNARS has also been concerned that the recent emphasis on the 'social mix' of neighbourhoods should not be used to weaken the 'right to housing'.

The impact of privatisation of social housing through a 'right to buy' policy was reported in the London workshop. First, a social housing sector that accounted for 33% of housing units in 1979 had shrunk to 19% twenty-five years later. The speaker from Greater London Council reported that in 2003/4 30,000 households were accepted as homeless by all the London Boroughs (33 London Boroughs), 14,000 were living in hostels, with 180 rough sleepers on any one night; in addition London Boroughs were responsible for 32,000 asylum seekers. Because of the lack of social housing in London 65,000 households accepted as homeless were living in temporary accommodation that year and the average length of time they had to stay before moving to permanent accommodation was 2-3 years. Second, under the Labour Government all the remaining social housing units had to be transferred from the ownership of the local authority to Housing Associations. The speaker from a London borough reported that the right to housing under the homeless legislation still exists in the UK but that Local Authorities no longer own social housing and are therefore increasingly forced to rent (at a high cost) private accommodation to fulfil their responsibilities to homeless households.

So that Tower Hamlets as a council is going to move from being the biggest landlord in the area to a fairly insignificant player in terms of landlords.

... Now we have 3,000 households in temporary accommodation and that will cost us £25 million pounds a year. (Speaker, London Borough of Tower Hamlets)

The speakers from the Greater London Council and from the London Borough of Tower Hamlets emphasised, as in Copenhagen, the extreme difficulty of finding affordable housing in a capital city. The speaker from the Municipality of Copenhagen reported that they were particularly concerned about maintaining a supply of housing in that city:

We are trying to stop Copenhagen becoming like London where it is too expensive for ordinary people to live in the centre. We have to prioritise, and women and children come first because we don't want them to grow up and become second generation homeless. Then there is not enough housing for the total group of homeless. (Speaker, Municipality of Copenhagen)

I want to continue this discussion about the problem of the capital city here in Denmark. Because I see this tendency that the politicians won't help these people who are moving towards homelessness because they have a housing problem. If you don't have a specific homeless problem then you can't get any help and you can't get listed on the acute help for housing here in Copenhagen. That means that you need to have more and bigger problems to get resocialized into housing here in Copenhagen. If this tendency keeps on going then you create 'homeless homeless' people because the people who only have a housing problem will go nuts or maybe get a tendency towards alcoholism and this problem will explode and then you have an increasing group that will join the other homeless. (NGO, Copenhagen)

In other words, if left too long, a housing problem frequently becomes a social work problem. Housing problems were most acute in capital cities, and this was also the case in Italy: at the Milan workshop the national homeless co-ordinating organisation reported a housing crisis in Rome.

#### **4.2.3. Special housing for homeless people**

In some Northern European countries special forms of housing have been created, at a standard lower than the national housing standard; this is true in both Denmark and the Netherlands. At the Copenhagen workshop the implications of this were discussed.

In the Municipality of Copenhagen we have 36 houses built in 3 different places; they are built like huts in the mountains. We tried to

find persons who wanted to live in a house and then we tagged people to find out how they got on. The result is that 70% continue to stay for 2-3 years. But it is difficult to find land to build those houses. (Municipality of Copenhagen)

One of the Dutch research team reported that this was occurring in the Netherlands and questioned whether this was a way forward for homeless people, or whether it would create ghettos of homeless people.

In the Netherlands we call it sub-standard living because it is below the standard that we agreed upon that you should live in. We could formulate the hypothesis that if you provide sub-standard housing for homeless people then it might be a way for them to have upward mobility in their housing career, it might be a step in between because there is a huge gap between the housing that we live in that is very expensive, and it is hard to pay the rent, and sub-standard housing might be a step in between to offer the homeless a step to go forward. That is one hypothesis that it might lead to better housing but the other hypothesis is that it might create ghettos with inferior housing where the homeless still got stuck, where they have no possibilities to move out and it could lead to another trap – they are off the streets but they still have inferior living conditions. These questions occurred to my mind and it would be interesting from a researcher's point of view to have another look at these issues. (Lia van Doorn, NIZW, Netherlands)

The representative of the Ministry of Social Affairs made it very clear that he believed that the Copenhagen authorities and the Ministry were no longer responsible for the homeless but that they were for the homeless and this might involve them in building different forms of accommodation.

We are not responsible for the homeless but we are responsible for the homeless homeless. Are we building ghettos for the homeless homeless – maybe yes, a shelter here, a residential house there. But there is a movement from shelter to a permanent dwelling that is a person's own home with no rules; that person can shut the door and have his own place. Maybe some need help during the day but it is their own home. (Ministry of Social Affairs, Copenhagen)

#### 4.2.4. Meeting the demands of multiple systems

At various workshops the question of fitting homeless people into appropriate social boxes was raised. In many systems funding was based on identifying particular social problems that homeless people had.

We transformed the strategy and based it on three different consecutive phrases:

- 1<sup>st</sup> phase: reception, when we try to help people to better understand their problem. When people understand their exact situation they can proceed to the next phase.
- 2<sup>nd</sup> phase: we put them into a specific service. There are four different dimensions: alcohol addiction, mental illness, drug addiction and generic. These are the classical definitions that government recognises and to be identified within one of these groups helps funding their service.
- 3<sup>rd</sup> phase: we help people with social integration, we help people to redefine which is the best housing solution for them and which is the best model of social integration for a specific person and helping them to get a wage to support this integration. We have an agreement with Bergamo municipality and regional support and also private support.

This dividing in four community sectors is necessary to obtain funding and it provides the division in small groups – for instance if we have a drug addict he is in a specific group which is allowed to deal with drug addiction. (*Nuovo Albergo Popolare, Bergamo*)

This was the case not just in Italy but also in Copenhagen. There was a reported problem with different social systems providing separate services:

The homeless provide a challenge to the social system in Denmark. There are different social systems for the marginalized. There are social systems for: Abusers, Healthcare, Labour market, Housing Market, System for mentally ill, Handicapped.

But the Homeless can overlap these, they don't fit into the small boxes of the system. (NGO, Copenhagen)

In Spain it was reported that the health and social work services did not work with the homeless. Therefore new systems bringing all services together were being created.

The obvious need is to establish relationships with the health service for example. But this is not so obvious because social workers didn't have a role to play in the field of homelessness. The social problem of homelessness was dealt with by other organisations, religious and other organisations. ...So we have to link all these sectors together – the housing sector, the hospital or health sector, has to be linked to the homeless question. (Discussion in Madrid)

#### **4.2.5. Conclusions**

Antonio Tosi (Italian team) reflected on whether the distinction between houseless homeless and homeless homeless was not different depending on whether or not there was an extensive welfare state.

This part is connected to my second point which was raised this morning about an increase in a type of homelessness which is more global and more multi-problem, or the increase of multi-problems among homeless people. .... In many cases it exists but it is also exaggerated; it is important to recognise that a problem is a multi-problem but many homeless people have more than one problem – is it just two or three – but calling it multi-problem suggests a huge range of problems which requires exceptional efforts to address the question. But fortunately this is not the case, many homeless persons may have a problem of housing or a problem of work, in two or three problems that in many cases may be associated. This is a research problem, to be looked at empirically. Maybe in Denmark things are different, according to what has been referred; if you have a relatively good coverage of basic needs it is possible that persons who escape the safety net are multi-problem persons but in most countries that don't have such good protection in general, things are not like that. (Antonio Tosi, Politecnico di Milano, Milan).

### **4.3. New homeless populations**

There was considerable agreement among NGOs over the problem of the emergence of new homeless populations: young people, women, and immigrants. But there was also agreement that some of the underlying issues that had emerged with these populations were also ones that should be considered in relation to other homeless populations.

#### **4.3.1. Family policy and homelessness**

The rise of youth homelessness was brought up in each of the workshops by different NGOs. At the Paris workshop it was raised by FNARS as a major research question on the proportionate responsibility of families, schools and public policies for the rise of youth exclusion. In London NGOs from London and Birmingham reported the development of separate services for homeless youth that provided accommodation, advice, training, family mediation, and resettlement support.

In Madrid and Milan agencies were particularly concerned about the rise of youth homelessness and the relation of this to the particular problems posed by the disappearance of the family welfare system in Spain and Italy. The rise of individualism posed particular problems for Continental/Family or Mediterranean welfare regimes.

We need special services for young people. The appearance for the first time in Spain and other countries of children on the street, or very, very young homeless; this wasn't the usual thing in our country at least, but unfortunately this is becoming more common. (Manuel Muñoz, Complutense University of Madrid)

The same issue of the decline of family welfare was raised in Milan:

The Italian welfare system is very weak from this point of view. It still works like 20 or 30 years ago when the Italian family was much stronger than it is now and the destruction of the family has not been recognized by the Italian welfare system. (Associazione San Marcellino, Genoa)

However, in the most extensive welfare system, in Denmark, NGOs also reported a growing number of young shelter residents.

Over the past few years it has become notable that a growing number of residents fall into two categories

- One, young people, over 18 years, alcohol users, who after their eighteenth birthday have no social safety net readily available to them.
- Two, worn out, middle-aged narcotic users, many of whom are terminal patients and who need long-term care probably for the rest of their lives. Similar legislation but nowhere else to go; traditional nursing homes cannot manage these people – either their needs or social behaviour. (Shelter Mændenes Hjem)

In Copenhagen a discussion occurred between those running 'traditional' shelters in the countryside and those running shelters in Copenhagen. It was apparent that the country shelters in Denmark, like those in the UK, were equally aware of the lack of, and need for, social networks, but could also provide separate accommodation for young homeless people. Store Dannesbo in Fyn could provide young people with separate buildings and different experiences. In Copenhagen shelters were now working with younger homeless people with drug issues, and immigrant populations in the same shelters as older homeless people.

Store Dannesbo in Fyn is placed in the countryside – and this has created a social bond between the people staying there and the institution, and you can feel that you can use the institution as a basis for the future, it is a solid basis for your further life, whereas the Shelter Mændenes Hjem is located in the Centre of Copenhagen and having multiple target groups, including ethnic groups with post-traumatic stress syndrome, and having users of illegal substances, and a lot of different people, there is not the solidarity or community feeling in the institution, which makes people less equipped when they face re-integration. (National Council for Socially Marginalized and Excluded)

In the UK, organisations working with the single homeless had also become aware of the issues of isolation in relation to older single homeless people.

There's a lot more awareness of, a lot more recognition of the fact that family breakdown and breakdown of social networks are a major contributory cause of homelessness. The focus in the past has been on

housing supply but if you look at the reasons that people give for becoming homeless, a significant number or the majority are people who are from a background where there's been a breakdown in their family or in some kind of close relationship.(Speaker, CRISIS, London)

At the London workshop three NGOs that specialise in working with young homeless people spoke about their work. Two of the organisations were founded in the 1970s to provide accommodation for young homeless people aged 16-25 years: Centrepoin is a national organisation that provides 500 bed-spaces in hostels across London, and St Basils Project provides 300 bed-spaces in Birmingham. Both provide other services including prevention services, services in schools and advice services. A speaker also represented the Foyer Federation, which is a federation of 120 foyers providing 6,000 bedspaces with training across the UK for young people. All three were concerned about the rise of youth homelessness in the UK over the past 25 years. All three organisations were not only providing accommodation but also offering prevention services and developing homeless strategies with local authorities.

#### **4.3.2. Homelessness among immigrant populations**

At the first workshop in Paris it was reported that issues of homelessness and the country origins of immigrant populations were similar between France and Italy. Immigrants to both countries came from Eastern Europe, Africa, China and Middle East, although in Italy immigration from Latin America, especially Columbia, was also important.

The Spanish research team reported that few immigrants were street homeless but they thought it was possible to distinguish two groups of homeless people among immigrants: first, those who use shelters for a few days until they find their own network; and second, those who stay in shelters and have similar problems to the Spanish homeless people who stay in shelters i.e. problems in childhood, drug or mental health problems. However, the view of Madrid City Hall was that there was a growing street population of immigrants.

Outside of the network we have some 500 persons sleeping on the streets everyday. For the most part it is men: 82% are men and 18% are women. Of these 29% are mentally ill, the average age is 42, which is of course important. 50% have been on the street for over five years now. These people who are currently sleeping on the street include 30% foreigners.

... Immigrants therefore represent 30% of the homeless in Madrid, of which one third come from Eastern Europe and the rest are Latin American. What is especially worrying is that 23% of foreigners who are on the street have been on the street for over five years. (Chief of Services – Madrid City Hall)

A researcher from the UK team reported that among young people in the foyers it was found that many asylum seekers/refugees had good adaptation skills and fewer problems than many UK nationals who were homeless. Speakers from NGOs in Copenhagen argued that this was true if they adapted – if they did not adapt then they lost their social network.

We can say that over the last ten years we have gone from this kind of group – the old alcoholics, drinking for many years, and living in the hostel for many years – they are not at our place any more. Instead, the group changed into those with drug problems that have been abusing drugs for a long period, they had been in and out of many shelters, or living in the streets, or living with each other in apartments. There was a change in the early 90s that you could have drug users living in the shelters, before then it was very rare to see that in the shelters.

The next change in the group was in 1995 when immigrants and refugees began coming in the shelters. These were immigrants and refugees who had social problems, not just not being integrated into Danish society. At the same time you had a drug scene in some areas.... In 1995 there was a change in the drug users group and they began to include new cultures and issues. We were able to help some of those people who were without housing. Immigrants were part of our target group and we went from housing 5-7% immigrants, to housing 30-50% immigrants among our residents. We have most immigrants and refugees with severe and heavy social problems – other shelters in Copenhagen have immigrants living there without those heavy social problems, they may just not have work. But those living at our place are those immigrants with mental problems and drug abuse. ...

Immigrants in refuges are the same because when their drug abuse gets too high, their back-up social network disappears and you have

the same problems as the Danes. There has been a myth that there is more acceptance in those cultures but when the abuse gets too high then the social network disappears. (Church Army Copenhagen.)

In Copenhagen, however, it was difficult for any undocumented person to enter a shelter because all had to give their register number. Therefore in Copenhagen, alongside shelters, had arisen what they called a 'Night Café'. People could sleep on chairs at night, without showing any papers, and there was a nursing clinic and a centre for distribution of free syringes. It was run by the Church Army.

Antonio Tosi, of the Italian Team, believed that too sharp a distinction was made between the current immigrant population (from other countries) and the Italian homeless:

In many cases immigrant homeless are not considered homeless, and are classified under specific categories that have nothing to do with 'no abode'. One of the problems in Italy is there are two different lines of policy and two different definitions for two kinds of population, who are not two kinds of population but among whom there is a strong overlap. (Antonio Tosi, Politecnico di Milano, Milan)

There was also a difference between the NGOs working with the immigrant population living on the street and those working across populations:

To give an example - we have a big problem about the legal status of a number of immigrants. Many of the immigrants are illegal and they go to the service for the homeless but they just have a legal problem. When you solve the legal problem then for most of them that is enough - they are able to have work, a wage, a house, and so on. They are inside the homeless context but it is not the right answer for them. (FIOpsi)

The problem is strongly connected with the current law that we have in Italy on immigration, the law is directly responsible for illegal immigration. Illegal immigration means that men and women are invisible and not reached by the institutional services that we have. Another part of the people that we see on the streets are people who come from a normal life style but who may have experienced the loss of their job, or a family problem, or both together, and this drove them on the road and they then encountered an alcohol or drug

problem. In these cases the situation of homeless people is strictly connected with the homeless policies we have in Italy. (Associazione Amici di Piazza Grande, Bologna)

In London a speaker from the Housing Associations' Charitable Trust (a body of all housing NGOs) reported on the work they had been doing in relation to 'refugees and asylum seekers' (the term used in the UK to distinguish them from other types of immigration).

We are talking about a group of very vulnerable people. But also talking about a group which perhaps doesn't display the same sorts of needs profiles that we have established about single homeless people. You know the levels of mental health problems, the levels of drug abuse or alcohol use aren't usually exhibited within the refugee population that comes to this country. I am not saying that there aren't those people within the refugee population that do have these difficulties when they come. (HACT, London)

The UK speaker and a psychologist from the Netherlands reported two different approaches in working with immigrant homeless populations. A researcher from Holland reported at the Madrid workshop that it could be important to include people from their home country in the mobile team.

I am a psychologist from the Netherlands, I work at a mental health institution in Rotterdam, one of the biggest cities...we found that immigrant homeless don't trust us because we have a different culture and we can't get them to trust us. What works really well is when we use people from their home country in our mobile teams and they respond very well to that. (Dutch researcher, Madrid workshop)

The speaker from HACT, UK, reported a different approach. HACT had not just involved immigrants in the services that are provided (as in Rotterdam) but also funded immigrant organisations to give housing advice and deal with housing issues among migrants.

... to date we have actually invested about one and a half million pounds into refugee community organisations and our focus really has been on them, on the organisations that people actually mostly go to when they seek help and assistance. So a lot of our work in the

early Nineties was actually building capacity within that part of the sector. There were lots of very small fledgling organisations that were struggling quite frankly. But research that we did looking at the impact of our investment in the Nineties, you know it showed quite clearly that refugee community organisations remained the first port of call for housing and related service for many refugees. (HACT, London)

However, although this approach had an important impact, other problems developed when the UK government introduced new legislation for asylum seekers/refugees in 1999. The impact of this legislation was designed to be two-fold: first, to reduce the numbers of refugees and asylum seekers coming to the UK and second, to disperse asylum seekers and refugees from London and the South-East where there was a housing shortage to areas in the Midlands and the North of England that were marked not by housing shortage but by poor quality housing, no jobs and a lack of social networks. *Moreover, the dispersal of this population then produced a housing crisis in the private rented sector in the 'cheaper' areas, as government grants for refugee housing drove up rents and also made it harder for students and single homeless people to move into rented accommodation.*

The aim of the government was also to have sort of third/third/third split between the private rented sector, the local authorities and the housing associations providing accommodation for asylum seekers. That never materialised, - in fact the vast majority of it's in the private rented sector and that's distorted the local markets as well, because as many people here from the UK will know, one of the realities of single homelessness in this country is very much that accessing social housing is incredibly difficult, accessing private rented housing is probably the only option, the same as for students and other groups of single people. So actually by placing asylum seekers into the available private sector housing has actually displaced the market in those areas for other groups of single people.... (HACT, London)

As well as external migration, some countries did not have service provision for internal migrants who became homeless. One Italian NGO reported that their organisation had been established originally in Bergamo in order to work with immigrants from Southern Italy who had come north to work and found themselves homeless. *The speaker from the Municipality of Copenhagen reported her concern that*

*whilst there were specific funds to take care of migrants from other countries, there were none to take care of internal migration from areas such as Greenland:*

(We) Can't give the same to those from Greenland because they are supposed to be Danish. So they can't have the same. (Municipality of Copenhagen)

#### **4.3.3. Homelessness among Women**

The issue of homelessness among women was seen as contradictory. On the one hand they were less likely to be seen on the streets and were more likely to have extensive welfare protection. On the other hand they were likely to be homeless in different ways and used services that were specifically available for them. In Italy, as in other European societies, women were less likely to be street homeless and needed dedicated services.

First I would mention the problem of the female homeless population: the difficulties of making contact and working with them. The difficulties of understanding the best possible intervention with them proved that it seems not to work if we're simply translating the intervention for men. (Associazione San Marcellino, Genoa)

The problem of working with the female population on the streets; about 10-15% of the population. The resources the welfare system brings to this are different than for men. Women are seen first of all as mothers, the girls and women we meet in the street usually have 6, 5, 7 children. So usually the method we have used for men, is not good for women because it doesn't give any results, because usually the welfare system takes care differently of the women's situation. The welfare system enters our project for women, whereas usually it leaves the men alone, there are no resources for men. But for women, anytime they say they have children somewhere, or they are married, or when they are alone and on the street, it is more simple to find places. We have a night shelter for six places for women but the time we stay in contact with these women is very short because they get pregnant. Every time they get pregnant they get two or three years of assistance from the social system, so they disappear for three to four years, and then we see them again. So using the night shelter and the same methods for women is not so useful. (Associazione Amici di Piazza Grande, Bologna)

This issue is probably specific to societies providing undifferentiated 'shelter' systems. In the UK, where there are shelters that separate young homeless people from older homeless people, half of the bedspaces are taken by young women, particularly in those hostels that have a training element.

In Madrid the issue of domestic violence was raised by the speaker from the Ministry of Childhood who reported a problem of family de-structuring that brought new risks to people. There were new plans in relation to prevention of homelessness and for local government agencies to take a greater role.

The male/female question is a priority in all employment plans and we have more information and more knowledge about resources. Men speak out, they know about their possibilities and what they should get. There is still domestic abuse and this is a very alarming situation, socially speaking. With respect to the family we have new legislation underway with respect to large families. We have regional and national plans for large families and we have the challenge of new family types. This is a new culture, clashing with the old culture of family. (Deputy Director General of social services, Ministry of Childhood)

One of the most important discussions in Copenhagen was over the issue of whether domestic violence could be classified as a homeless situation. Neither the spokesman of the Ministry of Social Affairs or the Municipality of Copenhagen would classify women experiencing domestic violence as homeless. The following exchange took place:

You mentioned battered women and in our system we don't define them as homeless. We won't accept them as homeless and right now we are discussing taking the husband, the violent husband, out of the flat rather than taking the woman out of the flat. The Minister for Justice has put forward a proposal and we think it will be before the Parliament in the summer. (Spokesman, Ministry of Social Affairs)

We have the same problem in France. (Martine Quaglia, INED, FR)

I wonder what will happen to the husband who has been kicked out. (Lia van Doorn, NIZW, NL)

The husband will be taken care of by the police and he might be taken to a shelter. (Spokesman, Ministry of Social Affairs)

So then he will be counted and he will be homeless so you will increase the level of homelessness. The woman is battered and not homeless. He is violent, that is a social problem and he is at that shelter. (Tobias Stax, SFI, DK)

Remember that they can come back and kill the woman, and that does happen in England so it is more difficult than just removing the man. (Joan Smith, CHCR, UK)

There was also a concern that there were no shelters for homeless women with a drug problem who also had children. Indeed in Copenhagen there were no special facilities for women with a drug problem.

In London the discussion was quite different. Homelessness legislation in the UK has always identified women with children as a priority need group and the definition of homeless situations includes situations of violence (domestic and racial). A speaker on the housing services of Women's Aid in England reported that they were a network of 270 refuges providing helplines, outreach services and advice centres. At the end of 2002 there were 16,738 women and 22,350 children accommodated in English refuges.

What I want to put domestic violence into now is the context of the need for housing. Domestic violence is fortunately at last recognised as a major cause of homelessness and relationship breakdown is one of the major causes of homelessness and repeat homelessness [in the UK]. And recent government statistics show that 20% – which is almost twenty eight thousand households – are homeless because of relationship breakdown and of that figure 70% are due to domestic violence. So between domestic violence and homelessness there is a considerable link.

The widening of the definition of homelessness to include any applicant who is suffering violence or threats of violence from another person should enable and I say should enable more vulnerable people to gain access to housing.

And the 2002 Act's amendment of the definition of local connection prevents local authorities now from referring applicants to another local authority in which they've previously suffered violence and would therefore be liable to experience further domestic violence. So

that is certainly a positive change. That should not happen anymore. (Speaker, Women's Aid, England)

In her speech to the London workshop, the speaker from Women's Aid, was most concerned that a lack of social housing, and an overall inadequate supply of housing was preventing women from leaving violent relationships. What does the right to housing mean? Or homeless legislation mean? – if there is no social housing, or if housing authorities do not recognise the specific needs of threatened women.

Now approximately a third of those women accommodated in refuges will present to the local authority for help with their housing needs and what we are concerned with is the lack of suitable affordable housing, which is a major factor both preventing women from leaving a violent relationship because of their housing situation and also a very strong factor in forcing women who may come into a refuge and stay for quite a time realise they've got to stay there for a longer, longer, longer time and therefore they are forced back into a violent relationship...

Waiting longer for the housing institutionalises abused women and also their children, it also produces a bottleneck in refuges and it means that women are not able to leave violent relationships and come into a place of safety to have the support they need in their lives, therefore it also means that women are more likely to return to violent relationships. (Speaker, Women's Aid)

The speaker from Women's Aid, England, raised two particular issues that emergency accommodation provision had to take into account: first, women's refuges can rarely provide specific services for women from Black and Minority Ethnic groups, or for disabled women, with mental health problems or substance abuse problems; second, refuges have to use their own resources to support refugee women not entitled to welfare benefits who are fleeing domestic violence.

#### **4.3.4. New Populations: the Homeless Working Poor**

At several workshops the team from INED, France, raised the question of the working poor who were homeless. As well as looking at individual personal reasons for homelessness, they argued, it is also important to look at structural reasons, and this was discussed in several workshops.

The new type of clients are not just drug abusers, alcoholics; in the total number of shelters there are few taking care of drug abusers, others are taking care of battered women, but the biggest part of people living in these shelters are not considered as having psychiatric problems, or having drug problems. So I am very surprised by what you said this morning that maybe the policies are very different from what they are in France. But I know that social workers are saying that they have a new kind of client and that client is the working poor. Don't you have this problem here? Don't you have a labour problem in Denmark? (Martine Quaglia, FR)

In Madrid a speaker from the Madrid City Government reported:

We are contemplating another project for those persons, for whatever reason, a divorce or they have been fired, who suddenly find themselves on the street with no shelter. Perhaps they had a normal life until that point. Here, of course, reinsertion is going to be much easier and we should provide services for them. (Chief of Services, Madrid)

In Milan it was a question for debate. There was a report of the working poor sleeping in cars in Rome but some street workers thought this did not occur in their towns.

#### **4.3.5. Conclusions**

Carmelo Vazquez (SP) summarised the challenge facing NGOs in relation to the new homeless populations at the third meeting in Copenhagen:

We are moving from an old to a new context; we are dealing now with homogeneous populations but moving to heterogeneous populations; from passive to active interventions. We are moving from the old target, just to provide a roof for people, to multiple interventions. We are moving from unilateral to multilateral

interventions, with different agencies public and private (who are also intervening now), and different levels of government. From single targets to multiple targets, maybe not in the same person as Antonio [Tosi] said, but in different persons. From one culture to multiple ethnicities. From interventions based on organisations, to interventions based on problems. From top down to bottom up, so we try to listen to the voice of the homeless. The concept has shifted from criminals, to victims, to clients and in the future perhaps to citizens.

The question is are we prepared to handle this? This is related not just to research but to knowledge. How do you handle this? According to your experience do you have some channels to know more? To exchange ideas and to learn about how to handle and cope with this different context?

But the speaker from the Municipality of Copenhagen raised the question of what happens if the resources for homeless people do not expand to meet the problem of new homeless populations.

The sum of money that we can use for the homeless is constant; we have a certain amount of money but this sum is spent over time. But the target groups to which this money is applied changes. 10 years ago you couldn't enter a shelter if you were a drug user – today they have become into focus so we are directing a lot of efforts at drug users but at the same time we are neglecting other problems and you pointed to the immigrants who are the most visibly neglected ... It is not only revolving door clients but revolving door type of problems that you are dealing with. (Municipality of Copenhagen)

#### **4.4. Changing services for the homeless**

During the workshops there were debates between NGOs and Officers of the Municipality, and between NGOs, on the shape of new services for the homeless. Are 'emergency' services appropriate? What should be the changes in the type of services and the provision of new services?

#### **4.4.1. The development of emergency services on the street – What is appropriate?**

In Madrid the speaker from the City Council explained that they had developed 85 measures to care for the homeless but had to decide which of these measures were emergency measures that had to be implemented immediately, in order to provide for the 1,600 homeless people not in touch with existing NGOs. The plan included a one-stop shop, other services in areas of more than 100,000 inhabitants, multi-professional teams and the establishment of norms and standards for all accommodation. As reported above, Health Services and Social Work had not been involved previously in working with the homeless in Spain.

Spanish NGOs and an NGO worker from France argued that the 'emergency model' of work was not a useful one.

But the emergency service is not the model to work for with the homeless because they don't have so many emergencies. They do have different needs – they need to be accompanied for a long time – they have to trust us so they will access services. They don't have so many emergencies. They do have some due to aggressions, police matters, lack of attentions with respect by the universal health care service etc. Emergency services are absolutely necessary but the possibility of mobility, taking people from one place to another, we need vans. Sometimes we have to take a taxi and take someone to a hospital; sometimes the taxi driver is not willing to take us. Two people he doesn't know. We shouldn't substitute one model for another. From what I have heard from other countries it is a model that is working; i.e. the professional accompanying of people in the street for as long as they need. The strategy of outreaching, the strategy of possibilities based on trust. Let us not do away with this model and use an emergency model that has more to do with solving that circumstantial (immediate?) problem, and not with solving the problem at large. (NGO, Madrid)

This view was also supported by a speaker from RAIS, Madrid, returning to the issue of preventing beggars in the street. This raised the issue of the human rights of the homeless, which is discussed further below.

Another question. The criminalization of poverty, and those philosophies linked to 'zero tolerance' policies, turning beggars into

criminals. We have to be very careful here. We do have emergency services but we also need the presence of social workers out on the street; we should not only control the crimes but also do something else more active. (RAIS, Madrid)

A speaker from the French research team raised the question in Madrid of the ethics of imposing social work upon homeless people who don't want it:

About the mobile teams in Paris. There were between 15-20 mobile teams of different NGOs. One of the many questions they have—it is an ethical question—, is what do we do for those people who don't want social workers to intervene?...What do we do with those who refuse us? Do we have to force them into following us, or do we have to accept that they have the right to walk away from what we offer for a while. There are some police working on mobile teams as well, but they are within the network, they know the people very well, and they have the same questions, ethical questions. (Martine Quaglia, INED, Fr)

The French team was accompanied by a French NGO worker/Spanish speaker (Pedro Meca, of the *Compagnons de la Nuit*) who believed that emergency work hampered long-term social work with clients:

Let me share an experience that we have in Paris. Emergency work actually endangers social work. We need to be very careful. If you respond immediately to emergency needs as RAIS pointed out, they are not necessarily emergencies. The person is sleeping on the streets, but he has been doing that for 15 years, so what is all the urgency about. Shelters open, there are *improvements*, but the problem is: What happens tomorrow?... We are being asked to do things quickly when they cannot be done quickly. The concept of time is absolutely essential. You need a long time. If you work with young people, building the right person is much easier than fixing a person who is broken, someone who has been years on the street, it will take you as long as ensuring that a young man, or a young woman, completes his or her studies.

In France, the speaker from *Secours Catholique*, like speakers in Madrid, said that the problem of winter shelters was, what happens after the winter? Maryse Marpsat reported on two kinds of shelters in France, long stay shelters and shelters where

people came every day (called Night Shelters in the UK). She believed that the latter should only be used for a very short time:

In France the situation where people have to go to a night shelter where they cannot stay during the day, where we sometimes still have dormitories, and some have violence – this should be an emergency, it should last for a few days, but for some people it lasts for years – for some it worsens their mental conditions if they have those to begin with and leads to depression if they were all right before. I do not say that their social links were very numerous but the kind of life in these shelters where you have to arrive early if you want a bed makes it very difficult to keep links, because you have no moments when you can see what is left of your family, and you can't receive them so it worsens the situation of people. (Maryse Marpsat, INED, Fr)

Having raised issues about the use of emergency services, the important question was what happened once homeless people were contacted? How could mainstream services be mobilised to support the homeless person who required considerable support? This was a particular problem in Spain as already reported, where neither health nor social work services saw it as their role to work with the homeless. This led the speaker from the Madrid City Government to say that they needed a 'key referencing person' to accompany homeless people through the system, and this was endorsed by NGOs at the Madrid meeting. But even in Denmark accessing statutory services was considered a problem. A speaker from the Hungarian team said that this raised the question of whether there should be special services for the homeless.

My question is about the separate systems for homeless and the social care system. That is what is going on in Hungary too and some people see it is a negative tendency – that you double your social, health, institutional system and you create separate services for homeless people that will increase their separation from the normal world. So how do you see this tendency, is it good because there are more proper services for the homeless people or is there a bad side? (Eszter Somogyi, HU, Copenhagen workshop)

A particular issue is the relationship between mental health services and emergency services. In Paris it was reported that the problem of connecting these services was acute.

The main problem is to connect the social network and the medical network. To make this connection it is necessary to have some kind of work agreements between the two networks and to have at the same time a continuity of care from the medical part that is difficult for mentally ill homeless people. It is also necessary to keep some kind of housing in the duration. (Association des Cités du Secours Catholique)

In Copenhagen a researcher from NIZW reported that in Holland it had been necessary to create a law that mental health services should follow homeless people into the shelters to give them services. In the Netherlands:

...a lot of homeless people with psychiatric problems fill up the system because people with long term problems have been pushed away from psychiatric hospitals and then they end up in shelters for homeless people. But the government makes a law that obliges mental health institutions to support these people in the shelters, to follow (medically) people in the shelters. The shelter is funded by local authorities and the medical aspect is paid for by national social insurance (Lia van Doorn, NIZW, Netherlands)

In Paris a similar development was reported:

From the 2<sup>nd</sup> January 2002 there is a new law in France regulating all medical and social institutions that makes a new responsibility for associations and gives a choice of what is offered to people...(Caritas)

Of course this is a good step but it is different from what still happens. Medical teams in charge of homeless people have a medical point of view. (Councillor, City of Paris)

The most extensive example of co-ordinated street services for homeless people is in London and was described in the London workshop by a speaker from one of the agencies that operates the Rough Sleepers' Strategy. He described how before co-ordination took place many agencies were being funded under the Rough Sleepers' Initiative, all of whom had their own outreach teams, 'some people could be woken up 8 or 9 times a night'. With the development of the Rough Sleepers' Unit, by a Government initiative there was the establishment of specific London-wide Contact and Assessment Teams, and Tenancy Sustainment Teams. The purpose of the RSU was to reduce the number of rough sleepers in London by two-thirds but, as he

reports, politicians find it hard to understand the 'flow' of homeless people on to the street. His final message in the following quotation is that their work is being hampered by a lack of social housing for rough sleepers.

We started out in the early Eighties funded by London local government to provide a Central London outreach team ...We have got about three hundred and fifty staff, we have a turnover as a charity of about fourteen million pounds, so it's quite a large organisation and we provide hostel spaces, we have got community support, we have a resettlement team, we provide all sorts of support through the meaningful occupation team.

...But we did have a situation where lots of different agencies were working, sometimes in the same area. ...Then the Rough Sleepers' Unit drew up a programme where we had to share a common language, and that was the first time all these different charities that had been doing their own thing in their own way came together... and a common strategy which we all had to buy into or we were out with no money. So it was very compelling. It was also very good to see in the strategy all the things that we wanted to see as well...

And the basic idea was that instead of all this confusion we would have two basic systems... that was going to be focused on need, people on the street what were their needs, where would they go as a result of their need? And in order to do that we had to assess them, so we had contact and assessment teams which then very quickly became known as CATs. Then once people had got into permanent accommodation they moved into the other system - Tenancy Sustainment Teams - where they would have for the first time not just six months support in their new flat but unlimited support in terms of time, it would go on as long as it was needed and the support would be there wherever they moved in theory. That of course didn't happen in practice but it was a target...

... Of course in policy circles very often in government what people are looking at are headline figures and they want to see a reduction, the Prime Minister's target was a two-thirds reduction in three years.... What we do know is that over the last twelve months in Central London, in the Borough of Westminster only we have had

1,700 individuals that we have seen who are sleeping rough, of those we have helped over twelve hundred, so that's a hundred a month. But the figure on any one night is about 180. Now that obviously causes a problem if the politicians are thinking we have got one hundred and eighty rough sleepers and we as practitioners are turning round and saying "Actually you've got one thousand seven hundred" and we know that for every fifteen people we help off the street fourteen people replace them. So it does present us with a huge problem - this flow through is massive.

On the plus side we started out twelve months ago with a new programme in Westminster based on the concept of rapid intervention. Now the idea of rapid intervention is very good if someone is in crisis but of course if someone is a chronic homeless person sleeping on the streets it's a rather different situation and maybe it takes a different approach, so we have had to balance the political needs to do something differently and show rapid intervention with also pragmatic approach with people who are very entrenched....

We have also had a problem about the lack of hostel space and a lack of move on. We know that in our hostels and other hostels that over forty percent of the residents are ready to be moved into independent accommodation, forty percent. So we have got a situation, as we have with some of our hospitals and certainly some of our psychiatric units, where we have the beds 'silted up' and we have got people who need those beds, who need that support but can't get in because we are not moving a whole cohort of people out from the hostels into other accommodation. That's perhaps where there is a significant failure at the moment in policy, where we haven't got new developments and new building that had been going on under the Conservative government; those developments have really dried up under the Labour government. (Speaker, Thames Reach Bondway)

The discussion of intensive co-ordination of homeless street services also raised the question of street management policies. UK NGOs were concerned about the introduction of these policies.

The government is taking what's called a street management approach where it's the police, the wardens, the cleansing authorities that are looking at where they find people saying "You can't be here, you need to go over there into this hostel, into the day centre". Now that presents all sorts of problems because we know that there are a whole cohort of people who aren't going to move, who won't move, and this comes into conflict with the new agenda of enforcement which is trying to look at whether legislation can force people off the street. That of course is very political and something that we strongly object to. (Speaker, Thames Reach Bondway, London)

#### **4.4.2. Changes in Shelter Provision and ways of working**

Several NGOs in many workshops reported changes in Shelter Provision. First as Caritas reported:

Homeless people don't want to be housed in big shelters anymore.  
(Caritas)

This was endorsed by the Church Army in Copenhagen who reported they had broken down their large shelter into smaller institutions. Not only were shelters getting smaller but across all the workshops, NGOs reported a concern (new for Madrid and Northern Italy) with action-planning for the homeless person and also with the re-establishment of their social networks.

We have to think about two different ways of working – not just specialised programmes for the homeless but also through programmes that are broader in scope. We need to think about mixed and permeable models, than allow for an inflow and outflow ... We should formulate personalised itineraries for the inclusion of those people and also deal differently with more chronic cases.

The second aspect is the community work, we say that today we live in a very individualistic society (but) .... We forget to work with accompanying networks, support networks, which are lacking the social fabric sometimes to really re-integrate a person (Discussion in Madrid workshop)

To finish I will say that in the last few years we have seen the widening of the tendency of defining the homeless people in Genoa in Italy starting from its psycho-social aspects. This has not been

followed by the traditional welfare system which is, therefore, not able to provide answers to the problem if not in essential terms, with first level dormitories, canteens and a few other tools. On the contrary this social and psychological attitude towards the problem has produced in the Association action for the construction, first of all, for relational and effectiveness and then for the construction of personal identities through the working, housing and associational tools. (Speaker, Associazione San Marcellino, Genoa)

The important part here is to focus on the professional level. You need to be able to work with the homeless ....You need to pull out their (the homeless person's) resources, and you have to be professional.You have to understand the social work done with the homeless, you have to avoid clientisation and you must draw forth the competence of the homeless themselves. (Discussion in Copenhagen)

NGOs also reported that they were managing their facilities differently; particularly in Copenhagen it was reported that homeless people were part of the management of the agencies.

What of User influence?Denmark has a political consensus on consulting users on policies. Therefore the Ministry of Social Affairs has supported the association of formerly and currently homeless people. There are local committees in 13 regions and a national organisation. They have a magazine and access to broadcasting. (Speaker, Ministry of Social Affairs, Copenhagen)

It is interesting to look at who is defining the problems?It is very important that the homeless themselves have got a voice in this forum, and take more care about what they are defining about their problems of their life situation. (Speaker, National Association of Shelters, Copenhagen)

There have also been changes in social methods, a new approach; a manager has to work on changes with the service users, involving them as citizens on new terms. As a manager you cannot decide how it (the service) is run anymore, you have to do in conjunction with the people living there, the people who are coming there and with the

employees. It is very complicated actually. (Church Army, Copenhagen)

A French NGO speaker put it differently in Paris where Secours Catholique describes this as 'une logique participative' that embraced not only homeless people but also the volunteers who worked with them.

#### **4.4.3. Services and the use of volunteer workers**

The most extensive discussion on the use of volunteers took place in Paris and Madrid. In both workshops Catholic organisations in particular reported an extensive use of volunteers in their work with the homeless. In Paris a particular issue raised was whether it was appropriate to use unemployed people as volunteers. Secours Catholique reported being able to find volunteers because of a pool of retired and unemployed people but, *'it is more difficult to find volunteers who can manage and take responsibilities'*, whilst Dutch researchers reported increasing difficulty finding volunteers in Holland. The speaker from Médecins du Monde – Mission des sans domicile fixe reported:

In relation to volunteers we take those who are working or retired but not those who are unemployed because their own problems are too big already.

But Secours Catholique did take unemployed people as volunteers:

We take them as volunteers but give them special jobs

In Madrid the Chief of Staff of the City Government was in favour of encouraging people to become volunteers to work with the homeless but under careful co-ordination. A new development had occurred in Madrid based on co-operation between the RAIS Foundation (professional workers) and SOLIDARIOS (volunteer workers) where volunteers who worked four days a week from 9 pm to 1 am, across seven different itineraries in Madrid city centre were accompanied by professionals once a week on Mondays:

We want to motivate the process of change and do the social accompaniment of the homeless throughout the changes. Volunteers did not do this before but with social workers they can cover the entire thing so social volunteering was limited before in what they did.

But much of this voluntary work only takes place between January and May when the University students are available.

At the Milan workshop NGOs also reported strong support from volunteers.

San Marcellino is a registered voluntary association with about 20 regular staff and 450 volunteer workers – all professionally qualified and well motivated. Lots of these volunteers come from these better off areas and this is good from a cultural point of view. (Speaker, Associazione San Marcellino, Genoa)

In Copenhagen it was argued that volunteers differed according to the influence of the Church in different areas. The speaker from the Church Army in Copenhagen also reported on the new professional standards that all agencies had to meet.

You have to have the development of skills – employees have to have a background to meet the new challenges, and you have to develop the support for that, but also you can say there is a professionalism of shelter work in the last year; the educational level is much higher than 10 years ago but also professionalism has come because of the money from the municipal government. Because over the last years, (...) you have to document the work, meet standards at the shelters, and deliver statistics for the work over the past five years. (Church Army, Copenhagen)

In the London workshop none of the NGOs were based on volunteer labour except for exceptional events such as the Christmas Shelter run by CRISIS for 10 days each Christmas and New Year for the past 30 years. CRISIS, like many other UK agencies, began as a volunteer organisation but faced with the homelessness crisis that developed in the 1980s grew into a professionally staffed organisation using volunteers only for specific actions.

#### **4.4.4. Advice Services for all homeless populations**

An important question raised in many workshops, including at Madrid by a Dutch researcher, concerned what to do about the 'nearly homeless'. How could homelessness be prevented? In London the organisation SHELTER that was established in the 1960s reported how an NGO could provide a nation-wide advice service.

Shelter opened its first Housing aid centre in 1970 and today Shelter is the UK's largest provider of independent housing advice, we help over a hundred thousand homeless or about to be homeless people every year. We do that through a variety of measures, we have over fifty Housing Aid centres which provide information, advice and advocacy services to people who are homeless or who have housing problems. In some of our Housing aid centres we now have actually direct access facilitators who are based there who are able to take up challenges and support people where it is necessary to provide support to people facing eviction.

We also have a legal advice service which is based in London which all our advisors can access and that provides specialist legal advice and is also very instrumental in taking up test cases and challenging pieces of housing law. That remains one of the main things that Shelter does.

Over the last years we have also developed Shelterline which is a twenty-four hour free telephone helpline service which provides both immediate advice and signposting referral advice to people anywhere in the country.

#### **4.4.5. Organisations of the Homeless**

In different workshops NGOs run by homeless people were in attendance. In Paris Caritas reported that '*...In various associations of self-support people there are homeless people who try to make society move*' whilst at the London workshop, Groundswell reported on their organisation of the homeless.

At the Milan workshop the detailed way of working of such an organisation was reported by the one paid organiser of an association founded in 1993. They ran workshops, mobile street services that go out with homeless people, and lawyers who work with the homeless.

The name of this Association can be translated as Friend of the Main Square in Bologna. It was founded in Italy in 1993 directly by a group of homeless people. This is the main feature that is specific to this association – it is made directly and founded by homeless people. Most of the people who are homeless and who are part of the Association take part in the Managing Board take decisions and the every day part of what goes on in the Association. So we can say that the social approach to the problem of social exclusion is based on self-help policies and all empowerment projects made by the Association (...).

So the core feature of our association over the past 11 years has been to be an organisation of homeless people and a self-help organisation. Social operators and the end-users are the same person and this is the specific feature of the association.(...)

The core social job is the needs of the homeless people: for the material needs of the homeless people, the essential needs – having a house, food, protection; the need for assistance – this is the advocacy work; and the relational needs. We can define the Association as a peer group that is based on the protagonism and the skills of the people who are considered borderline, and whom it is not easy to conduct back to public assistance, people who become chronic in their pathology (mental illness, alcohol, and addiction problems).

To reach our goals we work in co-operation with a network and a syndicate that all work in the field of social exclusion. We think that our Association has to work in a very strong network. We also work with the local Administration taking care of the services.

Half of all the income of this association comes from the self-financing activities of two enterprises: a bicycle repair shop and the repair and refurbishment of used clothes. (NGO, Bologna)

In Paris, however, it was reported that it was difficult to involve people while they were rough-sleeping:

The people who are rough sleepers are not the same as the people who are in these self-support associations. The rough sleepers are

very different from one another and there are those that are very isolated and the development of solidarity is very difficult. (Médecins du Monde – Mission sans domicile fixe, FR).

#### **4.4.6. Working to influence the wider community**

Influencing the wider community to be sympathetic towards the homeless and the issue of homelessness was discussed in all of the workshops, but particularly in the Paris, Madrid and Milan workshops. It was put most starkly first in Paris where Caritas and the Cités du Secours Catholique reported:

A crisis of living together – people don't want to live near the homeless. (Caritas)

Homeless people are not 'extras' to society but they participate in the construction of society and should have access to rights like every citizen, access to choice like any human being. (Cités du Secours catholique)

How can we change the society in which we want to insert homeless people? What are the insights that homelessness gives to society about itself? Is society sufficiently attractive to homeless people? (Compagnons de la Nuit)

In Madrid the organisation Solidaros reported:

We work in the street at night in Madrid ...

The three public bodies are here and the municipality has underscored the problem of social awareness, the problem of making society aware of the situation. They have a different image of the homeless. So what is to be done? I haven't heard of any specific measures. Are they at the municipal level, the regional level, other ministries? Some concrete measures, some specific measures are needed. We all agree it is very important but what is to be done? (Discussion, Madrid workshop)

In Milan the speaker from Associazione San Marcellino, Genoa, reported that they were undertaking a project of 'cultural contamination' in order to bring knowledge of homelessness to the 'better part of town'.

The Associazione San Marcellino is situated in the heart of Genoa and has continued the good work of "la Messa del Povero" (the Poor Mass) that was a religious organisation, in caring for those in need in the post-war years and the 60s, of those arriving from the South of Italy who came in search of employment and moved into the Old Town District because of low housing costs.... Most of the intervention is in the Old Town Centre but also now in the better off areas in the Town in the direction of 'cultural contamination' to create awareness amongst people who wouldn't otherwise come in contact with the poorest social class of society.

They had also sought private financing (as does CRISIS, UK) in order to be 'independent of the vagaries of public funding' and this also helped raise awareness. Many agencies saw the use of volunteers as a way of also engaging the wider public in an understanding of homelessness.

The speaker from CRISIS, UK, at the London workshop, reported on two major projects that organisation had developed with the aim of integrating homeless people and local people in London.

Skylight is a project based in the East End, its objective is to do two things, to help re-skill homeless people and to help re-integrate, and the way that we do that is by offering a wide range of activities ranging from Tai Chi right through to bicycle repair and basic numeracy and literacy. What we hope to do is to offer homeless people an opportunity to find an interest, hobby, a skill that they would like to develop, to relearn, to remember, to learn anew and to start engaging people in that way. The other thing that we are really keen on doing in Skylight is to offer an environment in which homeless people can meet people who are not homeless, so the activity centre is open to all people and we encourage members of the public to join with relatively varying degrees of success ...

The other big project which in some ways is the best expression of our thinking is The Urban Village. It's in its early stages as it still hasn't started yet, it's kind of at a point where we are trying to secure the physical space to develop the project, but essentially what we want to do is to create a small community in which homeless people and non-homeless people are able to live side by side and

which the actual accommodation is affordable of the highest quality and where there are services and support available for people who do need it, ranging from medical healthcare right through to training and employment and so on. The project was an idea that we nicked from the United States, it's a project called Common Ground in New York. (CRISIS, London)

#### **4.4.7. Conclusions: The Human Rights of homeless people**

One of the interesting discussions in Madrid and that was touched upon in other workshops but not explored, concerned the issue of the human rights of homeless people. This was raised directly by the Spanish research team.

Human rights for homeless people is an important question in Spain. We agree with this for homeless people outside of associations, but what of human rights for people inside shelters? Some shelters are more restrictive than prison. (Manuel Muñoz, Complutense University, Madrid)

The criminalisation of poverty, and those philosophies linked to 'zero tolerance' policies, turning beggars into criminals. We have to be very careful here. We do have emergency services but we also need the presence of social workers out on the street; we should not only control the crimes but also do something else more active. (NGO, Madrid)

As volunteer organisations we should defend the fact that we are political organisations; we do not belong to a particular party but we have a political dimension... We are political, we speak about dealing with individuals to make them real citizens whether they have a home or not, they are all citizens. (NGO, Madrid)

These issues had previously been raised in Paris in relation to ethics.

We have to have applied ethics in social services and this is urgent in order we can think about things that we don't pay attention to – autonomy, independence, information, confidentiality, all these ethical matters. (Speaker, Caritas, Paris)

In London, NGOs had become concerned about street management policies, whilst in Milan Antonio Tosi ended the meeting by pointing out the unique contribution that

organisations of the homeless themselves made in relation to demands for citizenship rights.

If you put together what has been said about the Italian welfare system, the narrow definition of homelessness, and the kind of actors that have been working in this field at the local level, it could be expected that the prevailing attitude is between a social assistance logic and compassion and it is marginally an approach in relation to rights, or citizenship rights, or social rights. I mean individual rights because rights should be individual from this point of view and on this basis and it would be expected that self-organisation is an exceptional event, and Associazione Amici di Piazza Grande (Bologna) is an interesting case from this point of view – it is a self-help organisation, it has a certain amount of self-organisation on the part of homeless persons. (Antonio Tosi, Milan workshop)

#### **4.5. Research issues and NGOs**

##### **4.5.1. Prioritising Research Questions**

At each workshop the NGOs were asked to prioritise their own research questions. In Paris FNARS prioritised:

- youth exclusion,
- adaptation of social policies and social work practice,
- right to housing,
- immigration and homelessness,
- mental health issues.

Caritas prioritised:

- the social integration of prisoners, foreigners and failed asylum seekers especially non-French speakers,
- course/trajectory of those who escape homelessness, measurement of actual access to rights,
- evaluation of services for both political and improvement reasons, mental health.

For the City of Paris the priority was to understand:

- 'repeat homelessness',
- outcomes through longitudinal research over 3, 5, 7, 10 years answering the questions 'Who are the service users? How many times did they move in and out? How do they use the service? What happens as they move from street or dwellings to etc.

Other agencies in the Paris workshop posed other questions:

- What is the role of economic factors in homelessness
- In a perfect world, where supply and demand were equal, would there still be homeless people? (Médecins du Monde)
- How can we change the society in which we want to insert homeless people? What are the insights that homelessness gives to society about itself? Is society sufficiently attractive to homeless people? (Compagnons de la Nuit)
- We need knowledge about people who are neither in the general population nor in the homeless population i.e. the hidden homeless (Mission d'information sur la pauvreté et l'exclusion sociale en Ile de France)
- Public opinion and many politicians have the idea that the social work [with the homeless] is expensive and without results. So, Secours Catholique, wants to show that social reinsertion is a reality. The collection of statistical data is, for example, a way to lobby action and to show that money is not thrown away (Cités du Secours Catholique)

At the Madrid workshop some other issues were raised including research into the mechanisms of inclusion, research in Spanish cities below 150,000 inhabitants about which nothing is known, and research into regional differences in homelessness.

In Milan FIOpsd argued that without research, organisations provided old services that did not fit the new needs. However, there was a problem in Italy:

But very few members of the FIOpsd have a good link with a research institute, or university, that is ongoing because most of the service providers have poor economic resources and this is a barrier to research. A better understanding is not a priority for most part of the service providers, it is not part of the culture of the service. So often

we have very old conceptions about the homeless and this means that service providers only deal with basic needs such as providing food and wardrobe. This is a problem because there is no thought about what homeless people need and what we must do to improve the intervention and make lives better for these people.

Therefore for FIOpsd the research questions were:

- more information for social workers to understand the homeless,
- more qualitative and quantitative data to understand pathways into homelessness,
- different categories in order to understand the profile of homeless people

The speaker from FIOpsd explained their priorities:

We can say that they are poor people but not all poor people become homeless; they are addicted people but not all the addicted people become homeless; they are without social ties, yes that is very important, but why does the breakdown of social ties, the breakdown of the family, produce homelessness? We can say they are without economic resources, and they are unemployed but, yes, not all the unemployed become homeless. We really need new categories to read these phenomena, the difficulties in the lives of these people. We need these categories to set up different services and to speak in a different way to the policy maker and to say that probably some kinds of trouble affect these people, to be addressed by the different policies, different welfare policies that we have.

Some of these issues were also raised by NGOs at the London workshop, despite the large amount of research that has been done in the UK, whilst others were specific to the situation of the NGO. The speaker from Thames Bondway said that it was important to have:

- longitudinal research on triggers for success and failure
- research into different types of interventions for different problems of mental health and substance misuse,
- research into the 'enforcement strategy' of street management.

HACT reported research needs in relation to:

- specific research on immigration issues and on flows of people across Europe,
- the effectiveness of different kinds of support and the experience of this support,
- the numbers of immigrants experiencing destitution and the impact of that,
- a need for research into the outcomes from combining housing and support services.

These priorities were agreed by some of the other UK NGOs, one of which added:

We need larger scale projects that require government funding, we need data with costings, we also need a more structural understanding of homelessness especially the impact of poverty, and finally longitudinal studies – more than eighteen months. (Speaker, Crisis, London workshop)

In several workshops the question of researching prevention was raised, and three agencies in the London workshop reported on research projects designed to prevent youth homelessness through work with 14-16 year olds. Centrepoin reported on Safe in the City, the Foyer Federation on 'Safe Moves', their work with school-age young people, and St Basils Projects on their work in schools with their prevention programme.

In Copenhagen the Church Army argued that before people arrived at their service there had been a:

Long social slide/downfall/decline; it's not the first time you get homeless that you end up at the back of the railway station. ... How can we grasp the problems before they become so big, so everyone knows them and be preventative? Can we grasp the problems before they are there and even perhaps suggest preventative methods? How can we become more proactive in our research? Do we have methods for that? (The mission among the homeless, Copenhagen workshop)

The Church Army in Copenhagen was also interested in research on how to prevent the circular nature of homelessness. This was also an issue for the London Borough of Tower Hamlets at the London workshop – How do we understand and prevent 'repeat homelessness':

The very last point I wanted to make is on repeat homelessness. Again it's already been mentioned that people who've been through the homeless system once are probably more likely to go through it a second or even a third time. Information that we were recently given by the Deputy Prime Minister's office said the average acceptance of local authorities, the people that they were accepting as homeless, the average was fifteen to twenty percent had been through the homeless system before. In Tower Hamlets it's nowhere near fifteen to twenty percent, it's about one and a half percent and I think a lot of the reason for that is because we have developed some initiatives. We have our own independent living team who help the most vulnerable people through the temporary accommodation process, give them the life skills, that ensures they are able to properly maintain their temporary accommodation.

#### **4.5.2. Research that changes the perspective on homelessness**

NGOs at the London workshop reported that several pieces of research had changed their thinking about homelessness. Some of the research findings could also be important for other European countries.

I think there are two reports that were really significant in our thinking...What Prevention Better Than Cure (Geoff Randall) did was say that there's a much stronger case for intervening earlier on in the cycle and intervening in a different way. The other piece of work that was very important was a report entitled Homelessness And Loneliness and one of the things that really kind of emerged very strongly out of the research was that homeless people suffer from social isolation in a kind of very powerful way and in a way that damages and we don't address that essentially, we don't really deal with that side of homelessness. And the focus traditionally has been very much on the material, upon providing housing, providing food and there's been very little around on the social side or the damaging effects of homelessness on people's social networks. (CRISIS, London workshop)

Thames Reach Bondway's been involved in some research and we did something called Dreams Deferred ... homelessness is not just about accommodation, that people have all sorts of aspirations and we

weren't necessarily working deliberately to try and help people realise some of their aspirations.(Thames Reach Bondway, London workshop)

Centrepoint reported the importance of the Taking Risks report for their perspective on youth homelessness and their work with the families of young people at risk.

#### **4.5.3. Researching homelessness from the perspective of the homeless person**

In Paris, Milan and London the importance of the perspective of the homeless person, through research undertaken by homeless persons or with their close involvement, was stressed.

It starts from the homeless person themselves, development of measurement tools that concern their lives and not imposing preconceptions. (Secours Catholique)

People in the field have knowledge of reality and it is impossible to have a real science without knowledge of the field. This is the way to establish knowledge and to transform reality. (Compagnons de la Nuit, Paris workshop)

The needs of the Association is to have a better comprehension of the crisis on the street in order to be able to translate it, very fast, into tools for intervention, and also to have an impression on the public administration [of Bologna]. So the research that we would like to see, to take from outside, and also to carry on ourselves, only makes sense for us if it involves the person who is the object of the investigation. It is always finalised to understand the needs of the people and not to be a theoretical exercise by itself. Also it should sensitize the local territory and the local community and is important in developing empowerment policies. (Associazione Amici di Piazza Grande, Bologna, Milan workshop)

Thames Reach Bondway described the work of their users in a particular research project. This NGO runs a peer education service and they had undertaken focus group interviews and their report back concerned the need for accommodation plus health services, the need to redress the skills deficit and the need for 'meaningful occupation' for people who are homeless.

So it was accommodation, health, daily living skills, meaningful occupation and belonging, a sense of belonging, this came out very loud and clear and one of the problems that we had in the homelessness sector in the UK is that people can over-identify with and over-belong with homelessness, 'I'm an ex-homeless person' and never move away from that and we are trying to move away from some of that stigma and at the same time help people move away from that, find new ways of belonging, belonging to the wider community....We needed to find purposeful ways, deliberate ways of addressing all of those things – accommodation, health, daily living skills, meaningful occupation, belonging and self-esteem. (Thames Reach Bondway, London workshop)

The speaker from Groundswell, himself an ex-homeless person who had been homeless on and off for 30 years described the importance of research undertaken by homeless people – both for the quality of the research but also for the development of skills among homeless people.

I start from the question 'Who's the expert?' the person who's learnt the theory or the person who's actually lived the experience? And that I think that is where peer research sits quite comfortably. Basically it's people conducting research underneath their experience....

So in the theory side of it basically it is evidence based, that's the whole issue of it, it can be done on a questionnaire, it can be tape-recorded, I prefer it to be done on a questionnaire. You've got that face to face value. One aspect of peer research can be in the service evaluation, it's a way of insuring that services meet needs, it can draw on the expertise of people who use the service, I've been a service user myself so it allows me to use my expertise in some of the services that I've received...It can empower people who use the services...

When you have peer research it gives you good access to so-called hard to reach categories - because I have no access problems at all....

What has happened to me definitely, one of the things that can happen, is that you start to learn to listen to people; that's a very very good skill, being able to just listen to somebody all the way through.(Groundswell, London workshop)

The speaker from Groundswell (himself a researcher who was previously homeless) went on to reflect on the skills that homeless people developed as they themselves became researchers.

It can also give people the abilities to learn how to organise and to manage if you are preparing to go and visit a centre or a foyer or somewhere else, making phone calls, getting times and dates when you can visit and this type of thing.

It's a recognised form of research in social research now, paying incentive, and so it's money management as well so you are learning budgeting skills as well.(Groundswell, London workshop)

#### **4.5.4. Research and its uses**

There was considerable discussion about the relationship between research and political understandings, public opinion and political strategies in the Paris workshop. A first point concerned ethics and the need for the researcher to be wary of possible misuses of his findings. Another was on the importance of research to get rid of misconceptions and to inform action.

Knowledge of reality is important for all the social actors – researchers, social workers, public opinion – because of the preconceptions about homeless people e.g. immigrants have come to take our bread. (Compagnons de la nuit)

People in the field have knowledge of reality and it is impossible to have a real science without the knowledge of the field. This is the way to establish knowledge and to transform reality. (Compagnons de la nuit)

But some researchers feared their work was at times in vain:

Researchers have to construct good research with good categories and good questions. Both have to be scientific in order to understand and to unveil the social process. So the researchers are not answering the questions of politicians and they are not using the categories of politicians. Therefore they do not want to hear these results. (Jean-Marie Firdion, INED, FR)

Research doesn't influence policies, would be better if researchers were more influential. People believe there are huge numbers of immigrants but this is not the case. (City of Paris Councillor)

The last point of view was not the perspective of the Hungarian research team who thought that researchers could influence developments.

In Hungary researchers can have an influence. We have been developing an idea about housing vouchers to help families pay their rent, based on US voucher system. Researchers can advise but politicians decide in the end. (Ivan Tosics and Sandor Erdosi, MRI, HU)

#### **4.5.5. Conclusion**

Several conclusions can be drawn from these second days of the workshops:

- 1) As Antonio Tosi remarked, there is a divide between countries where homelessness is considered as a housing problem, though ideas of social isolation may have been added later, and countries where homelessness is considered mainly as a social welfare problem, not within the competence of housing research or housing departments.
- 2) The characteristics of homeless people in each country depend on the efficiency of the safety net. In countries where most basic needs are covered, it is the most deprived who end up on the street, while in countries where the safety net is less effective, it is much easier to lose one's home.
- 3) The NGOs are preoccupied by the challenges in relation to what they perceive as new homeless populations and the difficulties of meeting new needs with fixed resources.
- 4) The issue of the human rights of homeless people, including the right to refuse help, was explored.
- 5) On the issue of their research needs, two messages were expressed by the NGOs: the necessity for research information that enabled them to work with the new problems of homelessness and move beyond their old understanding, and the necessity for the voice of the homeless themselves to be taken into account.

## **5. The final conference: "Research on homelessness in comparative perspective"**

The final conference "Research on homelessness in comparative perspective" was held in Brussels in November 2005 (3<sup>rd</sup>-4<sup>th</sup>), attended by about 50 persons: researchers, PhD students, EC officials, policy makers, and heads or members of NGOs. A large debate took place after each of the papers and after the concluding round table.

Papers were presented on the following issues:

- the framework of the conference;
- definitions;
- theories: Social capital, risk and social exclusion;
- methodology: quantitative, qualitative and complementarity;
- experience from other countries.

The first four themes were addressed by the members of CUHP, the last one by guest researchers from countries not participating in CUHP, namely the USA and Bulgaria.

In order to avoid single-country monographs, each presentation by CUHP members had to deal with at least two different countries, and/or be presented by at least two different teams. Discussants were selected from countries other than that of the authors and, whenever possible, from countries not participating in CUHP. The purpose was to promote discussions between researchers from the various countries of the European Community (including future members) and with researchers from the USA.

### **5.1. The framework of the conference**

This section included the following presentations<sup>52</sup>:

"A general view of the work of the CUHP", by Efi Markou (Institut National d'Etudes Démographiques, FR).

"European values and homeless policies: Examining the broader and narrower policy lines", by Joan Smith (Cities Institute, London Metropolitan University, UK), Eszter Somogyi and Ivan Tosics (Metropolitan Research Institute, HU).

The comments were made by Ingrid Sahlin (Sociological department, Gothenburg University, SE).

As indicated by its title, the first paper gave a general view of the work of the CUHP.

The aim of the second paper was to give an overview of the trends in homeless policies in different European countries, placing them in the wider context of social and housing policies. The paper consisted of two parts: the first (Hungarian team) examined the social and housing policy developments on European level (Part 1), while the second (English team) analysed the experiences of the NGOs working with the homeless who were invited to the second day of each workshop (Part 2).

#### **Part 1.**

The presentation started with a general summary on the development of the concept of the European Social Model (ESM), highlighting that it derives from the values of social solidarity and social protection shared by the developed European countries and which represent essential elements of the European identity. Nevertheless the actual forms of welfare systems vary substantially between countries and with the accelerated process of economic integration a need for a European-level social protection system has emerged. This need was heightened by the economic problems (slowdown of economic growth and high unemployment) of the 1990s, which also endangered the bases of the national welfare systems. However, practical moves towards harmonising the national social systems and developing an EU social policy have been very slow despite the high priority accorded to increasing social cohesion by the Lisbon Strategy. Many observers questioned the efficiency of the Open Method of Coordination in the field of social policy.

---

<sup>52</sup> The papers are available on <http://www.cuhp.org/Brussels%20conference.cfm>

Section 2 stated that there is a strong connection between the right to housing and other social rights, and that without the right to housing the other social rights cannot be realized. Although many states recognize the right to housing, its practical implementation lags. Nevertheless its recognition is important for policy-making purposes since it designates the housing situation of marginalised groups as an important area of housing policies.

Section 3 discussed the recent trends in housing policies, highlighting the substantial changes associated with the shift to more indirect state involvement in housing policies. It also emphasized that the housing problems (worsening affordability, increasing housing exclusion and homelessness) emerging at the European level, represent a severe challenge to housing policies. Furthermore, regulations on other EU policy areas increasingly influence national housing markets, housing provisions and the margin for manoeuvre in national housing policies. However, the EU has no legal competence in the field of housing policy. This section gave a detailed analysis of the areas where the EU could have an important role in housing policies: the EU-level coordination of national housing policies, better coordination between housing policies and other EU policies, and improvements to the situation of those affected by housing exclusion; in addition to the integration of national mortgage markets, an area much supported by the EU. Despite the EU-level harmonization of housing policies, the development of national housing policies should remain a national competence.

Section 4 led to Part 2 of the paper describing the relationship between housing and homeless policies, stressing that homelessness is a multidimensional problem and thus requires an integrated policy approach combining different policy areas. Among the different policy areas, housing policies are important from the perspective of preventing and ending homelessness, though other policies (social, health, employment etc) must also be used. It also showed that the new homeless policy approaches, besides managing the situation of rough sleepers, focus on prevention, early intervention and complex reintegration programmes.

## **Part 2.**

This part of the presentation dealt with what the researchers learned from the contributions of NGOs and policy makers at these second day meetings. One important outcome was an understanding of the anti-social exclusion agendas that had developed among NGOs in different European countries.

Part 2 was presented in five sections.

**Section 1** related some of the issues on homelessness to Part 1 of this paper on European Values, the ESM and EU Social Policy.

**Section 2** discussed the different perspectives on homelessness reported in the CUHP sessions in different countries: Homeless Populations, describing homelessness and legal definitions; The Right to Housing; Special Housing for Homeless People; The demands of multiple systems.

**Section 3** reported on the 'New Homeless Populations' as experienced by NGOs, and local authority work to provide services: Family policy and homelessness/protection from homelessness – youth exclusion and people without social networks; Homelessness among Immigrant Populations; Homelessness among Women; the Homeless Working Poor.

**Section 4** reported on changing patterns of working with the street and hostel homeless populations and other populations: The development of emergency services on the street – What is appropriate? Changes in Shelter Provision and Ways of Working; Services and the use of volunteer workers; Advice Services for all Homeless Populations; Organizations of the Homeless; Working to influence the wider community; Human Rights and Homeless People.

**Section 5** reported on the role of research in relation to the work of the NGOs and the research issues of importance to them: Prioritizing research questions; Research that changes perspectives on homelessness; Researching homelessness from the perspective of the homeless person; Research, homeless interventions, and political strategies.

## **5.2. Definitions**

The French team presented a paper on the difficulties encountered when trying to elaborate a common definition of homelessness, "The problem of definitions: Points of similarity and differences", by Maryse Marpsat (Institut National d'Études Démographiques, FR). The comments were made by Roser Cusso (Université Libre de Bruxelles, BE)

This paper examines how homeless people are defined in practice in different countries, especially in their different official reports. These definitions are based on principles that differ from one country to another.

The first difficulty involved in discussing the definition of homeless in different countries is that it assumes we are all talking about the same thing. But in fact, both

the history of the emergence of homeless people—or rather, the simultaneous increase in their numbers and visibility—and the way that emergence has been shaped as a social problem, vary between countries, and are inseparable from social policies and from the activity of NGOs in each country. Translating the terms used in each language uniformly by the expression homeless does not answer the question of what this construct actually signifies. Also, not all countries really have an equivalent or even approximate concept to that of hidden homelessness, and in those the extended concept of homelessness is formed according to different rationales that are related to how the central concept itself is formed.

Different definitions exist alongside one another in the same country. These national definitions vary with the users (researchers, government or voluntary agencies, etc.) and their purpose (research for direct use by other actors like government or voluntary agencies, data production by government or voluntary agencies for management or lobbying purposes, etc.), and with the methods they use (statistical surveys requiring a precisely defined coverage, qualitative investigation by sociologists or ethnologists, theoretical analyses of poverty or exclusion, prioritizing groups for rehousing, etc.) and the questions they ask.

The study here focuses essentially on three countries - Italy, the United Kingdom and France - all of which have definitions that are either statutory or used to compile official figures, supplied in reports like the National Action Plans for social inclusion or, in the case of Italy, the Report of the Commission of Enquiry into Poverty. A close examination of these three definitions reveals some salient characteristics that distinguish the different national definitions in Europe. The United Kingdom has had legislation on homeless people since the late 1970s which has provided the basis for official or competing definitions; in Italy, the construction of the issue has resulted in the concept of the *senza dimora* as a specific situation of exclusion in which exclusion from housing cannot be divorced from psychosocial marginalization; finally, in France, informed by the work of the National Council for Statistical Information (Conseil National de l'Information Statistique - CNIS), a body that brings together government departments, NGOs, and researchers, most statistics-based research has regarded the *sans-domicile* as people in a specific point-in-time situation within a continuum of housing situations.

A close consideration of these three cases points up some broad divergences, such as the existence or not of a statutory definition, the linkage between the definition and social housing allocation, and the inclusion of aspects relating to the household and individual or just the accommodation itself.

Also considered are the extended meanings given by users to these three definitions (hidden homeless or at risk of homelessness, mal-logés or situations marginales de logement, disagio abitativo). Finally, in the absence of a clearly-defined common social policy, the difficulty of agreeing on a European definition is discussed with reference to the definition developed by the European Observatory on Homelessness, a research group established within FEANTSA, the European Federation of National Organizations Working with the Homeless, and the Eurostat recommendations.

### **5.3. Theories: Social capital, risk and social exclusion**

This section presents some of the theories underpinning homeless research in Europe. More detailed information is available on the website, including papers on other theoretical perspectives. "Homelessness as a process: Theoretical approaches and social construction of the question", by Rossana Torri and Antonio Tosi (Dipartimento di Architettura e Pianificazione, Politecnico di Milano, IT); "Ethics, concepts, and methodology", by Jean-Marie Firdion (Institut National d'Etudes Démographiques, FR). The comments were made by Pascale Pichon (Université Jean Monnet, Saint-Etienne, FR)

#### **"Homelessness as a process: Theoretical approaches and social construction of the question", by Rossana Torri and Antonio Tosi (Dipartimento di Architettura e Pianificazione, Politecnico di Milano, IT)**

For Antonio Tosi and Rossana Torri, "the analysis of homelessness may greatly profit by the recent debate on poverty. Even if the theoretical attitudes introduced by recent studies on poverty have had a marked effect on research into homelessness over the last few years, their implications (and the further potential those studies may have for the conceptualization of homelessness and the definition of the theoretical status of the question) have not been fully discussed". Their paper discussed some of these implications starting with "what is the central theoretical notion of those introduced by the studies on poverty: the idea of the 'process' character of poverty and of the multidimensional nature of the process".

#### **"Ethics, concepts, and methodology", by Jean-Marie Firdion (Institut National d'Etudes Démographiques, FR)**

The French team's methodological, theoretical and ethical preoccupations were formed in the course of their investigations, during discussions with social agents responsible for welfare services and with voluntary sector organizations, and while carrying out survey research (in France). They sought to develop a theoretical and conceptual

framework that went beyond that of purely descriptive surveys. Their research had to include a statistical approach (notably use of sampling theory to construct representative samples) in its practical and ethical components. The pursuit of objective knowledge immediately brings them up against the social representations of homelessness, that is, the modes of perception, categories, and classifications whose origins are scholarly or official, common sense or militant, etc. Standing back from "ordinary intuition" and from representations originating in journalism, politics and social work is a dual scientific and ethical imperative.

The literature contains two main analytical models used to explain the social reality of homelessness, often presented as being mutually contradictory. One emphasizes structural causes, in an often highly deterministic approach that at times produces a fatalistic attitude towards social forces. The other mode of analysis focuses on the personal attributes of each individual, emphasizing his or her uniqueness, presenting their personal history in terms of disruption in the relational, familial and professional spheres, etc. and often leading to an approach centred on psychological and individual factors. At the outset of this empirical inquiry, therefore, the INED team was faced with a choice between two modes of interpreting social facts, while the manifest complexity of the situations precluded an analysis in simple or mono causal terms, which encouraged them to combine these two approaches to improve understanding of this social phenomenon. Several of their analyses have been conducted using the theoretical constructs—developed by Pierre Bourdieu—of "capital" (an aggregate of resources and competences actually useable and socially classified) and "field" (with specific properties and logic), and been premised on the fact that this population does not function on different social logics from society at large. They have also examined the stressful events that may have marked survey respondents in their youth.

This approach has enabled them to avoid the descriptive approach usually employed when working with quantitative data, and to situate the trajectories of homeless persons in the perspective of recent structural changes and the structuration of social space, particularly the effect of social inequalities. It also leads them to identify the capital and resources these persons can actually deploy, rather than their deficiencies and shortcomings, which provides a reminder that the homeless person is a "subject". Moving beyond a purely individualist approach allows them to identify what in these persons' present situation can be traced to their past, as well as the effect of the existing socio-economic structure, and to relate these elements to the observable socio-psychological characteristics.

#### **5.4. Methodology: quantitative, qualitative and complementarity**

"Quantitative methods in Homelessness Studies: A critical guide and recommendations", by Lars Benjaminsen (The Danish National Institute of Social Research, DK), Manuel Muñoz, Sonia Panadero and Carmelo Vázquez (Universidad Complutense de Madrid, ES). This paper was commented by Luigi Leonori (SMES-Europe, BE).

"A European perspective on the use of qualitative methods in the study of homelessness: methods, findings, theoretical understandings and policy interventions", by Megan Ravenhill, Joan Smith (Cities Institute) and Svetlana Stevenson (Department of Applied Social Studies), London Metropolitan University, UK, Lia Van Doorn and Petra Van Leeuwen (NIZW, NL). This paper was commented by Martin Gruber (Hamburg University, GE).

"Qualitative vs quantitative. Why are these two approaches relevant to understand homelessness?", by Martine Quaglia (Institut National d'Études Démographiques, FR). This paper was commented by Paul Koegel (Rand Health, USA).

**"Quantitative methods in Homelessness Studies: A critical guide and recommendations", by Lars Benjaminsen (The Danish National Institute of Social Research, DK), Manuel Muñoz, Sonia Panadero and Carmelo Vázquez (Universidad Complutense de Madrid, ES).**

This presentation focused on the role of quantitative methodology in homeless research. Within quantitative methodology a distinction can be made (as in the classification of methods) between cross-sectional studies (works in which the quantitative data are collected at a certain time or over a short period of time and which contribute valid data for a specific point in time) and longitudinal studies (studies in which there is more than one evaluation moment, that is, data are gathered at different times).

The first studies of the homeless were chiefly cross-sectional works that attempted to determine the number of homeless people, their main characteristics and needs. This type of work, with just one point of evaluation, was and still is the most common within homelessness studies. Point-in-time surveys have also been used to determine the opinions and attitudes of the general population and to describe the services targeted at the homeless.

Surveys and interview-based approaches have been the most common in cross-sectional studies. Various strategies have been used, featuring both direct (obtaining data directly from the homeless) and indirect approaches (collecting data provided by workers, volunteers, etc.), and diverse variables have been considered (socio-demographic variables, physical and mental health, stressful life events, etc). The results of this kind of work are influenced by certain variables that must be taken into account; chiefly, homeless people's characteristics vary depending on the way homelessness is defined, sample selection, the period of observation and the design, the definition of the characteristics and the way they are assessed (the instruments employed), as well as the sampling strategies utilized. These sampling strategies include multicenter, multiservice, and multiday sampling, and sampling in places where the homeless congregate; complex weighting to correct the deviations due to different levels of service use by each person is crucial to guarantee the representativeness of the samples used and, hence, the quality of the results and conclusions about the homeless.

Regarding data registers or administrative data, the last few years have seen various European countries use registers to collect information about the homeless. The Danish case is paradigmatic of the development of this kind of register. In Denmark a national register gathers information about most of the shelters and includes the users' social security number and increases the number of variables taken into account; it informs on how many people use these resources and how frequently, on discharge intervals and duration, etc. However, this kind of register also presents some problems: because the variables are clearly determined there is limited possibility for gathering other data or for freely designing a research project; the information obtained is interesting but concerns only a specific type of homeless person, etc.

Longitudinal analysis enables homelessness to be studied in a long-term or life-course perspective. The longitudinal study usually follows a group of initially homeless people over time and thereby generally strengthens explanation of complex processes by adding a time span to the analysis. This makes it possible to explain which factors are related to flows into and out of homelessness and also to establish possible future outcomes for living standards, health etc. A longitudinal study is also appropriate when we wish to evaluate the effects of different services and programs aimed at homeless people. A common problem or challenge in longitudinal designs is how to maintain contact with a group of homeless people who may or may not still be homeless after a certain period, in order to conduct follow-up interviews. The possibility of following users of homeless shelters through public registers also enables

register and survey methods to be combined. Combining the two sources of information can strengthen the design of the study, increasing the overall validity of the data obtained and helping to overcome some of the inherent difficulties in longitudinal studies on the homeless population. The use of the register data makes it easier to evaluate whether the interviewed persons are representative of the whole group since register information is available for everyone.

**“A European perspective on the use of qualitative methods in the study of homelessness: methods, findings, theoretical understandings and policy interventions”, by Megan Ravenhill, Joan Smith (Cities Institute) and Svetlana Stevenson (Department of Applied Social Studies), London Metropolitan University, UK, Lia Van Doorn and Petra Van Leeuwen (NIZW, NL)**

**I. The main purpose of this presentation** was to describe insights gained through qualitative studies into the lives of homeless people and homeless services that would not have otherwise been gained, and the policy interventions such insights can lead to. It described five studies that used qualitative methods to understand people living as street or hostel homeless in the Netherlands, UK and Russia. Two of the studies researched older single homeless people predominantly, one researched older and younger single homeless people, one researched young homeless people and one homelessness among children and young people aged 7-17 years.

These studies used a mixture of life histories, in-depth interviews and observation. They also used a mixture of analytical approaches: the observation/in-depth interview studies took a theoretical analysis approach, deriving their understandings from an intensive analysis of the data; some in-depth interview studies took a thematic analysis approach deriving their analysis from the research problem and research schedule; one study combined thematic analysis with statistical analysis; two studies included comparative interviews with domiciled people who were not homeless. Each of the studies reported here produced new insights into the processes and lived experience of homelessness, two of the studies produced agency programmes.

The five studies described their methodology, main findings and policy outputs as summarised below:

### **Time on the streets (Van Doorn 2000), NL**

This was a longitudinal study (1993 - 2000) based in Utrecht with 64 homeless and 20 former homeless. The research methods used included in-depth interviews, participant observation, observation, and 'ego-documents'. The original perspective was taken from Goffmann and asked: Are there 'careers' among homeless people?

The study concentrated on two aspects: i. biographies of homeless people, and ii. the relationship between homeless people and the institutions that work with them.

The study identified three different phases of homelessness:

- origins of homelessness,
- continuation of homelessness,
- termination of homelessness

The policy implication of this finding is that there are different and best intervention strategies for each of these three phases.

### **The culture of homelessness (Ravenhill 2003), UK**

This study took a biographic approach to rooflessness through 48 life story interviews, 52 formal and informal in-depth interviews, and observations in London and country settings. Additionally, 24 interviews were undertaken with people at risk but never roofless. The perspective of this study was derived both from Structuration theory and Risk Theory. It also used the 'grounded theory' approach of Glaser and Strauss. An innovative method was to develop a time-line analysis of biographic interviews and the use of the Atlas – Ti computer package.

The findings of the study were: first, the origins of rooflessness through the accumulation of triggers; second, biographic interviews showed that rooflessness usually began in childhood; third, the identification of both protective factors and predictor factors; fourth, the existence of street culture<sup>53</sup>.

The policy output from this study is that resettlement requires early intervention before someone has settled into the street.

---

<sup>53</sup> During the discussion the existence of street culture was challenged in terms similar to those directed at Oscar Lewis's "culture of poverty" in the sociological literature.

### **Implementation of the eight-steps model (Van Leeuwen c.s. 2000), NL**

This study began from the problems encountered by Dutch agencies when working with the homeless, principally a lack of clear trajectories and planned improvements, with no structure to the intervention and no clear view on the contribution of clients. The methods adopted were that of an action research programme with the goal of improving the individual support for homeless single men and women staying in shelters for at least 6 weeks (day and night shelters excluded).

The initial stage was based on meetings with national experts, and key respondent interviews with social workers and management. The next stage provided base measurement through questionnaires for social workers and clients. The new model of working was then introduced (the Eight Steps model) and outcomes re-assessed through follow-up questionnaires with both social workers and clients.

The eight steps model led to changes in the culture of organizations working with homeless people through the development of a holistic approach, empowerment of clients and the development of social competence among clients. From the client perspective the model leads them to feel they are taken more seriously, know better who to turn to, and feel they have more help from external caregivers. From the perspective of social workers and management the most important outcomes were transparency, improved structures and a more coherent programme; the agency became more goal orientated and co-operation improved.

The policy outcome was that the framework of individual support provided by the Eight Steps Model by social workers was implemented at a national level.

### **Street children in Moscow (Stephenson 2001), Russia**

This study looked at the research question of how to understand the sub-culture of street children, and their individual 'careers' – how did each of them become a street child. Stephenson used a triangulation of methods: questionnaire survey, in-depth interviews, focus group interviews. The study discovered that:

- focus group interviews were best for collective ideas and norms; and
- in-depth interviews for biographic information, life-stories and personal strategies.

The findings of the study were that children were displaced in their role as children, largely through family disruption and violence in their families. Their strategies of re-

placement were to maximise security for themselves; they had to find company on the streets, and developed supportive relationships with each other. They accumulated alternative social capital through pooling resources or joining with adults who took them into sex work or crime ('surrogate families').

The policy outcomes were primarily that the Russian state strategies are not working: children will not return to institutions when they are sent there and their sub-cultures are not all negative. There is a need for child welfare programmes that recognise children's sub-cultures on the street and work with those sub-cultures, as well as a need for individually designed programmes of support, not new youth centres that fail to reach the marginalised child.

### **Family backgrounds of young homeless people (Smith c.s. 1998) & Taking risks (Smith c.s. 1999), UK**

This described a research programme that began with a comparative study of homeless young people (56 in-depth interviews) and their parents (22 in-depth interviews), and a study of 60 young people living in families on deprived local estates (semi-structured interviews with 60 parents and 40 young people still living at home). The purpose of the study was to explore family obligation towards young people and the reasons they became homeless.

Three types of homeless families were found: 1) non-disrupted families where conflict has developed through the young person's behaviour – drugs, crime, young person's relationship; 2) disrupted families and conflict principally through a parent's new relationship; and 3) abusive families of either type. It also found that there was a major rupture in social structure/conditions experienced by the young people compared with their parents (unemployment, disrupted families). From the 'vignettes', small stories, that were presented to estate parents and young people, it was found that on the whole they would support the homeless parent by asking the young person to leave if there was a new partner or if the young person's behaviour led to violence and theft in the family home. A 'Circle of Risk' for young people was identified in relation to theories of Risk and Social Exclusion.

The findings of the 'Family Background' study were used to create a structured questionnaire for a 'Taking Risks' study that compared 200 young people living in homeless hostels in London, with 152 young people living at home in deprived areas.

The factors linked to a higher risk of being homeless were: didn't get on with mother (odds-ratio 13 to 1), moved house more than twice (11 to 1), mother aged under 25

at birth of first child (6 to 1), badly off as a child (5 to 1), living with step-parent or relative or in foster care compared with two or one only birth parents (5 to 1), hit frequently in course of an argument (4 to 1), poverty indicators – sharing bedroom, rented accommodation, no care (all 3 to 1), school excluded (2 to 1).

Two programmes for young homeless people were developed out of the 'Taking Risks' research. The first was 'Safe in the City', a programme introduced in eight London boroughs, that provided early intervention for young people at risk of becoming homeless through personal development, education and skills and family work. The second programme was 'Safe Moves' developed by the Foyer Federation across the UK in different foyers, intervention in schools and outside schools.

**II. A second purpose of this presentation** was to demonstrate that the charge levelled against qualitative research of producing findings that are dependent on the perspective of the researcher(s) and cannot be independently validated, is misconceived. This paper argues that it is possible to demonstrate the validity and reliability of qualitative research in different, but parallel ways, to that of quantitative research:

- Action research in different countries and/or different settings can be demonstrated to produce reliable findings when their intervention strategies are applied to another country or city, e.g. the Eight Steps Model has been applied by Petra van Leeuwen in Kiev;
- Parallel findings by researchers whose work is unknown to each other can demonstrate that observation/in-depth interviews with similar homeless populations yield comparable insights. For example, the studies in Utrecht (van Doorn) compared with the UK (Ravenhill).

Qualitative research findings frequently lead to the development of research tools for use in quantitative research. The use of understandings gained in qualitative research in one city and one context can be validated through findings of quantitative research instruments.

Of course, there are always several ways to research any particular issue. According to the authors, none are wrong but some methods are more appropriate than others.

**“Qualitative vs quantitative. Why are these two approaches relevant to understand homelessness?”, by Martine Quaglia (Institut National d’Etudes Démographiques, FR)**

As a sociologist and a member of the Survey department of the National Institute for Demographic Studies, Martine Quaglia has taken part over the past ten years in a number of studies related to homelessness, working with teams differing both in approach and background and including demographers, statisticians, psychiatrists (clinicians and epidemiologists), sociologists, anthropologists and psychologists. These experiences led her to question the legitimacy of the still discernible rivalry between supporters of the qualitative and quantitative approaches.

As a reminder, on one side is a so-called quantitative approach that would explain or understand the world only through numbers and mathematical theories in which objectivity is taken for granted. This approach is associated with the “exact” or “pure” sciences in which everything that cannot be validated by a model does not exist. The power of mathematical proof... In this framework, individuals and actual experiences only exist through statistical categories. Individual behaviour, statistically insignificant, is disregarded or even ignored. In contrast to the mathematicians is the approach termed “qualitative”, based upon interpretation grids generated from “comprehensive” sociology or from psychology. The concern here is with individuals in terms of their actions, and consequently, the logic that guides them. Number, in this category, does not exist, since the concern is with individual history and the interactions between individuals. We are then back to the old story about the “parts” and the “whole” that is not made up of the sum of the parts.

For Martine Quaglia, this argument is no longer adapted to the reality of research on homelessness. Combining both methods is an obvious advantage for the quality of data produced. The two methods ask different questions and therefore, produce answers on different themes, thus refining knowledge on homelessness; by broadening the researcher’s point of view, this combination enriches the method and tools and thus permits a better analysis of situations. This discussion has more to do with the researchers’ point of view and with the political and social demand for information on the subject existing in the country where the research is conducted. The CUHP European research network on the homeless, which includes researchers from both schools, is an example of this evolution in the perception and utilisation of these methods.

Through a brief description of the different stages and some of the issues raised during a research programme, the presentation identified some answers that can be obtained by associating the two methods.

### **5.5. Experience from other countries**

It was deemed important to have insights on homelessness and homelessness policies in countries that did not belong to the CUHP network or (yet) to the EC. Two guest communications, one from an American researcher and one from a Bulgarian researcher met this requirement: "US approaches to ending long-term homelessness for people with disabilities", Martha Burt (Urban Institute, USA); "Homeless and homelessness in Bulgaria", by Iskra Dandolovala (Institut of Sociology, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences). The comments were made by Péter Győri (Metropolitan Research Institute, HU).

#### **"US approaches to ending long-term homelessness for people with disabilities", Martha Burt (Urban Institute, USA)**

According to Martha Burt, in the USA, the past five years have witnessed a major shift in public commitment to end chronic homelessness. Her presentation examined the phenomenon of chronic homelessness and its emergence as the focus of a significant policy transformation. She first reviewed the reasons why homelessness remained a significant social problem after twenty years of public and private investment in homeless assistance networks. She then looked at definitions of homelessness in general, and chronic homelessness in particular. With respect to policy, her presentation traces a story that starts with research. "First came research proving that even the most chronic, disabled, street-dwelling homeless people will accept and remain in housing, given the right configuration and the right supportive services. Research on program effectiveness was followed by analyses showing near break-even public costs for providing the housing. The story continues with evidence that the numbers of chronically homeless people who would need housing are within a manageable range." Martha Burt concluded by examining what advocates have done and are still doing with the research evidence, and an overview of public commitments and the effort it will take to assure that they are fulfilled.

**“Homeless and homelessness in Bulgaria”, by Iskra Dandolova (Institute of Sociology, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences)**

In Bulgaria, as in Hungary, homeless and homelessness are relatively new phenomena, at least as an officially recognised problem. They became public issues for the first time after the breakdown of the former regime. According to Iskra Dandolova, during the years between 1945 and 1989, the presence of poor, homeless, unemployed or other socially deprived individuals was not recognized in the country even when there was evidence for it. The ideology of the political regime assumed that the socialist state provided the best basic conditions for living and prosperity and such recognition would have implied the failure of the system.

Also, the term "homeless" was restricted to those people sleeping rough or the "roofless". Unfortunately this general understanding of the term that was relevant for the former period has changed little up to the present time.

Iskra Dandolova presented contextual data about the housing sector in Bulgaria. The public housing stock has nearly disappeared. The number of people currently experiencing housing hardship is growing. Home ownership is still considerable. Private renting has started to develop since 1990, but remains a small proportion. The present government relies on macro-statistical data on the housing sector. According to these, Bulgarians dispose of 460 housing units per 1000 people (slightly higher than the EU average). Having these figures in mind the state and the local authorities judge the housing situation with relative satisfaction. As a result, at the political level, neither housing nor homelessness is evaluated as a priority social interest.

Immediately after the 1989 changes in Bulgaria recognition grew of the existence of marginal social groups and the homeless, but there was no housing strategy or policy provision aimed at them. During the transition some housing assistance for poor people and rough sleepers began to be established in Sofia and a few large cities, supported by the emerging third, voluntary sector. But this provision is far too limited to meet the needs of the homeless. So far there is no state institution or specialized service committed to establishing a policy and to revealing the living conditions of the homeless. No strategy or policy for prevention or protection has been developed. To date in Bulgaria there is still no legal recognition of the homeless, no definition of them, and no statistical methods to estimate their number and describe their profile and types.

Although the homeless are not recognised officially by the policy makers and public institutions, Iskra Dandolova presented direct and indirect sources used by

researchers to get information about Bulgarian homeless people. The very few direct sources give some estimates of the number of this population or some information about the characteristics of homeless people. Indirect sources include, for example, the registration of people in housing need, a survival from the time when there was a large stock of public housing, or the number of sub-standard housing units recorded during the periodical census. Direct data come from academic surveys on homeless people, the first started in 1993, conducted with the objective of identifying and recognising the local phenomenon and the characteristics of the types of homeless people.

Iskra Dandolova then described the profile and the typology of the Bulgarian homeless population in a first attempt to identify and to classify the groups at risk or in situation of homelessness. While not claiming to define a full picture of the situation as regards homelessness, she presented different types of homeless such as: seasonal, temporary, permanent, sporadic; or – roofless, houseless, cases of risks provoked by insecure housing, inadequate spatial and hygienic housing conditions. Some qualitative types of homelessness were mentioned like: "hidden", "potential", "particular" etc.

Some trends in the homelessness issue in Bulgaria were presented in the conclusions: rising number of homeless persons; expanding categories of homeless and groups at risk of homelessness; aggravation of housing exclusion as a social phenomenon when combined with poverty and other social problems. Particularities were mentioned: young homeless people face the most difficult situation; conditions for elderly people without ownership are deteriorating; some groups of the population are being marginalized through unemployment, poverty, health and mental problems, addiction. The income of the homeless remains unknown, with a relatively low assumed education, low work skills etc.

The services in Bulgaria providing social assistance for poor and homeless people are very limited in number and type. There is no permanent soup kitchen for the homeless in Sofia. Temporary soup kitchens are organized only at Christmas and on certain other special occasions. According to Iskra Dandolova many homeless persons in the capital do not get assistance with accommodation because social housing is deficient, the emergency services are very limited in number and the homeless do not meet the criteria used to select people for accommodation.

## 5.6. Round table

Finally, the round table, presided by Hugues Feltesse from the European Commission and coordinated by Maryse Marpsat (CUHP), brought together Martha Burt, Roser Cusso, Iskra Dandolo, Martin Gruber, Paul Koegel, and Ingrid Sahlin.

Asked to sum up in a few words their impressions of the conference, and their recommendations for further work, these guest researchers drew attention to various aspects:

- several insisted upon the necessity of taking into account structural reasons for homelessness and poverty, including the evolution of the housing market. A related issue was the remark that when describing homeless profiles we must be careful to avoid stereotypes and the conclusion that homelessness results from the shortcomings of the individual. Also, as one invited researcher observed, if certain breaks in individual lives are important, it is also important not to forget about "macro-breaks" affecting a country (such as wars, or changes like those that occurred in countries previously under communist governments);
- it is important to continue discussion on definitions, possibly enlarging them to include people who are housed but without a formal tenancy, or to ex-homeless people who go on meeting other homeless people and using homeless services (soup kitchens);
- further research should be done on institutional aspects such as the services themselves, housing benefits etc., and on the social workers working with the homeless, their interactions, and their discourse on the homeless;
- it would be interesting to work on the cities where there are no homeless populations, to understand what happens in these contexts;
- our American colleagues noted the interest of having a situation (the European Union) where a number of legal and social policy contexts could be studied to gain understanding of their impact on homelessness.

## **IV. CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Since this was its main objective, the CUHP conclusions deal mostly with recommendations for methodological good practice, together with an attention to the preoccupations of NGOs. We shall list here the main CUHP conclusions about definitions and methods, and end with a few conclusions about homeless policies, especially prevention.

### **1. Definitions**

The list of Laeken indicators, a basis for the Open Coordination Method, does not include an indicator of homelessness, but a recommendation to move towards one was made by the Social Protection Committee in its 2001 report. Creating such an indicator and thus a common definition of homeless people where there is no common policy for them, with reference to different national legislative provisions, when data is collected by a wide range of methods that are themselves dependent on specific social policies and a specific framing of the problem, is fraught with difficulties<sup>54</sup>.

Construction of a classification system requires an equivalence to be established between the objects (people, situations) classified within the same rubric of that system. But where homeless people are concerned, national classification systems already exist based on different principles and referring to different legislation and social policies. These policies create equivalences for each country which either draw together or distinguish between some of the elements classified.

One of the difficulties is that the contours of a country's homeless populations are shaped by prevailing national social policies. A woman victim of violence, for example, might be considered homeless (and therefore counted as such in the United Kingdom, say) or be the subject of protective measures in some other capacity, which could result in her living in a refuge (but not being regarded as homeless, in Finland, say). Also, availability of places in such provision will dictate the numbers of women who can leave home to take shelter there. The social policy pursued will therefore dictate the number of women counted as homeless. A supranational definition cannot square with all national practices, albeit trying to reconcile the maximum number of aspects.

---

<sup>54</sup> Also found in other cases, like insecure forms of employment. See the works of the French seminar "Statistique et évaluation des politiques publiques" (2004-2005).

### **1.1. The main divisions in the development of the definitions**

A study of a few national cases brings into sharp focus some principles that reflect essential differences in these definitions: the existence or lack of legislation on homelessness, the linkage between the definition and allocation of social housing, whether it is a multidimensional definition or not, whether definition is of housing situations, households or persons.... (see Marpsat's paper for the final conference).

### **1.2. First division: a legislation on homelessness**

The existence of a statutory definition that confers different rights on people depending on whether or not they fall within the definition of homeless often results in the other definitions used by the different actors being developed by reference (including in opposition) to this statutory definition.

The statutory definition of homeless people will be applied to produce data for statutorily-prescribed reports, while to make more visible the difficulties of those outside the legislation, researchers and NGOs will produce data on them. The advantage of such a division in categories is to give copious, regular data on the categories selected; by contrast, points of comparability may lack between the different segments of the population, little information may be obtained about transitions between categories, and scant information given on the categories rejected.

### **1.3. Second division: the linkage between the definition and social housing allocation**

Another question concerns the linkage between social housing allocation policy and the definition of homeless people. This linkage is direct in the case of the United Kingdom. In France, the definition adopted for statistical work by the CNIS (National Council of Statistical Information) is distinct from the social housing allocation procedure. This is in two parts. First, certain eligibility criteria are checked relating to nationality, legality of stay in France, and household resources, which must not exceed a maximum. Then, as regards priority households, the allocation rules are ultimately not that different from those in UK, as priority is given to people who are homeless or living in unhealthy or dangerous accommodation, those being evicted under town planning arrangements, people with disabilities or with a disabled dependent, large families, pregnant women, heads of large families, young first homeseekers, people experiencing a sudden loss of income, etc., and including victims of domestic violence.

#### **1.4. Third division: a multidimensional definition or not**

Italy is a defining case where multiple dimensions are taken into account simultaneously to define homeless people: being unhoused and socially marginalized. However, use of a definition based uniquely on the housing dimension does not prevent agreement that homelessness is multidimensional both in its causes and consequences or that it stems from macroeconomic factors no less than from the life course factors of those concerned. The elements used in the definition must therefore be distinguished from those used in the analysis of the causes and consequences of homelessness.

Indeed, the meaning of the term “housing” may vary between definitions: in the French definition, housing is defined by its material aspects and occupancy status, considered in a housing market perspective; in the British definition, where the housing condition includes situations of potential violence and imminent eviction, the emphasis is more on the social function of housing (home rather than housing), as a place one can inhabit with a sense of security. This meaning related to the social and psychological roles of housing is also found in the Italian term *dimora*.

#### **1.5. Fourth division: classifying housing, household or individual situations?**

The different definitions of *sans-domicile*, homeless, statutory homeless, *mal-logé*, *senza dimora*, etc., may relate to housing situations only—any other household in the same situation would then be classified in the same way—or to characteristics of the household or its members. Thus, a victim of violence in the United Kingdom would be classified as homeless regardless of their housing situation, but another member of the same household—the perpetrator, for example—would be classified differently even though in the same housing situation.

The distinction between people and households is important from the policy action viewpoint, partly because not all people in the household are necessarily similarly positioned as regards insecurity of tenure (only one may be the named tenant) and partly because different kinds of solution may be sought depending on whether it is people or households that are counted and characterised (housing for the whole family or temporary accommodation in separate centres, for example).

## **1.6. Towards a European classification system**

An interesting approach could be to build a classification that can be used to describe all housing situations (not just those concerning homeless people), as was done by the CNIS in France and the FEANTSA, and to base this classification on several independent dimensions (physical domain, occupancy status...). By combining these dimensions, various situations of housing hardship could be defined. From the statistical point of view, the main difficulty seems to be the compromise between the countries in favour of taking into account a social dimension of housing, or individual characteristics such as domestic violence, mental illness or social marginality.

If one needs to define a subset of the persons in a given housing situation (itself defined by physical characteristics and occupancy status), such as the mentally ill or those who have severed their links with their social network, these cases can then be identified among those surveyed in this "stricto sensu" definition of homelessness. This is the case if a statistical approximation of the Italian *senza dimora* is to be obtained: among those who have no dwelling (in the physical sense), will be kept those whom the survey has shown to have very little social network.

By contrast, if victims of domestic violence need to be identified, and given that they may be found in any kind of housing situation including those quite comfortable from a material point of view, further investigations will be necessary (a survey on domestic violence which also describes housing conditions, to avoid double counting). Otherwise the data may derive only from requests for help concerning domestic violence, which will give only a fraction of the people concerned and measure services and their activity rather than domestic violence itself.

To sum up, various segments of the population experiencing housing hardship can thus be defined, and estimated with varying degrees of difficulty. Double counts must be avoided, or estimated when they do occur (for example, how many persons are at the same time doubling up with family or friends and living in an unfit dwelling). This requires a detailed questionnaire.

This theoretical definition being agreed upon, it remains to establish the equivalences already mentioned. Housing situations need to be equalized between countries: for example, by classing together types of housing that do not coexist in a country by reference to principles that have been worked out, but on which a measure of consensus exists and that are possible to operationalize. But the extreme diversity of the forms such housing takes (transitional housing, supported housing, logement passerelle,

baux glissants, centri di accoglienza, alloggi protetti, comunità-alloggio, etc.) complicates such equalization and the explanation of its principles. Likewise, differences between legislation require classes of equivalence to be devised for occupancy status.

Finally, these classifications must be adopted only after consulting with researchers, NGOs and national and European statisticians.

## **2. Methodology**

Method(s) must be chosen according to the questions to be researched, and under the constraint of the resources available, as regards either staff (number, type of training) or funding. The national context must also be considered, in particular the level of development of services targeting the homeless and the possible type of partnership with the NGOs.

### **2.1. Complementarity between quantitative and qualitative methods**

Quantitative (sample surveys, use of register data) and qualitative (in-depth interviews, participant observation) methods are complementary and together contribute to a better knowledge of homelessness and of homeless persons' life courses.

Besides providing an estimate of the number of homeless people, quantitative research can inform (according to the method chosen) about their characteristics, including by comparison with the general population or with a fraction of the low-income housed population, their previous trajectories, and is used to estimate flows in and out of homelessness, and to evaluate programs. Qualitative research collects the point of view of the homeless, the detail of their life histories, and studies the way their everyday life is organised, as well as the service system. Their contributions are thus complementary. They can be used either side-by-side or articulated (e.g., in-depth interviews of some of the people answering a survey questionnaire may be collected).

Thus, the preliminary interviews held before a survey is conducted can suggest new lines of inquiry, which may lead to the elaboration of hypotheses that the researcher did not have at the outset.

When questioning homeless people about their employment histories, for example, the INED researchers were struck by the large numbers of single men who had been employed in occupations which involved "moving around" (such as lorry drivers,

soldiers, sailors, workers on itinerant construction sites). Consequently, in the 1995 statistical survey of the homeless in Paris, a question was introduced on forms of employment that might have required the respondent to move from place to place. The results from this question were extremely interesting, since 28 % of men were found to have had work of this kind.

Qualitative methods can also improve the interpretation of the results of quantitative analysis. For example, analysing the results of the survey on homeless people in Paris revealed a high proportion of men who reported becoming homeless as a consequence of family breakdown, the couple's separation being cited as the event that set in train the changes that caused the respondent's life to "fall apart". Evidence from the in-depth interviews provides a corrective to this interpretation that individuals give of their own experience but which tends to obscure the complexity of the sequence of events and factors in this life experience, many of which stretch right back to childhood and may have contributed to the respondent's present situation. The fact of having questionnaires and interviews from the same individuals means that they can be cross-checked to show how the narrative of their life is constructed and given meaning differently, according to the method used to collect the information: "Whether it be as answers to a questionnaire or in a life story, respondents tend to take over the framework that is offered for recording the specificity of their own history" (Battagliola et al., 1993). "Every respondent does seem set on producing a self-presentation, on giving meaning to his or her life, an objective which takes tangible form as a message structuring the narrative and the answers to questionnaires" (Ferrand and Imbert, 1993).

Another issue is that of phenomena which are both rare and important. A phenomenon that is present to a very small degree in the population being studied (and which thus produces only non-significant results in small samples) may be much more important from another point of view (social, media, etc.). In our area of interest, this is the case of the French NGO DAL (Droit au logement) and other movements working with the homeless, whose activists have an organizational influence on the homeless milieu out of proportion to their number. Similarly, a few homeless people come from relatively well-off backgrounds. These atypical experiences are hard to apprehend with statistical analysis (see however Koegel et al., 1995, who conclude in favour of the role of family breakdown during childhood, and Marpsat, 1999) but still need to be explained. Qualitative analysis is thus essential for a better understanding of the milieu under examination. (For more examples of the complementarity between quantitative and qualitative data see Marpsat, 2001 and Quaglia, paper for the CUHP conference)

On the other hand, quantitative methods can complete or trigger qualitative approaches. The “contextual data” that practitioners of exclusively qualitative methods too often see as the only interest of quantitative methods are useful for identifying the specificities of people replying to interviews and of their behaviour, by situating them in a broader context. Some quantitative results can produce hypotheses that are later validated or not by qualitative research. The results of quantitative analyses can also be different from what the homeless (or other people) express, hence helping to differentiate between the representations of a situation and some aspects of the social reality. E.g. these two widespread representations, according to which, first, most homeless people are mentally ill or, second, anybody can become homeless. Statistical surveys show that a majority of the homeless come from modest backgrounds and have experienced poverty, while only a minority suffers from mental illnesses if depression is excluded.

## **2.2. Classification of statistical sources**

The classification of statistical sources (see part III 3. supra) separates the data sources according to the interviewee/source (service managers or register-based data, homeless people, general population) and according to the time-span envisioned (point-in-time data or longitudinal).

Each type of method can be used to answer certain questions—but not others—and presents its own specific difficulties and limits. Their ease of implementation depends on factors which differ between countries: e.g., the way services are managed, especially shelters; or whether a country uses population registers for its statistics, as opposed to the countries which usually conduct sample surveys. This is the reason why, in the present state of diversity of the European countries, it seems unwise to recommend use of a single type of data collection for quantitative data.

In addition, these methods can be combined: e.g., to obtain “point-in-time” figures, and study their evolution, one can conduct a sample survey at regular intervals (e.g., every 5<sup>th</sup> year), with a detailed questionnaire, and in-between use more summary register data, the quality of which should be improved as much as possible and the weaknesses identified; one can also, in some national contexts where shelter registers are widely used, such as Denmark, periodically conduct sample surveys from a sample of registered persons, who will be interviewed to obtain complementary data.

Finally, the geographical scale must be taken into account. A number of complex methods which require a strong commitment of the interviewers over a long period (a panel survey, for example, where the respondents must be re-interviewed at regular

intervals) are possible under certain conditions, in a city or even a small country but not at the national level in large countries (in the United States, for example, panel surveys have only been employed locally).

### **2.3. Point-in-time data**

\* These data, either from surveys or registers, are used (according to the level of detail of the questionnaire or of the registers): to produce an estimate of the number of homeless people at a given point in time; to know their characteristics, life histories, opinions, living conditions; to identify factors associated with homelessness (but not necessarily causes) by comparing them with poor housed people (see on [www.cuhp.org](http://www.cuhp.org) the French paper "Point-in-time statistical surveys of the homeless population" for the Madrid workshop, and the paper presented by the Danish and the Spanish teams at the Brussels conference, "Quantitative methods in Homelessness Studies: A critical guide and recommendations").

\* In the case of countries (or regions or cities) where programs (accommodation, soup kitchens, clothes...) are well developed, surveys of service users (e.g. national surveys in the USA and in France, local surveys in Madrid and Paris etc.) can be conducted. Their main characteristics are:

- the survey principle is to draw a sample of services and then to interview the individuals who use these services;
- the data gathering can be spread over several weeks but the results relate to a shorter period, for example an average day or an average week of the survey period;
- a number of housed people also use these programs, and are thus surveyed. It is interesting to analyse these limit cases of people who are housed but often very poor, and may have experienced homelessness previously (as shown in various countries such as the USA or France). By comparing them with homeless people, and if the questionnaire includes questions about the previous periods of homelessness, one can reveal factors associated with exits from homelessness or returns to homelessness after a housed episode.

For this kind of survey (based on a sample of service users) it is necessary to elaborate weightings which adjust for the probability of the user being in different sampling frames, that is for the fact that the same person may use several services (shelter and food kitchen, for example). Hence the questionnaire must include a question on this topic for each type of service used (it is necessary to know how many

times a week -for results on an average week- the respondent has slept in a shelter; the same goes for food distributions etc.). Even if each new type of service improves the coverage of the survey, the number of different types of services must be small in order not to weary the respondents. French and North American experiences have concluded for a relatively good coverage when using only accommodation and food distribution programs. Depending on the organization of services in the country considered, some other possibilities could be added, such as considering a number of gathering places (such as the metro or the train stations) like a "shelter" to sample.

To weight the data, several methods are possible, but the "weight sharing" method used by the French national institute of statistics (INSEE) for its national 2001 survey of homeless people gives a simple formula for the weightings. For more details, see the French paper for the Madrid workshop, "Point-in-time statistical surveys of the homeless population":

- as to double counting, it is enough to find the respondents who have been interviewed several times in the same service site during the same visit of the interviewers (other occurrences of double counting are taken into account by the weighting procedure). This case is very rare, except when interviewees long for some company or try to benefit twice from the "gift" given as a compensation for their time (a sum of money or a telephone card, a radio...);
- a number of persons are not covered by these surveys, because they are homeless but do not use services such as shelters or food distributions. Coverage studies must thus be conducted. This is possible either by following outreach services (other than those already in the sampling frame, for example various non food distributions if mobile food distributions have been sampled) either by other methods of combing streets and abandoned buildings (but with some reserves about this last method: these difficult conditions permit only short questionnaires and few variables, hence determining the bias of the main data gathering is not easy);
- the questionnaires of these surveys can be quite detailed. In the Madrid workshop, the Spanish team presented a paper, "Psychosocial assessment in point-in-time surveys: rationale and domains of evaluation", where they discussed the functions that different instruments serve, outlined possible criteria to help investigators select appropriate instruments in a given study, then examined the instruments that are most often used, in the following domains:

- Sociodemographics (general, housing situation, employment situation);
- Important life events (in childhood, in adulthood);
- Quality of life (objective, subjective);
- Health (physical, mental, substance use);
- Social support (perceived social support, number of close family and friends, frequency of contact);
- Services (used and accessibility of services);
- Functioning (psychosocial and neuropsychological).

Also, the Spanish paper included a section detailing some specific instruments with good psychometric qualities that are widely used with the homeless population to evaluate different areas.

\* In some countries, shelters have computerized registers which can be used (see "Possibilities and Limitations in Longitudinal Analysis of Homelessness Based on Information From Official Registers" presented by the Danish team at the Copenhagen workshop and "Quantitative methods in Homelessness Studies: A critical guide and recommendations"). The main characteristics of this type of investigation are the following:

- in order to estimate a number of persons and not a number of services, and to obtain data on all shelter users of a given area, an identifier (national identity number or ad hoc number) is needed to unduplicate the data. In some countries, this can lead to ethical problems (confidentiality, anonymity);
- the coverage of the homeless population by these registers is incomplete since there are unregistered people who sleep rough or in various emergency shelters where similar data is not gathered (e.g. in Denmark, the "night cafés", places opened during the night -usually by NGOs- where homeless people can stay unconditionally). To achieve a better coverage it would be necessary to record the use of other programs (such as outreach services), but the unsuccessful experience of the ANCHOR software in the United States is a deterrent to trying this way of gathering data (though information systems at a local level can be quite useful to pool the data from different programs). (About ANCHOR, see on [www.cuhp.org](http://www.cuhp.org) the French presentation in Copenhagen, "Longitudinal Perspectives on Homelessness: some French and American Examples");

- the data thus gathered are of a limited nature, mostly socio-demographic data, except if use is made of other files merged with the previous one with an identifier (as in the Danish example), but this may cause confidentiality problems;
- the issue of cost is not straightforward. It might be thought that because the data from these records exist already, they are cheap. However, elaborated for administrative, not research, needs, the records require carefully checking before use, which can be costly;
- by contrast, this method gives results regularly, and these results can be “at a given date”, “in the course of the previous year” etc., thus estimating flows and stocks;
- when register data exist, they can be used at all geographical levels (local, national) while national sample surveys are not necessarily representative at the local level and local sample surveys do not give data on the national situation.

\* What should be done when programs are not very developed and when there are no registers and no possibility of conducting a survey of service users that gives adequate coverage of the homeless population? One possibility is to conduct a survey in a public space, or add one to a service survey when a few services do exist. This raises the question of how surveys can be conducted in public spaces.

In the case of large cities, areas can be sampled with unequal probabilities: each area is classified as a low, medium, or high density area according to the number of homeless people expected to be found in it, and sampled accordingly. But this classification of areas (with the help of various experts, such as NGO members, police, the homeless themselves etc.) is a very difficult task, since the occupation of a place may vary between daytime and nighttime and at different dates, depend on police harassment etc.

In the street itself, questionnaire length must be short, and homeless people are sometimes difficult to identify (they do not necessarily look different from other passers-by). Many homeless people keep out of sight, and to count only those who are visible and preparing to sleep can lead to a serious underestimate. It is also possible to try to enter abandoned buildings, but this can be dangerous for the interviewers. So conducting a survey in public space should only be done as a last resort, or as a complement to a service users survey.

The Hungarian team thus presented such a research in the case where services are little developed (Madrid workshop).

"A guide to counting unsheltered homeless people", published by the HUD<sup>55</sup> in the USA, reviews the different methods (basically the "Public Place Method" and the "Non-Shelter Services Method", and a combining of the two) which can be applied either when there are no or few accommodation services, or for the homeless who do not use shelters when these do exist. These methods can help obtain a count of unsheltered homeless people together with some information about them. This information is rather basic in the case of the "Public Place Method" (given the conditions in which the survey is conducted). The issues of screening who is homeless and who isn't, and of unduplicating, are the usual ones.

\* Generally speaking, non-shelter services surveys are the best way to reach the homeless who do not use shelters but are not visible in the street because they sleep in a hidden place.

#### **2.4. Longitudinal data**

\* These data, gathered over a period of time, are used to measure the length of homeless episodes, to understand which factors facilitate exit from homelessness, or return to homelessness after an exit from it. They can also be used to evaluate programs, to measure the effects of social policy interventions (for example the introduction of a new benefit) through the use of a control group.

\* Longitudinal data also follow two types of methods: sample surveys (or panel surveys) where (homeless) respondents are interviewed several times, and register data with use of an identifier to control double counts. See on [www.cuhp.org](http://www.cuhp.org) the papers of the Copenhagen workshop: "Possibilities and Limitations in Longitudinal Analysis of Homelessness Based on Information From Official Registers" presented by the Danish team (about register data), "Follow-up studies in Spain" presented by the Spanish team (about panel surveys), and "Longitudinal perspectives on homelessness: some French and American examples" presented by the French team (an overview of the two methods, their strengths and limitations).

Qualitative methods have also explored that issue, see for example in the same workshop "A follow-up study in The Netherlands" (about in-depth interviews) presented by the Dutch team.

---

<sup>55</sup> US Department of Housing and Urban Development.

\* Sample surveys: the method, which is not unique to studies of homelessness, has two components. First, a preliminary survey is carried out, to provide socio-demographic information on respondents and elements of their history up until the date of the survey. Next, the people surveyed in the first round, or at least those who agreed to participate in the panel, must be located for several more waves, each within a specified time frame. In subsequent survey waves, the respondents are asked for further information on their new situation and their trajectory since the last visit from the interviewer.

These surveys can have a complex questionnaire, but they also suffer from a problem of attrition (a large proportion of the respondents cannot be found again after the initial survey). To combat attrition, various strategies are employed to ensure the consistent participation of respondents, but these strategies can be expensive.

\* For register data: administrative records created by different social service agencies are pooled, and all records for each individual can be merged using an identifier (in the Danish case, the national identity number, but it could be an ad hoc number, created just for this purpose and based on sex, birth date etc.). It is thus possible to work with individuals rather than services provided, and to capture the movement of individuals between different social services.

But these data only give limited information, unless used with other administrative files, with various precautions to ensure the confidentiality of the data. As for "point-in-time" register data, these data are not gathered for research purposes, and may need editing (because of missing or unreliable data), which can also be costly.

## **2.5. Qualitative methods**

Qualitative methods can take various forms: interviews of service providers or homeless people, field observations study. Though less often used, the study of the diary of a homeless person was also presented in the London workshop.

These methods are particularly adapted for studying the point of view of the people interviewed and the connections between the situations in which they have found themselves. They are also of help for investigating little known practices (such as homeless activism), and in studying the functioning of the service delivery system. For more details, see *supra* the summary of the conference presentations dedicated to qualitative data, and these presentations themselves on the website.

As already seen with the example of the Dutch team, the follow-up of homeless people using observation and in-depth interviews has given very interesting results. This

follow-up across time of a group of homeless people gave detailed information on their practices and their adaptations to changes in their resources and the constraints that weigh on them. As a consequence of this research, possible policy recommendations include special measures for the recently homeless. The research also gives examples of those homeless people who succeeded in getting off the streets and how this was achieved.

## **2.6. Questions in surveys of the general population**

Another (inexpensive) way of obtaining information on homelessness is to insert questions in surveys on the general (housed) population. For example:

- people doubling-up with family or friends (but it is difficult to measure the degree of constraint in this situation). One can interview the accommodated persons about their wish to find independent housing, but also the accommodating households about their desire to continue or not with this situation;
- previous homeless episodes. However, since these questions are asked to the general housed population, the previously homeless people who answer them are those who have exited homelessness to a new dwelling, and this gives no information on the persons who are deceased, in institution (old people's home, foyer, prison) or still homeless (and hence different from those who exited homelessness);
- public opinion on the homeless issue, the NIMBY<sup>56</sup> syndrome, representations that housed people have of the homeless (as victims of circumstances or of economic problems, or as responsible for their situation).

## **2.7. Conclusion: adapting the method chosen to questions, resources, and national context**

\* The choice of a data gathering method must take into account the research questions to be addressed, the resources available (financial resources but also the kind of training of the team available to work on the issue), and the national context (in particular, the development and organization of these research partners, the NGO networks and the public authorities).

---

<sup>56</sup> Not in my backyard.

\* Some typical research questions are:

- 1) how many people are homeless at a given date?
- 2) how many people have experienced a homeless episode over a given period?
- 3) what are the basic characteristics of these persons (age, sex,...)?
- 4) what are their health statuses, living conditions, past life experiences, opinions etc.?
- 5) what are the characteristics of the persons more likely to exit homelessness?
- 6) how to compare homeless people to housed people?
- 7) how to realize a control sample of homeless people to evaluate a program?
- 8) how to understand the ways in which the homeless perceive their situation and face it?

The preceding pages have listed the different methods and can be used to select those most adapted to the research questions.

But it is also necessary to take into account resources, since some methods are costly, and the national context.

Indeed, in countries where register data are developed and where the merging of files, though regulated, is not too problematic, as seems to be the case in Denmark, the use of such data (possibly completed by, or as a complement to, survey data) will be easier than in countries where the tradition is to conduct sample surveys and where public opinion is not very positive about the merging of files.

Besides, register-based methods and sample survey methods necessitate close partnership with the NGOs. This partnership will be easier in countries where there is a dense and well-organized (e.g. federated) associative network. It will take a different form depending on the existence or not of computer files of the NGOs service users, and on whether these files are harmonized or not. In countries where the level of services is less developed, it may be necessary to conduct counts of the homeless in public spaces, with all due precautions.

What was gained by this international work in the CUHP research network? It permitted an examination of various concrete cases at close range and, for each

country of the network, an exploration of the articulation between theories underlying research, methods implemented, organization of homeless services, structuration of the NGOs network, relations between researchers, NGOs, public agencies and the central state, and finally, the national histories of the construction of the homeless issue as a social problem.

All the methods that have been adopted elsewhere in the world (in particular in the United States) have also been experimented in Europe, with varying degrees of sophistication according to the national context. It is thus possible to find for each method one or several pieces of European research of good quality, which can provide an example for other member states, as far as they can be replicated in these countries' national contexts, since not all methods are as easily reproduced in all countries.

### **3. Policy implications**

The main goal of the CUHP network was to make recommendations on methodological issues, while taking into account the NGOs' preoccupations. However, a number of results are similar in several countries, which can lead to recommend specific measures as well as complementary investigations on these issues.

#### **3.1. Prevention and early intervention strategies**

\* People who have spent time in an institution such as prison or the Army are overrepresented among the homeless. Two main factors may play a role here: on the one hand, socio-economic factors, poverty, family difficulties, can have an influence on enlistment as well as on the adoption of delinquent behaviours which may lead to prison; on the other hand, exit from these institutions may be insufficiently prepared, and improving this preparation - as is already done in some countries - could contribute to diminish the number of homeless people;

\* In the same way, people who have been placed in foster care (either in a family or an institution) during their youth are overrepresented, particularly among the young homeless. In this case too, even if the difficulties leading to foster care may play a role, exit from foster care should be better prepared;

\* The UK paper in London reported on a study that identified particular risk factors in relation to youth homelessness that had been used to guide the provision of prevention services to young people at school;

\* As Lia van Doorn's research has shown for the Netherlands, it seems that specific measures should be adopted according to the length of the homeless episode. In particular, the Dutch intervention in Copenhagen underlined the importance of identifying the recent homeless among the homeless population, as this is a crucial moment for intervention; it also described who succeeded in getting out of the streets and how this was achieved. The Italian presentation in London also demonstrated that if marginalisation is analysed as a cumulative process, it implies that the resources needed to take people off the streets will be greater the longer they have been there;

\* Several other issues were raised during the London meeting: some so-called "causes" of homelessness are in fact only "triggers" while the real causes go back a long way and should also be taken into account in prevention strategies; factors which correspond to a higher probabilities of homelessness should be highlighted to help policy decisions, but also factors which help prevent homelessness for people who are otherwise very close to it;

\* More generally, contextual factors such as action on the housing and the labour market should be adopted as part of prevention strategies.

### **3.2. Acting upon socio-economic factors and legislation**

Various discussions, notably that with the Danish NGOs on the issue of chronic homelessness, demonstrated that homelessness is not a given but is also related to the housing market in a given place.

The London NGOs also stressed the necessity of research to evaluate programs but also the consequences of legislation regarding not only homelessness but also immigration, for example.

The Hungarian paper for the Brussels conference proposed various measures to improve the housing market at the European level (see on the website Part one of the paper "European values and homeless policies: Examining the broader and narrower policy lines").

### **3.3. A few remarks on services**

How to deal with persons who have several kinds of difficulties (such as drug and mental issues) and avoid sending them from one service to another was a preoccupation of the NGOs and public authorities in Denmark. As in other countries, the diagnosis of a person's condition can assign him or her either to services for the homeless or to other services.

The Danish presentation in London was a study of the interactions between social workers and homeless people in a local welfare office and researched the way social work with homeless people is conducted, and could lead to recommendations on how to make them more effective. Of course, these recommendations cannot be the same everywhere, since the situation depends on the organisation of the services at the national and local levels. In the case examined by Tobias Stax, he concluded: "it seems to me that there is an orientation towards the past [in the interaction between the client and the social worker], as something that must be significantly documented before action is taken, which means that action often is something that belongs to the future. This might pose a problem especially since the people that I follow to meetings with their social workers have shown a high degree of mobility. Thus, some of the tenants have left the shelter, and thereby moved out of the jurisdiction of the specific welfare office, before the past was documented and the time for intervention reached".

The Dutch presentation in London stressed that qualitative studies had shown that after a long time on the streets, housing alone did not provide a solution to some people's difficulties. The Dutch paper was based on a study designed around three questions: how did people end up on the street (triggers); did they live on the street the whole time or come off and go back on; and how did they manage to get off the streets. This paper dealt more particularly with perceptions of time and space among the homeless and how these perceptions could hamper their regular contacts with agencies. It also produced some recommendations: to reduce the goals to small steps for the long-term homeless and to take into account the difficulties they felt when finding themselves in a dwelling again (such as claustrophobia).

## V. DISSEMINATION AND EXPLOITATION OF RESULTS

Dissemination of results has been accomplished mainly through the website and the final conference; we have also established contacts during the workshops with local research teams, NGOs and public agencies; various presentations and publications have been realised. The network has planned the publication of both its methodological and theoretical results. Joan Smith is contacting English publishers for the first one and Antonio Tosi Italian publishers for the second one.

### Through the website

The website has enabled a large dissemination of the results and a "Contact us" facility was designed to help the exchanges between the network and other interested persons. The website is indexed on Google. It will be maintained for about two years, which should facilitate the multiplication of contacts.

The home page of the website links to information about the project of the thematic network ("About us"), to the description of the seven teams ("About partners") and to the "Contact us" facility.

It also links to the papers and other works of the thematic network:

- "Outputs" contains the papers from the workshops and the final conference, as well as the summaries of the annual reports to the European Commission;
- "Definitions" contains the workshop papers on definitions and a paper on the classification of housing situations<sup>57</sup>. This paper has some additional information on the definition of homelessness used in France. It was elaborated by the homelessness-working group (Groupe sans-abri) of the Conseil National de l'Information Statistique (CNIS - French National Council for Statistical Information<sup>58</sup>) and written by François Clanché, from the French National Institute of Statistics (INSEE). The paper was first published, in French, in 2000<sup>59</sup>;

---

<sup>57</sup> François Clanché, Classifying housing situations: Homeless people in general classifications, <http://www.cuhp.org/DocStore/ACF6C42.pdf>.

<sup>58</sup> This group included statisticians, researchers, officials, social work professionals and representatives of voluntary agencies working with the housing excluded. It worked for more than two years, between 1993 and 1996.

<sup>59</sup> François Clanché, "Le classement des situations de logement. Les sans-domicile dans des nomenclatures générales". In Maryse Marpsat, Jean-Marie Firdion, 2000. *La Rue et le foyer. Une recherche sur les sans-domicile et les mal-logés dans les années 90*, Paris: INED (Travaux et Documents, n°144), 193-207.

- “Methods” contains the workshop papers on methods;
- “Policies” links to papers on the policy context of research;
- “NGOs” and “theories” contain the papers on those topics;
- “Ethics” contains a paper on the ethical aspects of researching homelessness, written by Jean-Marie Firdion, Maryse Marpsat and Michel Bozon<sup>60</sup>.

A logo, painted by street artists, has been added on the first page.

The research teams have been requested to give links to NGOs, government agencies and research sites on the issue of homelessness. The links are presented by country and are organised in relation to:

- General - European, North America, Other Countries.
- Central Government Departments/Agencies.
- Regional/Local/City Government Departments/Agencies.
- Homeless organisations/NGO links.
- Organisations of the homeless themselves.
- Research institutes/foundations.
- University research departments specialising in different aspects of homeless research.
- The “bibliography” links to a selected bibliography and a list of keywords divided in three sections: subject; discipline; and method.

The objective is not to offer an exhaustive bibliographical database, since other bibliographies are already available on the web, but to provide an easy to use database in relation with the topic of the CUHP and especially the methodologies used in the research on homelessness as they have been discussed in our workshops.

---

<sup>60</sup> Jean-Marie Firdion, Maryse Marpsat and Michel Bozon, *Is it legitimate to carry out surveys on the homeless? An ethical and scientific question*, [http://www.cuhp.org/admin/EditDocStore/JMF\\_Ethics.pdf](http://www.cuhp.org/admin/EditDocStore/JMF_Ethics.pdf). A French version of the paper has been already published with the title « Est-il légitime de mener des enquêtes statistiques auprès des sans-domicile? ». *Revue des Affaires Sociales*, 1995, 2-3, 29-54, and reprinted in Maryse Marpsat, Jean-Marie Firdion, *La Rue et le foyer. Une recherche sur les sans-domicile et les mal-logés dans les années 90*, Paris: INED (Travaux et Documents, n°144), 127-150.

As to the criteria for choosing the references, it was decided that each partner would provide the most important papers (about the method, findings, historical importance and policies) published in its country or in the countries not represented in the network (including USA and Canada). Each title had to be translated into English and each reference to be accompanied by an English abstract and a list of keywords chosen from the thesaurus.

As of now, the bibliography includes around 400 entries.

### **The meetings**

At all meetings, several NGOs were present on the second day (see list in Annex 4). Also attending were public authorities at different government levels and researchers.

Conferences, presentations

At the 2003 Hawaii international conference on statistics and related fields, Honolulu, 5-8 June, Maryse Marpsat (FR) presented a paper on: "French research about homelessness and marginal housing: definitional issues and first mapping of methodologies" and briefly described the CUHP network and its aims.

During the meeting of the European Observatory on Homelessness (Prague, September 26-27), Antonio Tosi (IT) gave a presentation of the CUHP programme.

Maryse Marpsat (FR) described the work of CUHP in a general presentation about homeless studies at the Mission d'Information sur la Pauvreté en Ile-de-France (MIPES, a sort of regional observatory on poverty). For a summary of this presentation see: [http://www.ile-de-france.pref.gouv.fr/mipes/documents/document\\_sans\\_domicile.pdf](http://www.ile-de-france.pref.gouv.fr/mipes/documents/document_sans_domicile.pdf)

Maryse Marpsat (FR) made a presentation of the CUHP network at the ENHR 2004 conference in Cambridge (2-6 July), under the title: Constructing Understandings of Homeless Populations (CUHP): a European network on homelessness.

The Hungarian team regularly circulated the CUHP papers among the Hungarian expert group which was set up at the beginning of the project including researchers, service providers (who also do research) who were willing to cooperate with them in the project. Around 10-12 people are included in the expert group and through them the most important organizations; these groups represent those doing homeless research in Hungary.

Péter Győri (HU) the director of the BMSZKI (Budapest Municipal Center of Social Institutions and Methodology) presented a background paper for the workshop in Milan (Hidden Homeless) with the title "On the Margin of Statistics" at the annual FEANTSA Conference, Budapest, 2004 October.

Antonio Tosi presented "Defining homelessness: between theoretical preferences and social construction", at: Seminar on homelessness research in Europe, Socialforsknings Instituttet, Copenhagen, September 21-22, 2005.

### **Contacts**

Some researchers working in the field of homelessness have asked to be kept in contact with the network and informed about the publications. It is useful to note the interest of certain collaborators from some important organisations including the FEANTSA, the European Observatory of Homelessness, and from networks and institutions working for national administrations (such as the German Ministry of Science).

### **Publications**

The coordinator has submitted a presentation of the CUHP network to the Newsletter on "EU Research on Social Sciences and Humanities" (November 2004).

## **VI. REFERENCES AND BIBLIOGRAPHY<sup>61</sup>**

Battagliola Françoise, BERTAUX-WIAME Isabelle, FERRAND Michèle, IMBERT Françoise, 1993, « A propos des biographies: regards croisés sur questionnaires et entretiens », *Population*, 2, 325-346.

FERRAND Michèle, IMBERT Françoise, 1993, « Le longitudinal à travers quantitatif et qualitatif », *Sociétés Contemporaines*, 14/15, 129-148.

KOEGEL Paul, MELAMID Elan and BURNAM Audrey, 1995, « Childhood Risk Factors for Homelessness among Homeless Adults », *American Journal of Public Health*, vol. 85, 12, December 1995, p. 1642-1649.

MARPSAT Maryse, 1999c, « Les sans-domicile d'origine bourgeoise », *Population*, 54 (6), p. 1019-1032.

Marpsat Maryse, 2001, « Problems in Comparative and Triangulated Homelessness Research », *BMS, Bulletin de Méthodologie Sociologique*, 71, July 2001, p. 5-57.

---

<sup>61</sup> See also in Annex 9.2. the list of the papers presented in the workshops and in the Final conference.

## VII. ANNEXES

### 1. Map of competencies

Institute	Researchers	Website	Topics	Methods
<b>A U S T R I A</b>				
Helix Research and Consulting	<b>Schoibl Heinz</b>	<a href="http://www.helixaustria.com">http://www.helixaustria.com</a>	Homeless women, National correspondent FEANTSA's European Observatory on Homelessness	
Interdisciplinary centre for comparative research in the social sciences (ICCR) Schottenfeldgasse 69/1 1070 Vienna	<b>Kofler Angelika</b> <b>Pohoryles Ronald</b> <b>Sharinger C.</b>	<a href="http://www.iccr-international.org/iccr/pohoryles.html">http://www.iccr-international.org/iccr/pohoryles.html</a>		Quantitative methods (survey 1993)
<b>B E L G I U M</b>				
<i>Université de Louvain-la-Neuve</i> <i>Unité d'anthropologie et de sociologie</i>	<b>Francq Bernard</b>	<a href="http://www.ehess.fr/cadis/francais/pages/chercheurs/pres-francq.html">http://www.ehess.fr/cadis/francais/pages/chercheurs/pres-francq.html</a>	Homeless policy	Qualitative methods
Antwerp University	<b>Pascal De Decker</b>	<a href="http://anet.ua.ac.be/acadbib/ua/7497">http://anet.ua.ac.be/acadbib/ua/7497</a>	National correspondent FEANTSA's European Observatory on Homelessness	

Catholic University of Leuven Institute for Social and Economic Geography W. de Croylaan 42 3001 Heverlee	<b>Meert Henk</b>	<a href="http://www.kuleuven.ac.be/geography/seg/staff/hme.htm">http://www.kuleuven.ac.be/geography/seg/staff/hme.htm</a>	Space and homelessness in the European Union, Coordinator FEANTSA's European Observatory on Homelessness	
<i>Santé mentale exclusion sociale</i> (SMES)	<b>Leonori Luigi</b>	<a href="http://www.smes-europa.org">http://www.smes-europa.org</a>	Mental health, social reinsertion for disadvantaged people, empowerment	Qualitative research action
<i>Faculté de psychologie et des sciences de l'éducation</i> <i>Unité CLIS (Unité de recherches en psychologie clinique et sociale)</i> Pl. du Cardinal Mercier, 10 1348 Louvain-la-Neuve	<b>Sempoux Fanny</b>	<a href="http://www.ecsa.ucl.ac.be/personnel/semmpoux/">http://www.ecsa.ucl.ac.be/personnel/semmpoux/</a>	Previous homeless episodes for housed people, Feelings towards homeless people, Social insertion of homeless people: attitudes, prejudice, and collective actions	Telephone survey of the general population
Population and Social Policy Consultants Maria Louizasquare 33/B2 1000 Brussels	<b>Avramov-Cliquet Dragana</b>	<a href="http://www.pspc-brussels.org">http://www.pspc-brussels.org</a>	Social policy, poverty, homelessness, Ex-Research Coordinator of FEANTSA's European Observatory on Homelessness	Secondary analysis of quantitative data
<b>B U L G A R I A</b>				
Institute of sociology, Bulgarian Academia of sciences	<b>Dandolova Iskra</b>			Synthesis of various data on homelessness

<b>C Z E C H R E P U B L I C</b>				
S.A.D. (Association of Homeless Hostels in Czech Republic)	<b>Janousek Petr</b>		Research on homeless providing system including the development of a monitoring system	Ongoing EU project
Division of Nutrition, 3 <sup>rd</sup> Faculty of Medicine, Charles University in Prague	<b>Kubisová Dana Rambousková Jolana Dlouhý Pavel Anděl Michal</b>		Substance use in a sample of homeless in Prague	Secondary analysis of the survey on health status of homeless
Institute of Health Policy and Economics, Prague	<b>Barták Miroslav</b>		Health status of homeless compared to the health data of the majority population	Questionnaire survey with homeless staying at charity organisations, results compared to the national health care system statistics
Nadeje	<b>Hradecky Ilja</b>	<a href="http://www.nadeje.cz">http://www.nadeje.cz</a>	Definition and typology of homelessness in Czech Republic, National correspondent FEANTSA's European Observatory on Homelessness	On the base of ETHOS typology, wide consultation with experts (in the framework of the ongoing EU project)
<b>D E N M A R K</b>				
Danish National Institute of Social Research (SFI),	<b>Benjaminsen Lars Christensen Ivan Fabricius Nina</b>	<a href="http://www.sfi.dk">http://www.sfi.dk</a>	Policies and services, Marginalisation and vulnerability,	Register based studies, combination of surveys and

Herluf Trolles Gade 1, 1052 Copenhagen	<b>Järvinen Margaretha</b>		Supported housing, L. Benjaminsen: National correspondent FEANTSA's European Observatory on Homelessness	register data Qualitative methods Evaluation methods
Rambøll Management A/S Nørregade 7 <sup>a</sup> 1165 København K	<b>Stax Tobias S.</b>	<a href="http://www.pls.dk">http://www.pls.dk</a>	Homeless trajectories	Register data; Qualitative data (interviews, observation)
Danish Centre for Research on Social Vulnerability (VFC Socialt Udsatte) Bavnehøjvej 6 6700 Esbjerg	<b>Tilia Gitte Elbæk Ole</b>	<a href="http://www.vfcudsatte.dk">http://www.vfcudsatte.dk</a>	Policies and services	Qualitative methods Evaluation methods
<b>E S T O N I A</b>				
University of Tartu	<b>Kõre Jüri</b>	<a href="http://www.ut.ee/english">http://www.ut.ee/english</a>	Reasons of homelessness, life stile and strategies, values and hopes, practical social work, experience and work methods with homeless people (rehabilitation, work with peoples personal network etc), National correspondent FEANTSA's European Observatory on Homelessness	Expert estimations, personal and group interviews

<b>FINLAND</b>				
Stakes	<b>Kärkkäinen Sirkka-Liisa</b>	<a href="http://www.stakes.fi/english/index.html">http://www.stakes.fi/english/index.html</a>	National correspondent FEANTSA's European Observatory on Homelessness	
<b>FRANCE</b>				
INED 133, bd Davout 75680 Paris cedex 20	<b>Firdion Jean-Marie Marpsat Maryse Quaglia Martine Razafindratsima Nicolas Arduin Pascal</b>	<a href="http://www.ined.fr">http://www.ined.fr</a>	Living conditions, life history, comparison with housed populations, Marginal housing	Point-in-time representative sample surveys of service users Qualitative methods Secondary analysis
INSEE 18, bd A. Pinard 75675 Paris cedex 14	<b>Brousse Cécile De la Rochère Bernadette De Peretti Gaël Marpsat Maryse</b>	<a href="http://www.insee.fr">http://www.insee.fr</a>	Living conditions, life history, comparison with housed populations, Previous homeless episodes, people doubling up with family or friends	Point-in-time representative sample surveys of service users; Surveys of the general population
<i>Centre Maurice Halbwachs ERIS (équipe de recherche sur les inégalités sociales) Campus ENS Jourdan 48, bd Jourdan 75014 Paris</i>	<b>Paugam Serge</b>	<a href="http://www.iresco.fr/labos/lasmas/axes.php#ERIS">http://www.iresco.fr/labos/lasmas/axes.php#ERIS</a>	Life history, traumatic events	Survey of the FNARS service users
<i>Université Jean Monnet -Saint-Etienne</i>	<b>Pichon Pascale</b>	<a href="http://www.univ-st-etienne.fr/cresal">http://www.univ-st-etienne.fr/cresal</a>	Homeless career	Qualitative methods

CRESAL/CNRS 6 rue Basses des Rives 42100 St Etienne				
<i>Laboratoire d'anthropologie urbaine</i> Ivry	<b>Terrolle Daniel Gaboriau Patrick Amistani Carole Jouenne Noël Teissonnières Gilles</b>	<a href="http://www.ivry.cnrs.fr/lau">http://www.ivry.cnrs.fr/lau</a>	Various issues including homeless women (Amistani)	Qualitative methods Anthropological approach
<i>GRIS Université de Rouen</i> Rue Lavoisier 76821 Mont Saint Aignan	<b>Guillou Jacques</b>	<a href="http://www.univ-rouen.fr/LGRIS/0/fiche_structure">http://www.univ-rouen.fr/LGRIS/0/fiche_structure</a>	Homeless youth	Mostly qualitative
EHESS 54, bd Raspail 75006 Paris	<b>Girola Claudia</b>			Qualitative methods Anthropological approach
<i>Fondation MGEN pour la santé publique</i> Université Paris5, 3, Square Max Hymans 75015 Paris	<b>Kovess Viviane (and Mangin- Lazarus Caroline)</b>	<a href="http://www.fondationmgen.org">http://www.fondationmgen.org</a>	Mental health	Sample surveys of service users
	<b>Zidi Dalila</b>		National correspondent FEANTSA's European Observatory on Homelessness	
<i>Université Paris VIII Centre de recherche sur l'habitat (LOUEST, CNRS)</i> 59, rue de Richelieu	<b>Lévy Vroelant Claire</b>	<a href="http://www.louest.cnrs.fr">http://www.louest.cnrs.fr</a>	Furnished rooms, history of their uses	Qualitative methods Quantitative methods

75002 PARIS Cedex				
<i>Université des Sciences et technologies de Lille</i> CLERSE 59655 Villeneuve d'Ascq Cedex	<b>Laflamme Valérie</b>	<a href="http://www.univ-lille1.fr/clerse">http://www.univ-lille1.fr/clerse</a>	<i>Pensions de famille, hotels</i>	
GREP/EHESS 105, bd Raspail 75006 Paris	<b>Lebleux Dominique</b>	<a href="http://cemi.ehess.fr/document.php?id=445">http://cemi.ehess.fr/document.php?id=445</a>		Qualitative methods Participant observation, interviews
<i>Université de Caen</i> LASAR Esplanade de la Paix 14032 Caen cedex	<b>Liégard Fabrice</b>	<a href="http://www.unicaen.fr/ufr/homme/socio">http://www.unicaen.fr/ufr/homme/socio</a>	The Emmaüs movement	Qualitative methods
LOUEST, CNRS 59, rue de Richelieu 75002 Paris Cedex	<b>Hérouard Florent</b>	<a href="http://www.louest.cnrs.fr">http://www.louest.cnrs.fr</a>	People living in cheap hotels, Asylum seekers housed in hotels	Mostly qualitative
SHADYC-EHESS <i>Centre de la Vieille charité</i> 2, rue de la Charité 13002 Marseille	<b>Bouillon Florence</b>	<a href="http://shadyc.ehess.fr">http://shadyc.ehess.fr</a>	Squats	Qualitative methods
<i>Université Lille 3</i> <i>Domaine universitaire du Pont de Bois</i> Rue du Barreau B.P. 60149 59653 Villeneuve d'Ascq Cedex	<b>Bresson-Boyer Maryse</b>	<a href="http://www.univ-lille3.fr/portail/index.php">http://www.univ-lille3.fr/portail/index.php</a> <a href="http://www.ifresi.univ-lille1.fr">http://www.ifresi.univ-lille1.fr</a>		Qualitative methods

	<b>Lovell Ann</b>		Mental health of the homeless	
<i>Université de Paris 13</i> 99, av. Jean-Baptiste Clément 93430 Villetaneuse	<b>Dambuyant-Wargny Gisèle</b>	<a href="http://www.univ-paris13.fr/default.php">http://www.univ-paris13.fr/default.php</a>	Homelessness and the body	Qualitative methods
CNAF 32, av de la Sibelle 75014 Paris	<b>Damon Julien</b>	<a href="http://julien.damon.free.fr/index.php">http://julien.damon.free.fr/index.php</a>	Homeless policy	Participant observation, Work with archives
<i>Université Paris 1 – CRPS</i> 14, rue Cujas 75005 Paris	<b>Bruneteaux Patrick</b>	<a href="http://crps.univ-paris1.fr/bruneteaux.html">http://crps.univ-paris1.fr/bruneteaux.html</a>	Homeless living conditions	Qualitative methods
<i>Université Paris 13</i> UFR SMBH Léonard de Vinci 74, rue Marcel Cachin 93017 Bobigny cedex	<b>Lanzarini Corinne</b>	<a href="http://cresp.ehess.fr">http://cresp.ehess.fr</a>	Homeless living conditions, Homeless women	Qualitative methods
IRDES 1, rue Paul Cézanne 75008 Paris	<b>Doussin Anne</b> <b>Rochereau Thierry</b>	<a href="http://www.irdes.fr">http://www.irdes.fr</a> <a href="http://www.irdes.fr/irdes/equipe/rochereau.htm">http://www.irdes.fr/irdes/equipe/rochereau.htm</a>	Health of homeless people, comparisons with housed populations	Sample surveys
<i>Université de Haute-Bretagne, CNRS</i>	<b>Zeneidi-Henry Djemila</b>	<a href="http://www.uhb.fr/index.jsp">http://www.uhb.fr/index.jsp</a>	Homeless living conditions, squats	(geographer)
<i>Université Paris 8</i> CSE EHESS/CNRS	<b>Soulié Charles</b>	<a href="http://www.univ-paris8.fr/sociologie/?page_id=6">http://www.univ-paris8.fr/sociologie/?page_id=6</a> <a href="http://www.ehess.fr/centres/cse/modèle.htm#ssoulie">http://www.ehess.fr/centres/cse/modèle.htm#ssoulie</a>	Homeless services	Qualitative methods
<i>Université Paris 8</i>	<b>Laé Jean-François</b>	<a href="http://www.univ-paris8.fr/sociologie/?page_id=14">http://www.univ-paris8.fr/sociologie/?page_id=14</a>		Qualitative methods

	<b>Declerck Patrick</b>			Qualitative methods
<b>G E R M A N Y</b>				
	<b>Busch-Geertsema Volker</b>	<a href="http://www.giss-ev.de">http://www.giss-ev.de</a> <a href="http://www.giss-ev.de/mitarbeiter1.html">http://www.giss-ev.de/mitarbeiter1.html</a>	National correspondent FEANTSA's European Observatory on Homelessness	
Hamburg University	<b>Gruber Martin</b>		Follow-up of a group of homeless people: survival strategies, role of social agencies	Participant observation, in-depth interviews, semi- structured interviews
Department of psychiatry, Munich University	<b>Fichter Manfred</b>		Homeless people, mental health, addiction	Sample surveys
<b>G R E E C E</b>				
Kivotos	<b>Sapounakis Aristidis</b>		National correspondent FEANTSA's European Observatory on Homelessness	
<b>H U N G A R Y</b>				
Metropolitan Research Institution Lonyay utca 34 1093 Budapest	<b>Somogyi Eszter Tosics Iván Hegedüs József</b>	<a href="http://www.mri.hu/english-opening.htm">http://www.mri.hu/english-opening.htm</a>	Mapping Hungarian homeless research, Housing situation of marginalised groups and developing policies for them	(in the framework of CUHP) Survey and interviews with households in arrears, living in rental housing, etc.

Shelter Foundation	<b>Győri Péter Gurály Zoltán Pelle József Mezey György Breitner Péter</b>	<a href="http://www.menhely.hu">http://www.menhely.hu</a>	Yearly survey on homeless in Budapest, Counting roofless in Budapest, Homeless definition, Analysis of homeless providing system.	Questionnaire with homeless staying in homeless shelters, hostels and in the streets — point in time survey, Counting homeless staying in the streets on winter night by social workers and volunteers
National Family and Social Policy Institution	<b>Gyuris Tamás Ladányi Erika</b>	<a href="http://www.ncsszi.hu/szocpol_e.html">http://www.ncsszi.hu/szocpol_e.html</a>	Researches for developing different homeless policies (policies for young homeless, employment program etc)	- surveys, interviews with homeless people, - monitoring programs - analysing institutional data
Maltese Charity Service, Budapest	<b>Gálig Zoltán Vályi Réka Vecsey Miklós</b>		Survey on health status of homeless	Questionnaire survey
Hungarian Academic of Science	<b>Dávid Bea Albert Fruzsina</b>		Personal relation network analysis of homeless	Secondary analysis of a homeless survey
<b>I R E L A N D</b>				
Department of Social Studies — Trinity College Dublin	<b>O'Sullivan Eoin</b>	<a href="http://www.tcd.ie/Social_Studies/eosulliv.htm">http://www.tcd.ie/Social_Studies/eosulliv.htm</a>	National correspondent FEANTSA's European Observatory on Homelessness	

<b>I T A L Y</b>				
<i>Dipartimento di Architettura e Pianificazione, Politecnico di Milano (DIAP) Piazza Leonardo da Vinci, 32 20133 Milano</i>	<b>Tosi Antonio Torri Rossana</b>	<a href="http://www.lps.polimi.it">http://www.lps.polimi.it</a>	Life history, marginal housing, homeless immigrants, illegal settlements, A. Tosi: National correspondent FEANTSA's European Observatory on Homelessness	
<i>Facoltà di Scienze Politiche, Università di Bologna</i>	<b>Bergamaschi Maurizio</b>	<a href="http://www.spbo.unibo.it/spbo/default.htm">http://www.spbo.unibo.it/spbo/default.htm</a>	Homeless services, homeless living conditions	Biographical research
DSS University of Turin	<b>Meo Antonella</b>	<a href="http://www.unito.it/">http://www.unito.it/</a>	Life history	Biographical research
<i>Facoltà di Scienze della Formazione University of Rome 3</i>	<b>Bonadonna Federico</b>	<a href="http://www.uniroma3.it">http://www.uniroma3.it</a>	Life history, homeless services	Biographical research Ethnographic research
University of Trento	<b>Barnao Charlie</b>	<a href="http://www.unitn.it">http://www.unitn.it</a>	Street homelessness	Ethnographic research
<i>Università di Trieste</i>	<b>Luigi Gui</b>	<a href="http://www.units.it/persona/index.php/rom/abook/persona/6763">http://www.units.it/persona/index.php/rom/abook/persona/6763</a>	Homeless services	Biographical research
<b>L A T V I A</b>				
Institute of Philosophy and Sociology	<b>Trapenciere Ilze</b>		National correspondent FEANTSA's European Observatory on Homelessness	

<b>L I T H U A N I A</b>				
Vilnius University Faculty of Economics Sauletekio 9 10222 Vilnius	<b>Karpuskiene Vita</b>	<a href="http://www.vu.lt/english/">http://www.vu.lt/english/</a>	National correspondent FEANTSA's European Observatory on Homelessness	
<b>L U X E M B O U R G</b>				
<i>Centre d'Etudes de Populations, de Pauvreté et de Politiques Socio- Economiques</i> Rue Emile Mark 44, B.P. 48, 4501 Differdange	<b>Maas Roland</b>	<a href="http://www.ceps.lu/index.cfm">http://www.ceps.lu/index.cfm</a>	National correspondent FEANTSA's European Observatory on Homelessness	
<b>N E T H E R L A N D S</b>				
<i>Nederlands Instituut voor Zorg en Welzijn (NIZW), Centre for Social Policy Catharijnesingel 47 2501 DD Utrecht</i>	<b>Van Doorn Lia Van Leeuwen Petra</b>	<a href="http://www.nizw.nl">http://www.nizw.nl</a>	Homeless careers, survival strategies, Life trajectories, International comparisons	Qualitative methods Anthropological approach, Longitudinal approach, Policy research
<i>Trimbosinstituut Da Costakade 45 Postbus 725 3500 AS Utrecht</i>	<b>Wolf Judith</b>	<a href="http://www.timbos.nl">http://www.timbos.nl</a>	Homelessness, battered woman, drug addiction, mental health, National correspondent FEANTSA's European Observatory on Homelessness	Evaluation-research, Policy research, Qualitative data collections, Point in time data collections

GGD Amsterdam Valckenierstraat 2 Postbus 2200 100 CE Amsterdam	<b>Leare Igor</b>	<a href="http://www.ggd.amsterdam.nl">http://www.ggd.amsterdam.nl</a>	Homeless and health, Trajectories leading toward homelessness, evictions	Quantitative research on physical health problems of homeless, qualitative research on trajectories leading toward homelessness, in particular evictions
<i>Katholieke Universtiteit Nijmegen (KUN)</i> Afd. Sociale geneeskunde UMC ST. Radboud 6500 HB Nijmegen	<b>Nuy Marius Heydendael Paul Roorda Jeanne</b>	<a href="http://www.kun.nl">http://www.kun.nl</a>	Psychological perspective	Quantitative methods, qualitative methods
<i>Dienst Sociale Zaken en Werk</i> Afdeling Bureau Onderzoek 9701 BC Groningen	<b>Polstra Louis Groningen Gemeente</b>	<a href="http://www.sozawe.groningen.nl">http://www.sozawe.groningen.nl</a>	Client perspective of homeless, developing digital registration systems for homeless	Qualitative methods, quantitative methods, registered data
<i>Verwey-Jonker instituut</i> Kromme Nieuwegracht 6 3512 HG Utrecht	<b>Davelaar Maarten</b>	<a href="http://www.verwey-jonker.nl">http://www.verwey-jonker.nl</a>	Homeless, meaningful activities and work	Qualitative research, policy research, evaluation research
<b>P O L A N D</b>				
	<b>Wyganski Julia</b>		National correspondent FEANTSA's European Observatory on Homelessness	

<b>P O R T U G A L</b>				
<i>ISCTE — Departamento de Sociologia</i> Av. das Forças Armadas 1649-026 Lisboa	<b>Menezes Filipa</b>		Risk theory and homelessness	Secondary analysis of quantitative sources Interviews
Institute of Social Security	<b>Caeiro Teresa.M.</b> <b>Quedas M. João</b> <b>Baptista Isabel</b>	<a href="http://www.seg-social.pt">http://www.seg-social.pt</a>	Characterisation of the homeless population, life-trajectories	Census of the homeless population, survey in the social care institutions
National Civil Engineering Laboratory Social Ecology Department for the Lisbon City Council	<b>Pereira Álvaro</b> <b>Barreto Pedro</b>	<a href="http://www.cm-lisboa.pt">http://www.cm-lisboa.pt</a>	Socio-demographic characterization, geographical distribution, drug addiction	Longitudinal analysis, observation
<i>Núcleo Intervenção para os Sem Abrigo (NIPSA)</i> Lisbon City Council	<b>Ferreira José</b>		Street homelessness, counting	One-night approach, questionnaire
	<b>Pereira Ana</b>		National correspondent FEANTSA's European Observatory on Homelessness	
<i>Centro de Estudos para a Intervenção Social (CESIS)</i>	<b>Baptista Isabel</b>	<a href="http://www.cesis.org">http://www.cesis.org</a>		

European Network for Homeless and People & Physical Suffering People	<b>Bento António</b>	<a href="http://www.smes-europa.org/index.htm">http://www.smes-europa.org/index.htm</a>	Mental health	
Network of the Street Workers	<b>Santos Hélder Luís</b>	<a href="http://www.travail-de-rue.net/en/axe1_c.htm">http://www.travail-de-rue.net/en/axe1_c.htm</a>		
<b>S L O V A K I A</b>				
Ethnology Institution, Slovakian Academy of Science, Zochova 5, 811 03 Bratislava	<b>Benová Nina</b>	<a href="http://irc-slovakia.sk/sas-en.shtml">http://irc-slovakia.sk/sas-en.shtml</a>	Characteristics of homelessness (life style, life strategy) in Bratislava	Qualitative research: Field work and interviews (1999-2003)
<b>S L O V E N I A</b>				
University of Ljubljana, Institute of Social Sciences Kardeljeva ploscad 5 1000 Ljubljana	<b>Filipovic Masa Mandic Srna</b>	<a href="http://www.uni-lj.si">http://www.uni-lj.si</a> <a href="http://www.fdv.uni-lj.si/osebne/Filipovic.htm">http://www.fdv.uni-lj.si/osebne/Filipovic.htm</a> <a href="http://www.fdv.uni-lj.si/osebne/Mandic.htm">http://www.fdv.uni-lj.si/osebne/Mandic.htm</a>	M. Filipovic: National correspondent FEANTSA's European Observatory on Homelessness. S. Mandic: Coordinator FEANTSA's European Observatory on Homelessness	
<b>S P A I N</b>				
<i>Universidad Complutense de Madrid</i> Ciudad Universitaria 28040 Madrid	<b>Manuel Muñoz Carmelo Vázquez</b>	<a href="http://www.ucm.es">http://www.ucm.es</a>	Mental Health Stressful life events	Quantitative methods, quantitative methods

<i>Escuela Universitaria de Trabajo Social Universidad Pontificia Comillas,2 28049 Madrid</i>	<b>Cabrera Cabrera Pedro José</b>	<a href="http://www.upco.es">http://www.upco.es</a>	Characteristics of the homeless population Life-trajectories, National correspondent FEANTSA's European Observatory on Homelessness	Quantitative methods, quantitative methods
Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia	<b>M<sup>a</sup> Rosario H. Sánchez Morales</b>	<a href="http://www.uned.es">http://www.uned.es</a>	Social exclusion	Qualitative Methods
<b>S U I S S E</b>				
	<b>Soulet Marc Henry</b>		National correspondent FEANTSA's European Observatory on Homelessness	
<b>S W E D E N</b>				
Department of Sociology, Gotenburg University	<b>Sahlin Ingrid</b>		National correspondent FEANTSA's European Observatory on Homelessness	
<b>U N I T E D K I N G D O M</b>				
Kings Fund, London		<a href="http://www.kingsfund.org.uk">http://www.kingsfund.org.uk</a>	Health and homelessness	
New Policy Institute, London		<a href="http://www.npi.org.uk">http://www.npi.org.uk</a>	Hidden homelessness, estimates of homelessness	

The Centre for Urban and Regional Studies (CURS), University of Birmingham		<a href="http://www.cursbham.ac.uk">http://www.cursbham.ac.uk</a>	West Midlands Regional Homelessness Strategy	
Cambridge Centre for Housing and Planning Research, Department of Land Economy, Cambridge University	<b>Whitehead Christine</b>	<a href="http://www.landecon.cam.ac.uk">http://www.landecon.cam.ac.uk</a>	Affordable housing, Foyers for young homeless people	
Cardiff School of City and Regional Planning, Cardiff University	<b>Card Pauline Clapham David Gurney Craig Milbourne Paul</b>	<a href="http://www.cf.ac.uk/cplan">http://www.cf.ac.uk/cplan</a>	Housing allocation, City and rural homelessness	
- Scottish Centre for Research in Social Justice (SCRJS), University of Glasgow and the University of Aberdeen - Planning, Regeneration and Governance Research Group, Heriot-Watt University, Edinburgh	<b>Bramley Glen</b>	<a href="http://scrjs.ac.uk">http://scrjs.ac.uk</a> <a href="http://www.sbe.hw.ac.uk/research/policyandplanning">http://www.sbe.hw.ac.uk/research/policyandplanning</a>	Housing allocation, UK contact point for the European Spatial Planning Observatory Network (ESPON)	
Centre for Housing and Community Research, Cities Institute, London Metropolitan University	<b>Smith Joan Ravenhill Megan</b>	<a href="http://www.londonmet.ac.uk">http://www.londonmet.ac.uk</a>	Youth homelessness, early intervention strategies	
Joint Centre for Scottish Housing Research, University of Dundee	<b>Edgar W. Doherty Joe</b>	<a href="http://www.trp.dundee.ac.uk/research/jcshr.html">http://www.trp.dundee.ac.uk/research/jcshr.html</a>	Role of housing associations, housing affordability, homelessness, housing and	

and University of St. Andrews			community care, European Coordinators FEANTSA's European Observatory on Homelessness, Development of new recording systems for CORE Housing Association data for England and SCORE for Scotland	
Sheffield Institute for Studies of Ageing, University of Sheffield	<b>Warnes Tony</b> <b>Crane Maureen</b>	<a href="http://www.shef.ac.uk/sisa">http://www.shef.ac.uk/sisa</a>	Older homeless people in both London and Sheffield, re-settled homeless	Administrative statistics produced by NGOs, Surveys, In-depth interviews, Longitudinal Studies
Department of Applied Social Studies, University of Stirling, Scotland	<b>Anderson Isobel</b>	<a href="http://www.dass.stir.ac.uk/Housing">http://www.dass.stir.ac.uk/Housing</a>	Homelessness, affordable housing, National correspondent FEANTSA's European Observatory on Homelessness	
Centre for Housing Policy, York University — Joseph Rowntree Foundation centre of expertise on housing and housing affordability (the home of the Housing Studies Association and the	<b>Fitzpatrick Suzanne</b> <b>Quilgars Deborah</b> <b>Pleace Nicholas</b> <b>Rugg Julie</b>	<a href="http://www.york.ac.uk/inst/chp">http://www.york.ac.uk/inst/chp</a>	A considerable amount of research on homelessness	

Journal — Housing Studies)				
Centre for Social Policy, York University	<b>Kemp Peter</b>	<a href="http://www.york.ac.uk/inst/spru">http://www.york.ac.uk/inst/spru</a>	Private rented accommodation	Homelessness surveys
Social Work Research and Development Unit, York University	<b>Stein Mike</b>	<a href="http://www.york.ac.uk/inst/swrdu">http://www.york.ac.uk/inst/swrdu</a>	Young people leaving care, young runaways	
	<b>Carter Mary</b>		Women and homelessness, use of bed and breakfast temporary accommodation	
of Lemos and Crane 64 Highgate High Street London N6 5HX	<b>Lemos Gerard</b>	<a href="http://www.admin@lemosandcrane.co.uk">http://www.admin@lemosandcrane.co.uk</a>	Homelessness and loneliness, the impact of neighborhoods on outcomes for resettled homeless people	
	<b>Randall Geoff Brown Susan</b>		Street homeless people	
Retired	<b>Hutson Susan</b>		Social construction of homelessness, homeless youth	Quantitative methods, qualitative methods
Now working for other areas	<b>Liddiard Mark</b>		Social construction of homelessness, homeless youth, housing policy	
Department of Social Policy and social Work University of York School of Social and Administrative Studies University of Wales	<b>Shaw Ian Bloor Malcolm Roberts Stephan</b>			Capture-recapture

University of Plymouth Faculty of Human Sciences Department of sociology	<b>Williams Malcolm</b>			Capture-recapture
School of social science, University of central England Perry Barr, Birmingham, B42 2SU, United Kingdom	<b>Adamczuk Henryk</b>			
<b>U S A</b>				
Urban Institute	<b>Burt Martha</b>	<a href="http://www.urban.org/bio/MarthaRBurt.html">http://www.urban.org/bio/MarthaRBurt.html</a>	Homeless living conditions and trajectories; methodology	Sample point-in-time surveys of service users
Rand Corporation RAND Health 1700 Main Street, M-28 Santa Monica., CA 90401	<b>Koegel Paul</b>	<a href="http://www.rand.org/pubs/authors/k/koegel_paul.html">http://www.rand.org/pubs/authors/k/koegel_paul.html</a> <a href="http://www.hsrcentre.ucla.edu/people/koegel.shtml">http://www.hsrcentre.ucla.edu/people/koegel.shtml</a>	Homeless living conditions and trajectories Mental Health issues Program evaluation	Point-in-time and panel surveys of homeless users
The Jacob France Institute University of Baltimore MD 21201 - 5779	<b>Taeuber Cynthia</b>	<a href="http://www.ubalt.edu/jfi/jfi/staff/ctaeuber.htm">http://www.ubalt.edu/jfi/jfi/staff/ctaeuber.htm</a>	Previously working at the census Bureau on homeless statistics	Sample surveys, census
Bureau of the Census	<b>Clark Annetta</b>	<a href="http://www.census.gov">http://www.census.gov</a>	Homeless living conditions and trajectories	Sample point-in-time surveys of service users
Wayne State University Department of	<b>Toro Paul</b>	<a href="http://www.psych.wayne.edu/people/faculty/pages/toro.htm">http://www.psych.wayne.edu/people/faculty/pages/toro.htm</a>	Mental Health issues, program evaluation,	Point-in-time surveys, panel surveys with

psychology 5057 Woodward Detroit – MI 48202			previous homeless episodes among the housed population, public attitude	control group, surveys of the general population
Department of Sociology School of Social Sciences 3151 Social Science Plaza Irvine, CA 926975100	<b>Snow David</b>	<a href="http://www.faculty.uci.edu/profile.cfm?faculty_id=4669&amp;term_list=">http://www.faculty.uci.edu/profile.cfm?faculty_id=4669&amp;term_list=</a>	Living conditions and strategies, Empowerment	
Institute For the Study of Homelessness and Poverty The Weingart Center 566 S. San Pedro Street Los Angeles, CA 90013	<b>Tepper Paul</b>	<a href="http://www.weingart.org/institute">http://www.weingart.org/institute</a>		Synthesis and diffusion of available information on the homeless
Department of Geography University of Southern California 3620 South Vermont Avenue LA, CA 90089-0255	<b>Wolch Jennifer</b>	<a href="http://www.usc.edu/dept/geography">http://www.usc.edu/dept/geography</a> <a href="http://www.usc.edu/schools/college/faculty/faculty1003832.html">http://www.usc.edu/schools/college/faculty/faculty1003832.html</a>	Service-dependent and homeless people in American cities	Anthropology, geography
UCLA Department of Family Medecine 50-071 CHS Box 951683, Los Angeles	<b>Gelberg Lilian</b>	<a href="http://fm.mednet.ucla.edu/Faculty/gelberg.html">http://fm.mednet.ucla.edu/Faculty/gelberg.html</a>	Homelessness and health	Sample surveys
City University of New York	<b>Duneier Mitchell</b>	<a href="http://sociology.princeton.edu/people/faculty/faculty.php">http://sociology.princeton.edu/people/faculty/faculty.php</a>		Anthropology

UCLA Law School 405 Hilgard Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90095-1476	<b>Blasi Gary</b>	<a href="http://www.law.ucla.edu/home/index.asp?page=433">http://www.law.ucla.edu/home/index.asp?page=433</a>	Homelessness and law	
Center for study of issues in Public Mental Health New York	<b>Hopper Kim</b>	<a href="http://www.sms.mailman.columbia.edu/faculty/hopper.html">http://www.sms.mailman.columbia.edu/faculty/hopper.html</a>		Anthropology
Dep of sociology Ohio University 48701 Athens, Ohio	<b>Anderson Leon</b>	<a href="http://www.sociology.osu.edu">http://www.sociology.osu.edu</a> <a href="http://www.cas.ohiou.edu/socanth/soc_fac_anderson.html">http://www.cas.ohiou.edu/socanth/soc_fac_anderson.html</a>		Anthropology
University of Massachusetts Amherst	<b>Rossi Peter H.</b>	<a href="http://www.umass.edu">http://www.umass.edu</a>	Conducted one of the first sample surveys of the homeless in the USA	Sample surveys, Street and shelter method
Department of Sociology, University of Arizona 400 Social Science Bldg., Tucson, Arizona 85721	<b>Crowley Schwartzman Kathleen</b>	<a href="http://fp.arizona.edu/soc/defaulthome.htm">http://fp.arizona.edu/soc/defaulthome.htm</a>	Political sociology, economical development, globalisation and its consequences on homelessness	
Center for the Study of Urban Poverty Institute for Social Science Research University of California, Los Angeles LA CA 90095-1484	<b>Marr Matthew D.</b>	<a href="http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/grads.php?lid=1746&amp;display_one=1">http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/soc/grads.php?lid=1746&amp;display_one=1</a>	Day laborers and homeless people in Japan	Qualitative and quantitative analysis, participant observation
University of Pennsylvania School of Social Policy and	<b>Culhane Dennis</b>	<a href="http://www.sp2.upenn.edu/people/faculty/culhane">http://www.sp2.upenn.edu/people/faculty/culhane</a>	Homeless episodes, ANCHOR system	Quantitative analysis of register data

Practice 3701 Locust Walk, Caster Building, CML Philadelphia PA 19104-6214				
Tulane University New Orleans LA 70118	<b>Wright James</b> <b>Rubin Beth A.</b>	<a href="http://www2.tulane.edu/main.cfm">http://www2.tulane.edu/main.cfm</a>	Wright: various issues including homelessness, urban poverty, violence, addiction, Rubin: homelessness, union organisation and working class militancy	Varied, including sample surveys
Columbia University 100 Haven Ave T2, 31D	<b>Link Bruce G.</b>	<a href="http://chaos.cpmc.columbia.edu/sphdir/pers.asp?ID=599">http://chaos.cpmc.columbia.edu/sphdir/pers.asp?ID=599</a>	Mental health, Public attitudes, Past homeless episodes	Sample surveys, surveys of general population with questions on previous homeless episodes
The Pennsylvania State University Dept of Sociology 0211 Oswald Tower University Park PA 16802	<b>Lee Barrett A.</b>	<a href="http://www.psu.edu">http://www.psu.edu</a>	Public attitudes, Street counts	Sample surveys, Street counts
<b>C A N A D A</b>				
UQAM Montréal	<b>Roy Shirley</b>	<a href="http://www.experts.uqam.ca/pages/roy.shirley.htm">http://www.experts.uqam.ca/pages/roy.shirley.htm</a>	Living conditions, Life history, homeless policy	Qualitative methods
UQAM Montréal	<b>Laberge Danielle</b>	<a href="http://www.uqam.ca/recherche/laberge.htm">http://www.uqam.ca/recherche/laberge.htm</a>	Vagrancy in Quebec	Sociology, Criminology

Institut national de santé publique du Québec	<b>Fournier Louise</b>	<a href="http://www.inspq.qc.ca">http://www.inspq.qc.ca</a>		Sample surveys
<b>B R A S I L</b>				
<i>Faculdade de Arquitetura e Urbanismo</i> Rua do Lago 876. 05508-900 Universidade de Sao Paulo Sao Paulo, Brazil	<b>Loschiavo dos Santos Maria Cecilia</b>			
<i>Departamento da Economia da Faculdade de Economia e Administracao da USP</i> Av. Luciano Gualberto, 908, Cidade Universitaria, Predio FEA2, sala 321, CEP: 05505-900, Sao Paulo	<b>Schor Silvia</b>	<a href="http://www2.usp.br/publishing/insite.cgi?template=index_en">http://www2.usp.br/publishing/insite.cgi?template=index_en</a>		
PUC-SP Sao Paulo	<b>Sposati Aldaiza</b>		Homeless policy	
School of public health, University of Sao Paulo	<b>Alvarez Aparecida Magali de Souza</b>		Homelessness and resilience in Sao Paulo	Five-year longitudinal qualitative study of 6 homeless people (Phd dissertation)

<b>J A P A N</b>				
Urban Sociology Research Center 21-17 Nakayama- Nakamachi Higashi-ku, Hiroshima 732-0026	<b>Aoki Hideo</b>		Urban underclass (day laborers, homeless men, squatters, foreign labourers) in Japan and the Philippines	
Resource Center of Homeless Human Rights 304 Shindaikyo- mainshion 3 Daikyo- cho, Shinjuku-ku 160-0015 Tokyo	<b>Yasue Suzuko</b>		Conducting member of the resource centre (private group, activists and volunteers of homeless people's movement)	
Faculty of International Studies Utsunomiya University 350 Mine-Machi Utsunomiya 321-8505	<b>Tamaki Matsuo</b>		The urban poor in Japan (day workers, homeless people), international labour mobility	
Faculty of Economics Osaka City University 33138 Sugimoto, Sumiyoshi-Ku Osaka 558-8585	<b>Fukuhara Hiroyuki</b>	<a href="http://ramsey.econ.osaka-cu.ac.jp/gse/E/index.html">http://ramsey.econ.osaka- cu.ac.jp/gse/E/index.html</a>	International comparison of programs to combat homelessness and social exclusion	



## **2. List of all partner organisations (2005)**

### **EC Scientific Officer**

Myria Vassiliadou

[myria.vassiliadou@ec.europa.eu](mailto:myria.vassiliadou@ec.europa.eu)

### **Coordinator**

#### ***Institut national d'études démographiques (INED)***

133, boulevard Davout, Cedex 20

75980 Paris, FR

Maryse Marpsat

E-mail: [marpsat@ined.fr](mailto:marpsat@ined.fr)

Administrative officer: Efi Markou

E-mail: [markou@ined.fr](mailto:markou@ined.fr)

### **Partner Institutions**

#### **London Metropolitan University**

Cities Institute

166-220 Holloway Road

London N7 8D8, UK

Joan Mary Smith

[joan.smith@londonmet.ac.uk](mailto:joan.smith@londonmet.ac.uk)

***Nederlands Instituut voor Zorg en Welzijn (NIZW)***

Centre for Social Policy

Catharijnesingel 47

3501 DD Utrecht, NL

Lia van Doorn

[l.vandoorn@nizw.nl](mailto:l.vandoorn@nizw.nl)

**Universidad Complutense de Madrid**

Facultad de Psicología

Universidad Complutense de Madrid

Campus de Somosaguas, s/n

28223 Madrid ES

Team 1: Manuel Munoz

[mmunoz@psi.ucm.es](mailto:mmunoz@psi.ucm.es)

Team 2: Carmelo Vazquez

[cvazquez@psi.ucm.es](mailto:cvazquez@psi.ucm.es)

**The Danish National Institute of Social Research**

Department for Social Policy

Herluf Trolles Gade 11

1052Koebenhavn K/Copenhagen, DK

Inger Koch-Nielsen (till 31 March)

[ikn@sfi.dk](mailto:ikn@sfi.dk)

Lars Benjaminsen (since 1 April)

[lab@sfi.dk](mailto:lab@sfi.dk)

***Politecnico di Milano Dipartimento di Architettura e Pianificazione (DiAP)***

Piazza Leonardo da Vinci, 32

20133 Milano, IT

Antonio Tosi

[antonio.tosi@polimi.it](mailto:antonio.tosi@polimi.it)

**Metropolitan Research Institute Ltd.**

Lonyay utca 34

1093 Budapest, HU

Ivan Tosics

[tosics@mri.hu](mailto:tosics@mri.hu)

### 3. List of members CUHP network

Country	Researchers	Discipline	Personal status * <sup>1</sup>	Themes of research	Methods used	Institution	Status of the institution	Status of researcher * <sup>2</sup>	MAIN orientation of the institution	MAIN origin of funds * <sup>3</sup>
FR	Marpsat Maryse	statistics, demography, sociology	researcher	homelessness, spatial segregation, marginal housing situations	quantitative	INED	public research institute	permanent	demography, quantitative (+ qualitative)	public
	Firdion Jean-Marie	sociology, demography	researcher	methodology, marginal or dominated populations	quantitative	INED	public research institute	permanent	demography, quantitative (+ qualitative)	public
	Quaglia Martine	sociology, demography	engineer	methodology, elaboration and implementing of sample and qualitative surveys	quantitative	INED	public research institute	temporary after permanent	demography, quantitative (+ qualitative)	public
	Razafindratsima Nicolas	statistics, demography	engineer	methodology and statistics	quantitative	INED	public research institute	permanent	demography, quantitative (+ qualitative)	public
	Frechon Isabelle	sociology, demography	PhD student, after researcher	methodology, fostered children, gender issues, marginalised populations	quantitative qualitative	INED after ONED after CNRS	INED, CNRS: instituts de recherche ONED: observatory publics	student (INED) permanent (CNRS)	demography, quantitative (+ qualitative)	public

	Menezes Filipa	sociology	PhD student	risk theory	qualitative	ISCTE (PT) INED	university	student	sociology	public
	Markou Efi	management sociology, history, architecture	engineer and PhD student	administration of the network	historical research, qualitative	INED	public research institute	temporary	demography, quantitative (+ qualitative)	public
<b>UK</b>	Smith Joan	sociology	reader of sociology	homelessness, youth, services, substance misuse	quantitative qualitative expertise evaluation	CHCR in Staffordshire after in LMU	self-funding research unit in university	temporary	sociology + social work expertise, evaluation	contracts (government, local agencies, NGOS, CE)
	O'Sullivan Ann	sociology, nursing, counselling		homelessness, youth, abused women	quantitative qualitative expertise evaluation	CHCR in Staffordshire after in LMU	self-funding research unit in university	temporary	sociology + social work	contracts (government, local agencies, NGOS, CE)
	Ravenhill Megan	sociology, social policy	research fellow	homelessness, street culture, biographies of homeless people	quantitative evaluation	CHCR in LMU	self-funding research unit in university	temporary	sociology + social work expertise, evaluation	contracts (government, local agencies, NGOS, CE)
<b>IT</b>	Tosi Antonio	urban sociology	professor	homelessness, housing, distressed urban areas, migrants	qualitative	DiAP, Politecnico di Milano	university	permanent	urban and social studies and planing	public
	Torri Rosanna (since 2004)	architecture, sociology	researcher	housing, social exclusion	qualitative	DiAP, Politecnico di Milano	university	temporary	urban and social studies and planning	public
<b>SP</b>	Munoz Manuel	psychology, epistemology	professor	mental health, social exclusion	quantitative consultancy	UCM	university	permanent	psychology	public

	Vazquez Carmelo	psychology, epidemiology	professor	psychopathology evaluation of scientific projects	quantitative consultancy	UCM	university	permanent	psychology	public
	Panadero Sonia	psychology,	PhD student after researcher	homelessness	quantitative	UCM	university	temporary	psychology	public
	Vazquez José-Juan	psychology, sociology, political science	professor	homelessness, social exclusion	quantitative	UCM	university	permanent	psychology	public
<b>DK</b>	Stax Tobias (till 12-2004)	sociology, political science	PhD student	homelessness, social exclusion	quantitative qualitative	SFI	public research institute	temporary	social research	public + contracts
	Christensen Ivan					SFI	public research institute		social research	public + contracts
	Benjaminsen Lars (since 04-2005)	sociology	PhD student	housing exclusion, social marginalisation	quantitative qualitative	SFI	public research institute	temporary	social research	public + contracts
<b>NL</b>	Van Doorn Lia	sociology	researcher	homelessness, social exclusion	qualitative	NIZW	private institute of information and support, expertise	permanent	care and welfare sector	contracts

	Van Leeuwen Petra	social work	researcher	homelessness		NIZW	private institute of information and support, expertise	permanent	care and welfare sector	contracts
	Daan Heineke (WS 3)	pedagogy	researcher	homelessness		NIZW	private institute of information and support, expertise		care and welfare sector	contracts
<b>HU</b>	Tosics Ivan	sociology, mathematics	researcher	urban sociology, development, housing policies	quantitative consultancy	MRI Ltd.	consultancy, research, training		housing policy, urban development, local government	contracts
	Somogyi Ezster	sociology, economics	researcher	housing policy, social housing, housing finances	quantitative	MRI Ltd.	consultancy, research, training		housing policy, urban development, local government	contracts
	Erdoesi Sandor	sociology, economics	PhD student	housing and affordability, development	quantitative opinion surveys, consultancy	MRI Ltd.	consultancy, research, training		housing policy, urban development, local government	contracts

\*1 for all the duration of the network; \*2 in the institution; \*3 for the Institution.

#### 4. Final conference programme

In English:

Thursday 3 November – Morning

09h45-10h15 Registration and Coffee

**Chair: Fintan Farrell (European Anti-Poverty Network - EAPN)**

10h15-10h30 Welcome: Directorate K, Social Sciences and Humanities,  
Foresight, DG Research, European Commission

10h30-10h45 Opening: Francis Wurtz, Member of the European Parliament

10h45-12h30 Introduction: The framework of the conference

10h45-11h15 *A general view on the work of the CUHP*  
Efi Markou and Maryse Marpsat (INED, FR)

11h15-11h45 *European values and homeless policies: Examining the broader  
and narrower policy lines*  
Joan Smith (Cities Institute, London Metropolitan University,  
UK); Eszter Somogyi and Ivan Tosics (Metropolitan Research  
Institute, HU)

11h45-12h00 Comment: Ingrid Sahlin (Sociological department, Gothenburg  
University, SE)

12h00-12h30 Discussion

Thursday 3 November – Afternoon

**Chair: Freek Spinnewijn (Fédération Européenne des Associations nationales  
travaillant avec les Sans-Abri - FEANTSA)**

14h00-15h00 Definitions

14h00-14h30 *The problem of definitions: Points of similarity and differences*  
Maryse Marpsat (INED, FR)

14h30-14h45	Comment: Roser Cusso (Université Libre de Bruxelles, BE)
14h45-15h00	Discussion
15h00-17h15	<i>Theories: Social capital, risk and social exclusion</i>
15h00-15h30	<i>Homelessness as a process: Theoretical approaches and social construction of the question</i>
	Rossana Torri and Antonio Tosi ( <i>Dipartimento di Architettura e Pianificazione, Politecnico di Milano, IT</i> )
15h30-15h45	Coffee
15h45-16h15	<i>Ethics, concepts, and methodology</i>
	Jean-Marie Firdion (INED, FR)
16h15-16h45	Comment: Pascale Pichon ( <i>Université Jean Monnet, Saint-Etienne, FR</i> )
16h45-17h15	Discussion

Friday 4 November – Morning
-----------------------------

**Chair: Nicolas Razafindratsima (INED, FR)**

09h30-12h45	<i>Methodology: quantitative, qualitative and complementarity</i>
09h30-10h00	<i>Quantitative methods in Homelessness Studies: A critical guide and recommendations</i>
	Lars Benjaminsen (The Danish National Institute of Social Research, DK), Manuel Muñoz, Sonia Panadero and Carmelo Vázquez ( <i>Universidad Complutense de Madrid, ES</i> )
10h00-10h15	Comment: Luigi Leonori (SMES-Europe, BE)
10h15-10h30	Discussion
10h30-11h00	<i>A European perspective on the use of qualitative methods in the study of homelessness: methods, findings, theoretical understandings and policy interventions</i>

Megan Ravenhill, Joan Smith (Cities Institute) and Svetlana Stevenson (Department of Applied Social Studies, London Metropolitan University, UK); Lia Van Doorn and Petra Van Leeuwen (NIZW, NL)

- 11h00-11h15 Coffee
- 11h15-11h30 Comment: Martin Gruber (Hamburg University, DE)
- 11h30-11h45 Discussion
- 11h45-12h15 *Qualitative vs quantitative: why are these two approaches relevant to understand homelessness?*
- Martine Quaglia (INED, FR)
- 12h15-12h30 Comment: Paul Koegel (Rand Health, USA)
- 12h30-12h45 Discussion

Friday 4 November – Afternoon
-------------------------------

**Chair: Hugues Feltesse (DG Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunity)**

- 14h00-15h45 Experience from other countries
- 14h00-14h30 *US approaches to ending long-term homelessness for people with disabilities*
- Martha Burt (Urban Institute, USA)
- 14h30-15h00 *Homeless and homelessness in Bulgaria*
- Iskra Dandolovala (Institut of Sociology, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences)
- 15h00-15h20 Comment: Péter Győri (Metropolitan Research Institute, HU)
- 15h20-15h35 Discussion
- 15h35-15h45 Coffee
- 15h45-16h45 Round Table, coordinated by Maryse Marpsat (CUHP)

Martha Burt, Iskra Dandolo, Martin Gruber, Paul Koegel,  
Ingrid Sahlin

16h45-17h15 General discussion

In French:

Jeudi 3 novembre – Matin
--------------------------

09h45-10h15 Enregistrement et café

**Président de séance: Fintan Farrell (Réseau européen contre la pauvreté - EAPN)**

10h15-10h30 Accueil: Direction K, Sciences sociales et humanités,  
DG Recherche, Commission européenne (sous réserve)

10h30-10h45 Ouverture: Francis Wurtz, député européen

10h45-12h30 Introduction: Le cadre de la conférence

10h45-11h15 Une vision générale des travaux du CUHP  
Efi Markou et Maryse Marpsat (INED, FR)

11h15-11h45 *Valeurs européennes et politiques publiques sur les sans abri:  
un examen des lignes directrices*  
Joan Smith (Cities Institute, London Metropolitan University,  
UK); Eszter Somogyi et Ivan Tosics (Metropolitan Research  
Institute, HU)

11h45-12h00 Commentaire: Ingrid Sahlin (Département de sociologie,  
Université de Gothenburg, SE)

12h00-12h30 Discussion

Jeudi 3 novembre – Après-midi

**Président de séance: Freek Spinnewijn (Fédération européenne des associations nationales travaillant avec les Sans-Abri – FEANTSA)**

- 14h00-15h00 Définitions
- 14h00-14h30 *Définitions: convergences et divergences*
- Maryse Marpsat (INED, FR)
- 14h30-14h45 Commentaire: Roser Cusso (Université libre de Bruxelles, BE)
- 14h45-15h00 Discussion
- 15h00-17h15 *Théories: Capital social, risque et exclusion sociale*
- 15h00-15h30 *Le sans-abrisme comme un processus: approches théoriques et construction sociale de la question*
- Rossana Torri et Antonio Tosi (Dipartimento di Architettura e Pianificazione, Politecnico di Milano, IT).
- 15h30-15h45 Pause café
- 15h45-16h15 *Ethique, concepts et méthodologie*
- Jean-Marie Firdion (INED, FR)
- 16h15-16h45 Commentaire: Pascale Pichon (Université Jean Monnet, Saint-Etienne, FR)
- 16h45-17h15 Discussion

Vendredi 4 novembre — Matin

**Président de séance: Nicolas Razafindratsima (INED, FR)**

- 09h30-12h45 *Méthodologie: quantitatif, qualitatif et complémentarité*
- 09h30-10h00 *Méthodes quantitatives et études sur les sans-domicile: guide critique et recommandations*

Lars Benjaminsen (The Danish National Institute of Social Research, DK), Manuel Muñoz, Sonia Panadero et Carmelo Vázquez (Universidad Complutense de Madrid, ES)

10h00-10h15                      Commentaire: Luigi Leonori (SMES-Europe, BE)

10h15-10h30                      Discussion

10h30-11h00                      *Perspectives européennes sur l'utilisation des méthodes qualitatives pour l'étude des sans-domicile: méthodes, résultats, approches théoriques et applications aux politiques publiques*

Megan Ravenhill, Joan Smith (Cities Institute) et Svetlana Stevenson (Department of Applied Social Studies, London Metropolitan University, UK); Lia Van Doorn et Petra Van Leeuwen (NIZW, NL)

11h00-11h15                      Pause café

11h15-11h30                      Commentaire: Martin Gruber (Université de Hambourg, DE)

11h30-11h45                      Discussion

11h45-12h15                      *Qualitatif vs quantitatif. Pourquoi ces deux approches sont-elles appropriées pour comprendre les situations sans domicile?*

Martine Quaglia (INED, FR)

12h15-12h30                      Commentaire: Paul Koegel (Rand Health, USA)

12h30-12h45                      Discussion

Vendredi 4 novembre – Après-midi
----------------------------------

**Président de séance: Hugues Feltesse (DG Emploi, Affaires sociales et égalité des chances)**

14h00-15h35                      Expérience d'autres pays

14h00-14h30                      *Etre sans domicile dans la durée: les personnes souffrant d'un handicap et les politiques publiques aux Etats-Unis*

Martha Burt (Urban Institute, USA)

14h30-15h00	Les situations sans domicile en Bulgarie  Iskra Dandoloва (Institut de Sociologie, Académie Bulgare des Sciences)
15h00-15h20	Commentaire: Péter Győri (Metropolitan Research Institute, HU)
15h20-15h35	Discussion
15h35-15h45	Coffee
15h45-16h45	Table ronde, coordonnée par Maryse Marpsat (CUHP)  Martha Burt, Iskra Dandoloва, Martin Gruber, Paul Koegel, Ingrid Sahlin
16h45-17h15	Discussion générale

## 5. CUHP website

Homepage: [www.cuhp.org](http://www.cuhp.org)

**CUHP** Researching Homelessness and Homeless Populations

[About Us](#) | [About Partners](#) | [Subject Index](#) | [Contact Us](#)

- [Home](#)
- [Outputs](#)
- [Definitions](#)
- [Methods](#)
- [Policies](#)
- [NGOs](#)
- [Ethics](#)
- [Theories](#)
- [Bibliography](#)
- [Links](#)
- [Site Map](#)

### CUHP Conference

The final CUHP Conference took place on November 3rd and 4th, 2005, and presented the most important conclusions of this 3-year project. Issues dealt with include definition, theoretical approach, quantitative and qualitative methods, and integrating the preoccupations of NGOs and policy makers. [Papers from the Brussels conference can be found here.](#)

CUHP (Constructing Understanding of the Homeless Population), is a research network funded by the European Commission. It brings together research teams from seven European countries to discuss various aspects of researching homelessness.

The network is meeting in five workshops and a final conference. The first workshop was in [Paris](#), the second in [Madrid](#), the third in [Copenhagen](#), the fourth in [London](#), the fifth in [Milan](#), and the final in [Brussels](#).

The work of these meetings includes:

- Describing competing definitions of homelessness, comparing them and seeking an agreed set of definitions.
- Describing the use of different methodologies and determining their specific use.
- Describing national legislation and policy in the field of homelessness.
- Investigating the research agenda of Non-Government Organisations in each country
- Discussing the ethical issues involved in homeless research
- Describing the theories underlying our researches

Our network is also creating:

- A European wide bibliography of research in the field of homelessness including references to major studies outside of Europe.



European Commission

**EUR 23119 — EU RESEARCH ON SOCIAL SCIENCES AND HUMANITIES — Constructing  
Understandings of Homeless Populations - CUHP**

Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities

2007 — 206 pp. — 21,0 x 29,7 cm

ISBN 978-92-79-07568-1



### **How to obtain EU publications**

Our priced publications are available from EU Bookshop (<http://bookshop.europa.eu/>), where you can place an order with the sales agent of your choice.

The Publications Office has a worldwide network of sales agents. You can obtain their contact details by sending a fax to (352) 29 29-42758.

