

**Politecnico di Milano
Dipartimento di Architettura e Pianificazione
Milano**

Programme of workshop No 5 of the CUHP network: Identifying Hidden Homelessness.

Thursday April 21st 2005

Morning 9:30-13:00

The programme began with a welcome to the Politecnico di Milano from **Antonio Tosi**. He reported that the delegates must walk to the meeting tomorrow morning because of a public transport strike.

Maryse Marpsat. INED, France, reported on the latest news of the CUHP programme.

1) Reports:

2004 report has been sent and is on the website. The mid-year report is due in June.

2) Conference

We must plan the conference in Brussels, preliminary date will be in October and at the latest early November.

3) Teams

Megan Ravenhill has joined the UK team

Inge Koch-Nielson has been provisionally in charge of the DK team after Tobias' departure department. Ivan Christensen is joining the DK team

Lia Van Doorn is working in Paris as a Research Officer intern for 6 months and Filipe M ? is also working in Paris with INED as part of her post-graduate studies.

Section 1: Hidden Homelessness

Joan Smith, UK, made a short presentation introducing all the papers of the morning of the first day on the theme of 'Identifying Hidden Homelessness': She argued that the chief question to ask of all the papers was: *What is the purpose of the definition?*

The French definition of homelessness, arising from their classification of four housing elements (housing type, occupancy status, quality, stability/instability), was made in order to make precise surveys of the homeless population – first the literal homeless (street and hostel) and then those living within other households (see Paris Workshop papers). The French paper raises the question of whether all other households not living at the norm i.e. living within other households are at risk of homelessness? What of the over one million that had applied for housing assistance? – would they have applied as homeless in the UK under UK legislation?

The Hungarian paper and appendix are important because they demonstrate the impact of sudden socio-economic changes on the growth of homelessness: growing unemployment due to structural changes, reduction in social welfare payments, supply of housing affected by privatisation, contraction of housing stock, and demographic change. All of these result in increases in rents. Hidden homelessness is particularly important in Hungary because of the numbers who chose to hide and avoid shelters, and the substandard housing of those living in unimproved housing blocks. In Hungary the purpose of the definition is to understand the extreme housing deprivation of large groups of society. The definitions of homelessness the paper considers includes that of the UN's, FEANTSA's and Gyorgi's that applies particularly to the Hungarian situation. The Hungarian teams are using their definition for surveys of the 'hidden homeless', the literal homeless and a study of the 'housing mafia' in one area of Budapest.

The Italian paper argues that the main reason for broadening the definition is because of the theoretical debate on the new poverties, and the processes of social vulnerability. Hidden homelessness definitions must arise from concepts such as severe marginalisation and social exclusion, and be able to understand the path or process of homelessness

'Connecting exclusion with precariousness, the situation with the process and analysing the factors that precede exclusion itself, instead of merely controlling the visible effects, is an operation for which instruments such as risk and similar concepts have been found to be important.'

This paper raises the question of when does poverty transmute into homelessness? What are the strategies and policy implications of different dimensions in the French definition of homelessness?

The UK Paper poses three questions: What is the purpose of the definition of homelessness?; What are the consequences of the particular definition?; What is the relationship between visibility and vulnerability?. All teams can agree on rooflessness (street homelessness) and on hostel homelessness largely but these are the visible homeless – does visibility make them more vulnerable? How vulnerable are the hidden homeless living within someone else's household? The French definition excludes domestic violence as homelessness but .in UK law domestic violence or racial violence leading to an unsafe environment is homelessness. In the UK there are scales of homelessness created by agencies working on behalf of the single homeless that record people through a series of housing situations from sleeping rough through to living in someone else's house with no rights – these are scales similar to Meert's scale for FEANTSA. I will discuss these in my own presentation.

The meeting then moved to discuss the full papers.

Maryse Marpsat introduced the paper from INED: **Beyond the literal homeless**

The purpose of the definition of homelessness in France was to serve scientific studies. Statistical research on homelessness was launched in 1993, to understand those not well covered by the general surveys of the population, based on a sample of housing of dwellings. The surveys were not used to determine the priority needs in relation to legislation, as in the UK, although the priorities for social housing must not be very different from those in the UK. .

'Hidden Homelessness' is not a term that is used in France. French NGOs use terms meaning housing hardship, 'mal logement' on which there is a report every year from the Abbé Pierre Foundation. Exclusion from housing and the importance of the housing market from the CNIS perspective.

There is a housing crisis in France because there is not enough social housing, and less cheap housing in hotels, and furnished rooms. More housing is provided by the NGOs, but without a proper lease and it is difficult to access conventional housing (not enough people exit from hostels). More sharing with family or friends: the French housing survey will have knowledge of potential households in a few months.

Therefore to define these marginal situations/ housing hardships the French definition works along several dimensions, and cross tabulates these dimensions (to avoid double-counting). It embodies a notion of norm (physical aspect, status ...) and therefore has some similarities with the Australian definition. We are now studying the role of these marginal situations in people's trajectories and life cycle.

Statistical sources include the Census, Housing Survey, Family Survey Questions about sharing with family and friends in Housing Survey and whether they want to leave. There are questions about past episodes of homelessness in Health survey and next Housing survey.

**Joan Smith presented the paper
Hidden Homelessness and definitions of Homelessness in the UK – some
issues for the European definitions of homelessness**

The situation in the UK is complicated by the definition of homelessness in the UK legislation – this does not depend on any degree of visibility (i.e. street homeless or hostel homeless) but on lack of secure housing and therefore is similar to some aspects of French definition. But it includes as homeless those living in domestic violence or racial violence situations, which is not included by the French definition. It is therefore a 'broad' definition, including some households living as 'hidden homeless', and prioritisation for housing is not based on the visibility of the homeless situation but on social priorities (families with children, vulnerable people including those leaving institutions).

However, there also exist homelessness 'scales' that have been developed by agencies working with the single homeless who were not included in the priority need groups. The purpose of these scales is to estimate the numbers of single homeless people outside the protection system of homeless legislation and these scales are based on degrees of visibility. The most recent example is that of the New Policy Institute for Crisis.

If we compare the NPI/Crisis scale then we can see that it is a visibility scale (from rough sleeping to those living unsafely at home) similar to that of Meert's for FEANTSA – unlike Edgar's previous scale. Meert's FEANTSA scale is a narrow definition of homeless compared with the broad definitions of homelessness adopted by FEANTSA in the 1990s, and it is a much narrower definition than that of the UK legislation. Meert's definition of housing exclusion, as opposed to homelessness, includes families defined as homeless in the UK. It is narrow compared with the UN definition given in the Hungarian paper by Eszther Somogyi and Ivan Tosics, whose definition is more in the spirit of the UN and earlier FEANTSA definitions.

I would go further and say that these scales are not just a visibility scale but a social nuisance scale.

This raises the question of whether the French definition based on four dimensions of categorisation also create a narrow scale?

There is a further question. Can a scale of homelessness be defined without reference to the type of household that is homeless? The French definition does not want to add a social domain but should we create scales indifferent to social categories – households with children and the vulnerable are different from non-vulnerable single people?

In these circumstances it is important to acknowledge the importance of understanding 'hidden homelessness'. Some evidence was created in the UK through studies of 'concealed households' that investigated which were potential households. IN these studies single people living with family or friends were much less likely to be potential households than couples or couples with children or lone parents. Household type has an enormous impact on whether a concealed household is a potential household.

Estimates of 'hidden homeless' based on concealed households (CRISIS) that are single and subject to over-crowding are suspect because of the lesser likelihood of wanting to form a potential household.

What questions should be included in surveys of the general population? The Survey of English Housing has proposed four new questions of households living temporarily within another household. The questions in the French housing survey are yet different. What other questions should be asked? What other questions should be asked of the host household.

The Italian paper has used women as an exemplar, but the French paper says explicitly that women subject to domestic violence should not be included in definitions of homelessness. The situation in the UK demonstrates the need of

women and children for special protection and also the need of young people for special protection.

Antonio Tosi, It, Extending the concept of homelessness

The question is how broad the definition of homelessness should be around the 'strict' homeless situations, both because of theoretical issues and also because of changes in the nature of the homeless population.

The definition in Italy has been that of 'senza dimora', i.e. 'no abode', which is a strict or narrow definition; what are the advantages and disadvantages of broadening the definition..

We need to consider two axes of the definition: the narrow/broad definition and the axis of homelessness defined as a housing problem/defined as a social problem. The strict definition equates with a social problem (social marginalisation); a broader definition links to a housing definition (housing exclusion).

Those people who have a housing homeless problem are known differently as *senza casa* (without house) and *senza letto* (without roof). In Italy the non-chronic causes of homelessness are not given sufficient attention.

The main reason for broadening the definition is the change in circumstances – new poverties and new processes of social vulnerability. Social marginalisation is a result of broader processes of fragilisation. The path to homelessness is important - the model includes the concept of risk and overlapping factors of social vulnerability that relate to the big social trends (reorganisation of work, family and welfare systems).

Housing poverty can be interpreted as a specific form of risk, and as a component of broader process and the relation of housing hardship to a range of risk factors. But is risk an individual or a social factor?

The concept of social exclusion also produces an enlargement that includes all factors that could produce or generate homelessness and everything that is able to explain poverty. This still leaves the question of how to deal with the inter-twining between housing and non-housing factors of homelessness. Most visible – rooflessness – housing problems overlap and converge strictly with social exclusion. If we extend classification beyond strictly homeless conditions and use 'risk' to connect then we have to introduce other variables that are not strictly visible housing variables, but social conditions e.g. shelter for immigrants, women etc. This also raises the question of domestic violence as a housing condition, 'control of the home is an essential complement of home, so it is not really home'. What is the risk connecting with domestic violence? What are the other risks of non-control over the home – why don't we do this list? Risk in domestic violence of losing a home, but risk of losing your life, a more important hierarchical classification of risk.

There is also a continuity of homelessness and bad marginal housing. In many national contexts what is classified as insecure or inadequate housing is not the same – to get public housing is the contrary to being at risk of homelessness. In other cases what is inadequate housing is already classified as at risk of housing. The exemplar in the Italian paper is women homelessness in Italy. Homelessness among women is different; they are at risk but it is not probable that they become homeless because of their relation to social networks. Women who remain at risk are not likely to become homeless.

Perhaps the concept we should consider strongly is that of social exclusion. More than the objective reason for classification is the policy implications of the classification. Most advocates of the extended and enlarged definitions of homelessness insist on a public construction role of enlargement including some categories of persons who should be made visible to policy construction. They must be inserted into the system of the recognised categories of homelessness and all discussions of continuity between marginal house and homelessness and housing

exclusion plus homelessness is more a problem of communication but something that has a real, recognisable common basis.

Ezsther Somagyi and Ivan Tosics, Hu presented their paper and the appendix to their paper written by **PÉTER GYŐRI: IN THE MARGIN OF STATISTICS: INTRODUCTORY THOUGHTS ABOUT HIDDEN HOMELESSNESS.**

This paper presented a) general definition issues in relation to Hidden Homelessness; b) research related to Hidden Homelessness and then policy issues arising from this research.

The paper reviewed in what context the Hidden Homeless concept is used, through a search on the Internet. The concept was used in English speaking country: the UK, in Australia and in the US but not in other countries. How is the concept used?

1. Literal homeless but not visible who live in forests
2. Live in conventional housing but accommodation is not secure, friends and squatters
3. More stable place to live but in some respects they don't have a legal title for their housing, Threatened by eviction, Other groups include substandard housing, overcrowded housing.
4. Those not registered, not receiving services

In many ways these uses are unrelated to definitions of homelessness. The concept of hidden homelessness could be broadened to situations where people had insecure housing and the largest debate is whether inadequate housing, sub-standard housing should be included in the concept of homelessness. This was reflected in the FEANTSA work when in the 1990s that argued that not all forms of housing hardship should be included in housing situation. Current FEANTSA definitions include the whole spectrum of housing hardship as a sort of homelessness.

What are the main problems of the measurement? What level of housing should be defined when we measure homelessness? Some say that homelessness should be measured to a particular scale and not to housing scale and should not include homelessness.

In the Hungarian Census: 4 broad categories were used in this Census and then narrow categories within each. The four categories are:

Roofless

Interim Homeless

People without Flat

People without a real Home

From these four categories almost one third of the population could be regarded as people without home, 3 million people.

In the Hungarian Housing Survey information was collected about the structure of the housing sector. 1) One very important issue was that of affordable housing i.e. owner occupied housing, for low income households. Even with the help of subsidised housing loans, very few low income households can get access to housing. 2) Second important issue: How do you get into areas, risks could be identified.

Ivan Tosics asked the question of What follows for policy from different definitions of homelessness. The broader definition of homelessness is important for policy. If we define all people who have the risk of entering homelessness in their life then policies should be different. But in Hungary a broader approach to homelessness is not accepted by those dealing with homelessness, because the NGOs think that they will get less attention to those 'really' homeless. For example in the UK Fitzpatrick argues that being homeless and being poorly housed are very different.

In Hungary; 10% of the population is homeless, in a country of 10 million people there are 800,000 homeless and this means that the number of 'hidden homeless' is 10 times higher than the literally homeless. So this can lead to a rejection of the problem.

The broader definition is not just about a housing intervention but a problem of the housing system. A good functioning housing allowance system is the basis of solving the problem. I have read that in the EU 15 that without housing allowances the 10% of the population currently in poverty would rise to 40%.

There are very different programmes to tackle this:

- Programmes to upgrade the housing – but this pushes out poor people and middle class people come into the housing.
- Unemployment and poverty approaches – give work to people then it is easier for them to handle difficulties in housing sector.
- Area based programmes – concentrate on one area, concentrate on complex programmes in one area. Planning stage. First interventions are taking place on public space, and on the schools, but no interventions yet in housing.

In our paper we list some examples of work with broader homeless populations. For example in London – 32 districts with different rents and policies, and they have developed a pan-London strategy. London level housing solutions Austria have developed a system in which they look at the risk of family; local government has to announce the risk and see if they can mediate.

FEANTSA is working to get housing into European policy e.g. FEANTSA is trying to get lower VAT bracket for social housing companies and money from the structural funds.

10 member states agree that structural funds should be used for housing in some situations such as the problems of large social housing estates with particular problems of running these estates and higher costs. There is a need to rebuild the heating systems so that they are individual systems not collective.

DISCUSSION

1. CNIS (France) classification of different dimensions is perhaps some kind of scale, more or less security of tenure, more or less good housing type. But when you cross them it isn't a scale anymore – can be an owner-occupier and be very low comfort.

2. If we *consider* as vulnerable women from domestic violence problems, young people homeless from their parents, families with dependent children, there are others that we would miss:

Those who have lost a job over 40 and can't find new jobs,

Young people who have no job

People who have problems with a long contract

3. Introducing social variables produces a different level of analysis. We should start with a housing classification and then introduce social variables. If we don't do this then we cannot do causal analysis.

4. European Commission don't deal with housing. Why don't they? Because it includes and makes visible every other social reasons including employment. The housing point of view is a very broad point of view that includes everybody. If you don't have a housing position then you are in difficulties. DGV Employment, has asked for people to produce a definition and FEANTSA has answered to produce a common definition and a common methodology. This is a sign of interest. However, this call raises the question of how close research definitions should be to policy definitions i.e. to priority needs

6. Homelessness is not a housing definition. For the roofless the definition of housing is not a good definition – to give them a house is not a solution.

7. Can you then classify those at risk of housing. FEANTSA classification taken from the Danish paper – category 11, living under threat of violence – 2 parts which are of

not the same importance . Category 5 means living in institutions and this is unpleasant but what is the housing dimension of this (leave within 3 months). Why do institutions matter more than all other situations where you are liable to leave within 3 months – institutions

8. Domestic violence is an important issue but those who have come from jail are also vulnerable. The justice system punishes people twice.

9. These situations are not just about housing but about individual vulnerability.

10. 2 dimensions of disagreement or a divergence of view?

1. Definitions of hidden homeless or homelessness that is close to policy. Definition in relation to risk groups that is very long or housing definition.
2. Do you take a housing definition and then see what kind of people are in these situations and see what is the consequence of being in these situations Or do you put these definitions inside the definition itself.

11. Netherlands is an important test case because there is sufficient housing – homelessness is the final consequence of different types of problems. Not housing types, but social issues and personal disfunctions.

12. The roots of this work of definition is in the will to make easier social policies to prevent homelessness and to define target populations but there are some limitations. First, I don't think we can define all categories or social groups that can be at risk of becoming homeless because we are in a changing world and because the process of becoming homeless is more complex.

Second, policies to prevent homelessness have to work on the social world and not just on some situations at risk. If we think only in terms of risk factors and risk indicators we can stay at the individual level and I have some difficulties to analyse the situation also on the structural level or meso and micro level. We have surveys with variables at the individual level and when we are modelling it is difficult to think on the structural level. Perhaps we could think about using multi-level modelling in a European project – perhaps it would be more interesting to define some better patterns and some dimensions of definition. And, according to the question and to the tools of analysis we can have a more precise definition. It would be interesting to deconstruct all administrative definitions.

13. If you broaden the definition of homelessness then there are problems of the situation on the literal homeless, you don't capture the real thing.

Not exactly the real thing.

When we work towards broad definitions of homeless then we loose the real things.

14. UK definitions are about causes – our broad definitions to prevent homelessness and include families. There are dangers in not having a broad definition.

Thursday afternoon 14:00-18:15

Antonio Tosi: Introduced the work '**Theoretical references of research on homelessness**'

Theory is an interest that was not explicit in our programme at the beginning but emerged with the development of the work especially at our last meeting in London and it will probably be one of the topics in Brussels.

Reading the papers on this the interpretation of what theoretical tools are important raises questions:

- What is intended by the interest in theory in our network? Probably one reason is that much writing on homelessness is about the gathering of data, that is necessary to improve policy, decisions, and organisational services. But we should try to understand what are the implicit theories because all simple, data gathering has some theory behind it.
- There is a consensus about the necessity of integrating different theories and an assumption that no single theory can understand homelessness. This appears to be a point of convergence. To some extent this is simply the

result over the idea that homelessness is multi-dimensional. But in more precise terms this is the consequence, in the field of homelessness, of a more general theoretical attitude of these last twenty years in social science i.e. the need for a better way to deal with the problem of agency and structure, macro and micro.

- In the field of homelessness the divide was between social and structural approach and the individualistic approach; the individualistic approach is the real target of the revision. The tradition of the research on homelessness was an individualistic one but this is uncertain. But the individual approach may still be the dominant paradigm of research on homelessness, particularly in relation to pathways.
- A great diversity of methodological approaches can be matched by a diversity of theoretical.
- Main consequence of the orientation is the way of approaching the problem. Thinking in terms of causes of homelessness is not appropriate – triggers is a more correct view – no single causal explanation is possible.
- Late modernity requests an ability of orientation towards the future. This kind of population is everything except able to assume this active relationship to circumstances. The idea of actor in these active terms could or should apply to homeless populations. In specific terms what does active mean? It could simply mean to be able to adapt.
- The structural models and the psychological/vulnerabilities modes are both important to compare. Other models that are important are the social categorical mode; systematic approach of Habermas, biography process; career, and workshop on life cycle; debates on poverty, social exclusion. As well as this there are the correlates of social exclusion – process, multi-dimensionality, perhaps some programmes are hostile to social exclusions.

Lars Benjaminsen and Ivan Christensen, DK reported both on the 'hidden homelessness' in Denmark and the reasons for the previous emphasis on micro theories. Information from homeless people living in shelters showed that the largest group (24%) had previously been living temporarily with friends, and 20% had been a sub-tenant, and 10% in prison. All of these rates were higher than for the general population (9%, 11% and 1% respectively).

Researchers at their Institute are interested in the categorisation attempts by FEANTSA and others, but there should be further integration between such categorisation attempts and theories.

In Denmark the main theoretical focus has been on micro-sociological theories – phenomenology, constructivist, interaction. Most studies have not focussed on structural mechanisms and not studied 'hidden homelessness'. Recently Danish theorists have been using Bourdieu's approach to bring together macro and micro levels. However Bourdieu has never created an operational definition of homelessness therefore it is necessary to extend his theory.

For example, Copenhagen has experienced a similar housing crisis (rising prices, less social housing) to other European capital cities. This crisis has led both municipal and local governments to narrow the definition of who is homeless and for low income groups without 'vulnerability' characteristics the situation has worsened because there is now a long waiting list for social housing. It is an intricate interplay between the macro and the micro.

Jean Marie Firdion, Fr introduced his paper on Bourdieu's concept of social capital. Social capital is one example of a theoretical frame for understanding homelessness that has been used for understanding homelessness in France, beginning from Bourdieu's five types of social capital: physical and health, social relationships, education, economic, and symbolic. This framework allows us to analyse the social

capital that exists within the homeless population. The concept of social capital is always linked to the concept of field. Bourdieu's theory of social capital is very different from that of James Coleman or Robert Putnam.

It is possible to use concepts such as risk factors, or protective factors, but there is a danger of blaming the individual homeless person. The question of comparison group is also difficult.

How do we study those people within the homeless population who are on the street and have a position that they want to avoid the social work that is being offered to them? How do we measure their coping skills?

A further important question about studying a cohort of homeless people is how can we do this without huge attrition over time?

Petra van Leeuwen and Lia van Doorn introduced the paper from the Netherlands. They reported that in the Netherlands studies of homelessness were dominated by quantitative studies in order to determine the national budget for homelessness, and provide local authorities (which had the authority to deal with the problem) with information on which to base their services.

The Dutch worked with a broad definition of homelessness including vulnerable people at risk of losing their house or have lost their housing. Theoretical approaches are just developing.

There have been four studies using qualitative methods with greater theoretical orientation towards the problem. All four were based on Ph.D work.

- A study of homelessness among older people that used perspective of the life world – Schutz and Habermas
- A study of homeless young people that used attachment theory and social relations – the key concept was Bowlby's attachment theory. This was a case controlled study – homeless youth and attachment, non homeless youth and attachment.
- A study that used the perspective of Giddens and late modernity to analyse the different identities created by homelessness. Homeless had difficulties about thinking about the past and the future.
- Lia van Doorn's study that used the concept of careers to undertake a longitudinal study of homeless people. The study also referred to Goffman.

Other theoretical approaches (both micro and macro) that were used in Holland were also based on qualitative methods, either gathering life histories and also looking at organisations and institutions.

It is apparent from these studies that it is easier to explain some aspects of homelessness but not others. Why does homelessness happen to men rather than women? – these theories can't answer this.

Carmelo Vazquez introduced the paper from Spain on theory

The Spanish team reviewed the area of research into homelessness and drew out the flavour of current research in the field of homelessness.

Their sources: psycinfo, medline, sociological abstracts, using the

Key words used: homelessness, homeless, framework, model, theory.

- Sources of variation'
- Theoretical grounds of the model e.g. psychological, sociological
- Most studies don't try to explain homelessness but specific studies about specific sub groups. Studies are targeted to specific sub groups (e.g. women, youth, drug users) rather than the phenomenon as a whole
- Studies are targeted to different outcomes and processes (e.g. use of services, onset and maintenance of the situation etc)
- Methods used in the studies

- (Restricted) definitions of 'homelessness' is quite limited to literal homeless and to users of services. This is a source of bias about what we know about homelessness

Methods used in the studies were qualitative methods (life stories, in-depth interviews) or quantitative methods and it is quite unusual that researchers use a mixture of the methods.

Their paper also reported some current tendencies in Spanish research into homelessness:

- A move from social structural models to vulnerability models
- Vulnerability is now understood as a complex array of variables (structural, psychological, economical, contextual) with no one predominant view. There is a ritual acceptance that explanations must have a structural element as well as biography but what we really do is give a questionnaire.
- Vulnerability causal models now conceptually include complex interactions among diatheses components and 'triggers' (e.g. critical life events). No necessary or sufficient cause. What interacts to trigger the problem. How do we capture that dynamic – we are very poor at that. Qualitative methods are a way to produce the understanding of process. Not just snapshots.

Some empirically derived vulnerability factors are: childhood factors, sexual abuse, expelled from school, being far from home

Adulthood factors: breakup of relations, divorce, family conflicts, few social networks, physical health problems, psychotic problems

Some pathways for future research is a greater emphasis on interactions among vulnerability components, and a need to explore dynamic changes in the trajectories, or in the processes (e.g. impact in people's identify of the homeless situation). Need of appropriate methods. It is also necessary to not just list the variables but to weight them.

Ezther Somogyi and Ivan Tosics, Hun.

There is no theoretical research on homelessness in Hungary and we have to ask the question: Why? Research on poverty is more theoretical because there is a greater tradition of poverty research in Hungary. The existence of both poverty and homelessness was denied under the socialist regime but sociologists studied poverty theoretically but not homelessness.

Research on homelessness focuses on how the structure of the society changed and homelessness is therefore part of the bigger story. Moreover, research into homelessness has been mainly carried out by social workers who established the homeless institutions after homelessness appeared in the 1990s. These researchers don't have time to deal with theoretical questions; their questions are very different as they are more interested in the needs of homeless people

There are general perceptions about homelessness among these researchers. They mainly emphasise the structural factors in the causes of homelessness; focussing on structural factors is a kind of simplification of the problem, because it is easier to communicate the problem to both the homeless sphere and the rest of society.

Megan Ravenhill, UK

In the UK there has been an integration of theories, a triangulation of methods. The main theories of British Homelessness range from functionalism through to risk society. There have been seven main ones of which the most popular are agency, structure, and deviance

- Pre 1945, homelessness was regarded personal failing, or weakness. Welfare state led shift in ideology towards structures. But in 1977 single persons were not included in the homelessness legislation because thrift and hard work should get them out of homelessness.

- A dichotomous approach developed: homelessness was due to individual failings and the provision of structures to deal with homelessness. Deviance theory was used to understand those who didn't fit into the structures created for them.
- In 1970-90 there were several developments including: the observations of repeat episodes of homelessness; theories that combined both structure and agency approaches.
- 1990-2000 The concepts of triggers and prevention and a combination of structure and agency.
- 2000 onwards. Shifts towards structuration theory (Giddens).

Theoretical developments have had an impact on the definition of homelessness and approaches to homelessness in the UK, and vice versa. Theories that stress agency look at the causes of homelessness in terms of events that happened to individuals, whilst structuralist theories look at the shortage on suitable housing, and deviance theory considers the dysfunction of the individual.

The impact of theory on research can be seen in Rough Sleepers research, and a shift from an emphasis on the causes of homelessness to triggers of homelessness.

Structuration theory brought together biographical, behavioural and structural characteristics of homeless people (Anthony Giddens), and linked to multiple triggers, complex and multiple needs, especially long-term rough sleepers.

Risk society theory (Beck); risk is multifaceted. Impacts on all levels of society from state to individual. Associated with the shift to individualism – the individual is responsible for anticipating and negotiating risks. Need to develop new sets of life skills.

DISCUSSION of Theory Papers

Discussion:

Several points were made

- We need an insight into economic point of views, we don't take into account economic factors because most of the members of the network are sociologists. They might have interesting things to say about both the effect of long term unemployment and the causes of
 - Discrimination. More difficult for black people to find accommodation from landlords. There is also a difficulty for people who don't have stability in their work.
 - All the risk models miss the fact that most people who are subject to risk factors are resilient to these factors. Our research should focus on the protective factors. What are they? This is a general problem of the vulnerability framework – we focus on weaknesses but we don't focus on resources.
- This is where the social capital theory approach is important (Fr).
- Our study has looked at personal network, economic network and housing situation; these three elements that have an impact on protective factors (DK)
- Concept of risk can be applied to a whole cohort e.g. UK youth in the 1990s, as well as to individual. Early intervention programme in Safe in the City. (UK)
 - Structure is very important, it is probably easier to think in terms of individual approach, present is orientated towards individual and it is only a ritual to mention structural determinants.
 - There are many uses of the integration of theoretical approaches. In scientific analysis we can't adopt the neither, neither approach. We have to find a real integration. The advantages and uses of Bourdieu's concept of social capital is not clear; more of Bourdieu's theories need to be integrated - practice,

structure and personal strategies, and particularly the concept of Habitus. What is the lack of capital among the homeless (Italy).

- The concept of habitus is within the concept of capital. One of the major uses of the concept of social capital is the field concept that can be the theoretical frame to describe the social condition of the capitals that we can measure and study. It is through the analysis of the structure of the field that we can describe inequality etc. A major point because when we are studying factors, risk factors, then we are studying lack of skills to have a job. But we are not studying the social conditions but the effects of social conditions. Habitus is one of the major concepts to understand the social conditions and the social field and the distribution of capital. (France)
- In the Netherlands the concept of social capital could be used to describe both how people got themselves off the streets, and the homeless person's strategies to stay on the street, and how they got themselves into homelessness more and more. Lia van Doorn stopped using this theory because of the two sides of social capital. (Netherlands)
- Bourdieu is not very specific about how local government and the state can play a role in changing routes out of homeless. (DK)
- Two issues on which French team haven't work are 1) the connection between the ideas of risk, and vulnerability to homelessness. If we look at very poor people then we would find situations not very different from the homeless population. Many of the things we think specific to homeless people in the vulnerability approach we would find them among very poor people. There is a rise in the number of homeless people in the past twenty years. Why are there more homeless problems – it is seen as an individual problem, but why are there more vulnerable people and it is seen as an individual problem. Why would the number of people having personal deficiency would be that much higher than twenty years ago.
- Structural factors in UK in relation to changes to position of youth, ideology (individualist families) and also the housing market. (UK)
- Introduction of capitalist market in the economy in Eastern European countries has brought in the most expensive technologies that need less and less manpower. The knowledge based society increases the gap between those who are able to keep up with knowledge and those who can't. The idea of the European Commission is that the aim is to be at the edge of knowledge is our aim; the choice between being homeless in a big city or jobless in a small city where there is no chance to work is not a good choice for the citizens of Europe (Hungary)
- Articles from the Spanish paper were largely American. But there are also important models in England e.g. Brown and Harris work on path models and depression
- Is the reason we don't use the same theories is that we are not trying to address the same problems? Jean Marie is preoccupied with the different levels to apply to pathways and why people are homeless and is using Bourdieu. But one of UK team is also interested in this problem and using Giddens structuration theory.
- In our 3 years it has not been possible to have a real analysis of theory - How does this theory come out, in which context was it constructed.
- One of the big problems is European social values. Do we have different theoretical approaches because of our values to other societies?
- A comparison of theories is useful and we could have that as an object of the Brussels conference. Bourdieu vs structuration theory is more about local culture and national context and the traditions. But this is a point to start, to try to analyse. General consensus on the need to integrate different approaches.

Combination of positions between structure and agency and this could happen in a stronger form of integration and weaker forms of integration.

- Bourdieu is a strong way to integrate these different theoretical models. But Structuration is a stronger way to integrate these different theoretical ways. How to combine social-psychological model of Spanish is a weaker way to combine this – is it possible to use non-American databases. What is the difference in image between United States and the different image from European studies. For instance – psycho social models are not gaining importance in European as in the US, whilst ethnographic models are not marginal, they are an important emergent category. European values would become more obvious if we used European search engines.
- Not every tradition of sociological research can be integrated. Some are destined to remain on the margins of things; some are outliers.

Friday April 22nd 2005
DAY TWO: FRIDAY APRIL 22ND 2005

Friday Morning. Conference in Brussels

1. a) Research on homelessness in various national contexts must be elaborated; we must avoid national papers, papers must be across countries. Use what we have already worked on, keeping in mind the importance of the context in which the research was conducted.

b) One team could work on one paper and several teams working on the same paper. We should agree on a list of topics and then share them between us and when one team have finished a paper on one topic then we have to circulate it to all.

2. Type of conference: 2 days, who else should speak and who else should be invited. A smaller conference, up to 30-40 people. We could have the presentations by members of the various teams and others invited to be discussants and enlarge them to policies and what happens in their own country. Who do we propose to attend the conference and who will we invite to be a discussant.

3. List of topics:

i) Definitions – not to arrive at a common definition but to explain the various kinds of definitions we use and how they fit into various contexts and answer various questions.

ii) Several papers about methods and tools.

iii) Should theory be separate.

How could the different papers be listed – qualitative or quantitative, combining quantitative and qualitative, about policy, about collaboration between public agencies and NGOs.

There should be a paper or a conclusion about recommendations for further research. Plus questions to be added in national surveys such as Eurobarometer.

The original proposal was that:

“The final Conference will bring together the work of all participants in the network in open discussion with other researchers, policy makers and service providers in three sessions dealing with three consolidated reports:”

Report 1) Mapping methodologies which have been used to research homelessness in Europe and their most appropriate use.

Spanish will cover cross-national surveys, and French survey and the Danish register data and work with the French and the Danish teams.

UK team and Netherlands team will work on Qualitative research methods.

Danish team will lead on the relationship between register data and survey data.

Report 2) Mapping policy issues in relation to homelessness in Europe and the European social model including a discussion on the definition of homelessness and how broad the definition should be drawn.

French team will start the paper on definitions.

Hungarian team will lead on narrow and broad definitions and policy and what it means for the European Union and UK team will add in the responses from the NGOs.

Report 3) Mapping theoretical understandings of homelessness in relation to theories of social and cultural capital, risk, vulnerability, psycho-social disorders, socio-economic stress and welfare regimes.

Italian team will start work on the theoretical issues in relation to strong policy area.

4. Italian team recommended:

- a) We should relate our conference to the questions of dissemination and publication.
- b) We have produced over 50 papers and this is a huge amount and we should distribute these as appendices but we should focus the conference on what is more interesting for discussion.
- c) In relation to methodology the technical questions should be out, the materials that are already produced are appendices. But methodology is what Joan said in terms of theory and in terms of results.
- d) Everybody should look to the sixty papers and then try to extract the material for the paper and then relate to the general international debate.

5. Conference Arrangements: Agreed that all partners will prepare papers for this conference, which will be circulated two months in advance. These papers will be gathered to with previous papers in the three themes of the three sessions above (Methodologies, Policies, Theoretical models) and published as three sets of conference papers. The conference is open to all researchers, policy makers and NGOs. It will be held in Brussels.

A 2 day conference and half between ourselves to discuss dissemination.

Papers should have 4 pages summary for the paper version.

Invite discussants and invite people from NGOs but we need to have translation.

6. Conference invitees:

- a) We should look for academics who are discussants from other countries who are not around the table e.g. Germany, Austria;
- b) We also need to invite policy makers in the public sector, including FEANTSA, CECONDHAS, European Commission/ European Parliament.

7. French team will come up with a provisional programme and timing and see what it looks like.

Then discussion about the finalisation of the work of the thematic network, dissemination and publications.

Friday Afternoon. Presentation of the Italian NGOs and their views on research

Attended by:

FIOpsd

Albergo Popolare (Bergamo)

Associazione Amici di Piazza Grande (Bologna)

Associazione San Marcellino (Genova)

Associazione Cena dell'Amiciza (Milano)

Reports from the agencies will be analysed as part of the NGO paper for the final conference. However several interesting points emerged including a point about the immigration of people from the South to the North of Italy.