

# Quantitative point in time surveys of homelessness in the UK

Paper for the second thematic workshop of CUHP, in Madrid 9-10 2003

Dr Joan Smith, Centre for Housing and Community Research, Cities Institute, London  
Metropolitan University

## Introduction

There are two major problems in describing quantitative point in time surveys of homelessness in the UK. First, as reported in the paper to the first workshop, homelessness research studies in the UK usually relate to particular countries i.e. either England, Wales, Scotland or Northern Ireland separately or, England and Wales together. This is because housing strategy is organised through separate Executives. As elsewhere in Europe, municipal authorities also conduct surveys of homeless people in their area; for example, the Greater London Authority has its own large housing research centre that undertakes housing research for all the London boroughs, and also reports on homelessness statistics of the London boroughs. Other research centres, often in Universities, will undertake research in their own local area e.g. in Birmingham, Sheffield, Manchester, Edinburgh, Cardiff, Glasgow and Edinburgh. Our own research centre has worked on homelessness strategies in Birmingham, Staffordshire and Herefordshire.

Second, as also reported to the first workshop, homelessness legislation has determined the character of homelessness research studies. Most research is conducted on separate categories of homeless people, categorised in relation to their homelessness status according to homelessness legislation. The main categories of homeless people investigated through point-in-time surveys have been:

- Homeless applicants accepted as both *homeless* and in *priority need* by local authorities i.e the 'statutory homeless', usually households with dependent children, older person households (60 years plus), those vulnerable through mental health, physical health, and now, since 2002, young people aged 16-17 years (vulnerable by age), ex-prisoners and applicants homeless and previously in the armed forces.
- Homeless people who are 'single homeless' and do not qualify as being in 'priority need' under the legislation. These include single people living in hostels, as well as those living on the street.
- Rough sleeper surveys that include only those physically sleeping on the streets.

- There are also **two** other categories of homelessness that have been investigated through point-in-time surveys.
  - Surveys of households (family or one person) living in shared accommodation where they are not the householder i.e. potentially hidden homeless households; and
  - Surveys of school children to establish rates of running away pre 16 years of age.

Therefore this paper discusses the major point in time surveys of people living as homeless in relation to three types of homelessness – statutory, ‘single homeless’ and rough-sleeping – in England or England and Wales. It then reports on two point-in-time surveys relating to ‘hidden homelessness’ and ‘runaways’.

In response to the paper from the Spanish team this paper also reports on a survey of mental health among homeless people that was part of a wider survey of mental health within the general population and provided robust comparative data.

Finally, not considered in this paper, are surveys and homelessness estimates based on service records or general household surveys. Estimates based on service records are common and there have been some very good ones. There is also evidence on homelessness from general housing surveys undertaken in the individual four countries of the UK e.g. the *Survey of **English** Housing*. These surveys contain questions about past experiences of homelessness, and collect responses from current householders. Although they record whether someone is living temporarily in a household there is no further information on which to determine whether that person is homeless or not. (This is also true of the UK Census, which is unreliable for homelessness given the large numbers of young people, especially young men, missing from both the 1991 and 2001 Census).

## **1. Point in time surveys of statutory homeless people**

### *Introduction – the use of local authority statistics*

There are relatively few of surveys of statutory homeless people because of the availability of administrative information derived from local authority registers of homeless applicants, collected nationally through P(1)E returns. These provide statistical information on all applications to English local authority housing departments (or their agent if they have devolved the responsibility to a local housing provider). In the first paper presented at the

Paris Workshop various tables reported information available through these returns on a quarterly basis.<sup>1</sup>

One of the most important studies of homelessness in relation to statutory homelessness was undertaken in the early 1900s and reported in 1996. The study was designed by staff of the Department of the Environment, England and Wales and also by staff of the University of Wales. The report was written by staff of the two departments: O'Callaghan B and Dominian L, et al *A Study of Homeless Applicants*, 1996, HMSO Department of the Environment, Housing Research Report. This study followed a series of studies that had been undertaken in the early 1990s by researchers in that Government department that included studies of homeless people living in temporary accommodation (Duncan, S. and Evans A., 1988; Thomas A and Niner P, 1989), routes into housing through the homeless application and the role of housing associations in housing the homeless.

The background to the *Homeless Applicants* survey was first, the rise in homeless applications over the previous 15 years, from 53,000 households in 1973 to 144,780 in 1991 and second, the then Conservative Government's concern with the working of homelessness legislation and demand for more reliable information on homeless applications from 1991. In particular that Government was concerned that homeless applications were providing a 'fast route' to social housing for young single mothers to the exclusion of couples who were on the waiting list for local authority housing.

Like other studies of homelessness the '*Homeless Applicants*' survey undertook a national study (of *English* local authorities) through a focussed study of nine local authorities (LAs) and their homeless applications. The nine LAs included three London boroughs, three metropolitan districts, and three non-metropolitan districts. 2,474 homeless applicants were included in the survey and interviews were achieved with 61% although the response rate varied between 45% and 79% in different local authorities. Of applicants interviewed in the first round a second stage interview was completed with 68%. It is therefore a point in time survey with a longitudinal element.

The purpose of the study was to: (a) compare the characteristics of those applicants accepted as homeless, with the characteristics of those who were rejected, and (b) to follow

---

<sup>1</sup> Important work investigating the reliability of these statistics through comparing applications accepted as statutory homeless in different local authorities, has been undertaken by Glen Bramley.

the two groups of applicants to establish their subsequent housing histories. It also identified reasons for the homeless application (c).

The findings of the 1996 study were that two fifths of applicant households were families with children (44%) the majority headed by a lone parent; a further ten percent of households contained a pregnant woman. In all 55% of households applying contained children and 61% of all applicants were women. The other large group were single person households, who were 35% of all applicants. The age distribution of applicants peaked between the ages 25-34, one third of all applicants were in that age group, *but 42% were aged below that age group i.e. between 16 years and 24 years.* The median age of all applicants was 26 years. At that time, the majority of applicants were local (42%) and white (74%) and 71% were not in paid work.

Half of applicants were living in someone else's home when they applied (51%) and the younger the applicant the more likely they were living in someone else's home. Particular household types were more likely to be living in someone else's home – single pregnant women, couples where the woman was pregnant, and single person households. Couples with children and lone parents were more likely to be renting elsewhere. Those not living with relatives were most likely to have lived in their accommodation for less than one year.

A third of couples with children and nearly a third of lone parents had only one bedroom for themselves and their children. The main causes of their immediate difficulty were either relationship breakdown (partner) 17%, family relationship breakdown (parents, siblings asked them to leave) 21%, family formation (new child, new partner) 17%, accommodation problems 51% (including overcrowding at 19%), other reasons 25%. Behind the immediate difficulty were other difficulties including previous divorce, family breakdown, or family formation. When looking at earlier housing problems the immediate accommodation problems fell to 27% i.e. the overwhelming cause was in relationship to partner, new partner or parents. Two thirds of applicants had tried to find housing themselves before they applied to the local authority.

The importance of this survey was that it recorded the proportion of single people who were applying as homeless (35%), the proportion of young people (42%) and also the proportion of applicants with children. *It also reported the proportion not accepted.* In the London authorities only 38% of applicants were accepted, in the other metropolitan authorities 59% were accepted and in the non-metropolitan authorities 46% were accepted. *Therefore it could be deduced that the pattern of non-acceptance not only related to the circumstances*

*of the applicant but to the availability of social housing in a local area with both London and non-metropolitan areas having the greatest scarcity of social housing by the early 1990s. .*

The reasons for non acceptance of applicants were: not being in the priority need categories (i.e. with dependent children or older persons or vulnerable, 54%), and not being homeless (34%), other reasons included being intentionally homeless or not having a local connection. Overall nearly half of all rejected homeless applications were from single people. Household type was the most important reason for rejection rather than their current living circumstances except for those in a violent relationship breakdown. (It is for this reason that studies of non-statutory homeless people are usually described as studies of the 'single homeless'.)

Overall, this survey found that:

- a) Unemployed couples and single parents were applying to local authorities to be housed because they could not afford alternative accommodation - those not living with families were more overcrowded than those that were – and their families were no longer willing to accommodate. There was a tranche of young newly formed families, or reconstituted families, who could not afford accommodation in the private rental market and could not afford to buy. The background to these circumstances was the rise in the proportion of households whose income was below half of the median from one in ten households to one in three under the New Liberal economic policies of 1979 on. The impact on different households and different neighbourhoods of these policies are summarised in a report by the Social Exclusion published in 1998 on *Bringing Britain Together: A national strategy for neighbourhood renewal* (available at [www.socialexclusionunit.gov.uk](http://www.socialexclusionunit.gov.uk) as are reports on *Rough Sleeping* and *Young Runaways*).
- b) Four out of ten applicants were aged 16-24 (42%)
- c) Single people were also seeking social housing through the homelessness legislation

### **Point in time surveys of non-statutory homeless people**

In 1991 the Department of the Environment commissioned the first survey of the 'single homeless' since the late 1970s (Drake, 1981) The study for the Department of the Environment was undertaken by the University of York and published in 1993 as *Single Homeless People*, Anderson I, Kemp P and Quilgars D. The study was based on structured interviews and group discussions in ten local authorities including five London boroughs and five cities (Birmingham, Bristol, Manchester, Newcastle and Nottingham).

Structured interviews were conducted with representative samples of users of hostels and bed and breakfast hotels providing accommodation for the single homeless. The sample frame was constructed in a similar fashion as those in the United States and in France i.e. through a complete list of all services. Squats were excluded, homeless people living with friends were excluded and women's refuges were excluded. Most women's refuges would not have met the other criteria for hostel inclusion – that more than 5 homeless people who had not been accepted as homeless by the local authority were living there i.e. they were excluded from this sample because they fulfilled the criterion of being 'statutory homeless' and being accepted as homeless by the local authority.

As in the US and France there was a two-stage probability sample, the first stage being to select hostels and services through a stratified sample based on the number of users and the second stage to select bed spaces for the number of interviews. In each area hostels and bed and breakfast hotels were sampled separately as the latter accommodated people who were not homeless (as did YMCAs and YWCAs). 1346 interviews were achieved, a 76% response rate, and they were then weighted.

The survey also achieved representative samples of those who had slept rough through day centre users and users of soup runs in seven of the ten areas including all five London boroughs and Manchester and Bristol. 351 interviews were achieved through day centres and 156 through soup runs. These were unweighted. Three fifth of the interviewees were found in the 5 London boroughs.

*Therefore the 1991 survey was based on separate samples taken in hostels, bed and breakfast hotels (included in the hostel sample although sampled separately), day centres and soup runs.*

Nearly a quarter of those interviewed in hostels were women (23%) compared with very few women in day centres (7%) and at soup runs (13%). Compared with the general population more people were aged under 25 and a much higher proportion of women were aged under 25. Black people were over-represented. They were less likely to have any qualifications.

One of the most important findings with subsequent impact on homeless services provision was the proportion of single homeless people who had lived in an institution at some time in their lives.

1. Among the single homeless living in hostels or bed and breakfast (1,267) a quarter had lived in a children's home or with foster parents, a third had been in prison or a

remand centre or young offenders institution, one in eight had been in a psychiatric hospital/unit (12%) and 10% in either a drug or alcohol unit. Nearly half (47%) had been in one of the above.

2. Among the single homeless interviewed at day centres (345) a third had lived in a children's home or with foster parents, two thirds had been in prison or a remand centre or a young offenders institution, one in five had been in a psychiatric hospital/unit (20%) and 22% in either a drug or alcohol unit. Nearly three quarters (73%) had been in one of the above.
3. Among the single homeless interviewed at soup runs (152) a third had lived in a children's home or with foster parents, two thirds had been in prison or a remand centre or a young offenders institution, one in six had been in a psychiatric hospital/unit (17%) and nearly a fifth in either a drug or alcohol unit. Two thirds (68%) had been in one of the above.
4. There was also a correlation with having been in the armed forces (a career in the UK, as there is no conscription). One fifth of those in hostels/ b and bs sample, 28% of the day centres sample and 30% of the soup run sample.

A second important finding was in relation to health. 29%, 37% and 43% of the three samples (hostels, day centres and soup runs) reported symptoms of depression and anxiety as well as a range of physical symptoms. In all 66%, 82% and 80% of the three samples reported one health problem.

A third important finding, that also influenced subsequent policy, was the proportion of single homeless people who had become homeless from their own home: 31% of those in hostel or b and b hotels, 40% of those in day centres and 31% of those interviewed in soup runs had previously been living in their own accommodation, mostly rented, but including a few who had owned their own accommodation. This led to an increased policy emphasis on the prevention of homelessness through support and maintenance of tenancies.

The most common source of income was income support (benefits) and the second was begging. One in five of those sleeping rough had no income in the previous week.

The final part of the survey looked separately at women, young adults and ethnic minorities, all of whom were considered particularly important sub-populations because they were in a minority.

### **Point in time surveys – Rough Sleepers**

The transformation of UK society that had increased the number of homeless applicants by more than two and a half times between 1978 and 1992 also had an obvious effect on street homelessness. In 1991 it was estimated that there were between 1-2000 rough sleepers on the streets of Central London with most agencies believing the higher figure to be correct. This led to a government programme entitled the Rough Sleepers Initiative that was, for the first five years, confined to London. In 1996 it was spread out to other cities.

In 1993 and 1996 Randall and Brown undertook two evaluations of the Rough Sleepers Initiative through interviewing agencies and rough sleepers. The first survey was restricted to those who had received services but the second included both RSI clients and potential clients and was based on a sample from winter shelters, day centres, hostels and clearing house records – 375 clients. The research also undertook brief interviews with 79 clients of outreach teams, and in-depth interviews with 13 who had been rehoused but had returned to the streets.

The 1996 survey *'From street to home: An evaluation of Phase 2 of the Rough Sleepers Initiative'* London, HMSO reported several findings of importance to the continuation and expansion of the RSI. First, that only 4% of those interviewed wanted to sleep rough in the long-term. Second, that 40% of rough sleepers would refuse a hostel place because they considered it unsafe and not private.

Of those rough sleepers who were interviewed in hostels it was found that direct access hostel accommodation was helpful as a first step to re-integration. A large majority, four out of five, reported that they required practical help in order to move into new accommodation such as a tenancy, and two thirds required additional social or medical help. Multiple-need clients were among the most difficult to help.

This report led to several developments in the delivery of rough sleeping services in the UK. The Rough Sleepers Unit, established under the Labour Government, created specialist teams of two types:

1. CATs. Contact and Assessment teams including a youth worker and a mental health worker
2. Tenancy Support teams.

These specialist teams were based on particular NGOs with an outstanding track record in delivering services, and replaced the earlier fragmented service delivered by several NGOs. These separate teams are area specific and work with other agencies in the area to deliver the service.

The report of this survey was one of several written by Randall and Brown on the work with Rough Sleepers and the body of their work has led to valuable policy changes in this area. A separate report by Anderson and Yanetta has been made of the Rough Sleepers Initiative in Scotland (1998)

Following these surveys the RSU teams also conduct counts of homeless people. The methodology of the count in London has been challenged because it is strictly restricted to those sleeping on the streets i.e. those bedded down for the night and this has excluded young people and others who sleep in hidden places, or stay away in the all night slot machines, (Smith, 2000), but it is the case that the RSU CAT teams have reduced the incidence of rough sleeping in London.

### **Point-in-time Surveys – Mental Health and Homeless People**

The National Psychiatric Morbidity Survey of 1993-4 was the first in GB and covered the whole of Great Britain (i.e. England, Wales and Scotland, excluding Northern Ireland, and also excluding the Highlands and Islands of Scotland). It followed several smaller studies in local area and was supported by government funding following the improvement of mental health become a major priority for the National Health Service.

Postal address files were the basis of the sample of 13,000 individual adults, who were identified within each household through a Kish grid. A 79.4% response rate was achieved with 10108 adults successfully interviewed trained interviewers from OPCS (Offices of Population and Census Surveys) who had three years interview experience. They had additional training in the use of the diagnostic tools contained within the interview schedule. Neurotic psychiatric disorder was assessed using the Revised Clinical Interview Schedule (CIS-R) that enabled diagnosis classes according to ICD-10. Psychosis screening used the Psychosis Screening Questionnaire and questions about current drug use; those who scored high were re-interviewed by psychiatrists shortly afterwards using SCAN. Alcohol use was based on US questions in the National Alcohol Survey and those on drug dependence from the ECA. (For further information on the instruments used see articles by R. Jenkins and others 1997a, 1997b).

Four separate surveys were carried out from April 1993-August 1994: i) 10,108 adults living in private households, ii) a supplementary sample of 350 people aged 16-64 years with psychosis, iii) 1200 people aged 16-64 years living in institutions specifically catering for people with mental illness, iv) 1100 homeless people aged 16-64 living in hostels for the

homeless or other such institutions, and this sample also included people sleeping rough (fieldwork from July 1994-August 1994). There are 7 reports of which the homeless study is the 7<sup>th</sup>.

The importance of this survey is that the same instruments and same methodologies were used in interviewing the homeless population as well as the general population and therefore the rate of neurotic and psychotic disorder between the two populations can be compared. The prevalence of neurotic disorder among the hostel population was 38% (around two and a half times that of the general population), and the prevalence of psychosis was found to be 8% (Gill et al, 1996).

### **Point-in-time Surveys – Shared Accommodation and evidence on the extent of ‘potential households’**

One of the first surveys to look at shared accommodation was one undertaken in London in 1988, this was followed by a national (English) survey in 1990 that was based on the Labour Force Survey but hadn't identified enough households. Learning from this failure, a subsequent national survey was that undertaken by Green and published in 1994. Green's study was of five areas whose sample was based on the 1991 Census and included samples of 'concealed' households in 5 areas – Camden (London), Bristol, Guildford, North Bedfordshire, Blackburn

Green (1994) identified six groups of sharers in her study of shared accommodation:

1. Sharing households. Households living in non self-contained accommodation
2. Concealed married or cohabiting couples, living as part of someone else's household;
3. Concealed lone parents, living as part of someone else's household;
4. single adults, living with parents aged 18 years plus, living as part of a larger household;
5. single adults, living with other relatives aged 16 years plus, living as part of a larger household;
6. single adults living with non-relatives, age 16+, living as part of a larger household.

Table 1 summarises Green's results for the proportion of concealed households who 'want to move', and the proportion (included in the former) of those who 'strongly want to move'. This gives two measures of housing need. Proportions are reported for Camden, and for Green's other four areas (we group the four areas outside London together); and the 1990 Sharers Survey (reported in Green, 1994).

**Table 1. Identifying Potential Households among concealed households**

	Green's 1991 study		England 1990
	Camden %	Other (average of 4 areas) %	%
<b>Concealed Couple</b> Want to Move	56	47	49
Strongly want to move	28	28	25
<b>Concealed Lone Parent</b> Wants to Move	46	58	53
Strongly wants to move	24	33	32
<b>Concealed Adult</b> with parents (*18+) Wants to move	45	43	39
Strongly wants to move	20	15	11
<b>Concealed Adult</b> with other relative: Wants to move	34	10	15
Strongly wants to move	10	5	4
<b>Concealed Adult</b> with non-relative** Wants to move	26	26	25
<b>Non-student</b>			...
Wants to move	30	31	
Strongly wants to move	14	15	9

Source: adapted from Green (1994: table 4.6.3)

\* Age 16-24 in each category, except for concealed adults living with parents, which included 18-24 only.

\*\* Concealed adults with non-relatives were the only category Green split into students & non-students.

Green also reported the proportion of households on the waiting list of a local authority or housing association. Camden was higher than the other four areas for all types of concealed households but the most important difference was the much higher rates for couples and lone parents compared with single adults. The lowest rates were for single adults living with non-relatives.

**Table 2: Registered for Social Housing, on local authority/Housing Association waiting list**

	Green (1991)		1990 study (all England)
	Camden %	4 areas outside London %	%
<b>concealed couple</b>	46	22	24
<b>concealed lone parent</b>	41	29	45
<b>concealed adult with parents</b>	21	3	8
<b>concealed adult with other relatives</b>	22	4	5
<b>concealed adult with non-relative</b>	10	8	5

Source: Green (1994)

The proportion of households on the waiting list provides a broad picture of housing need amongst different types of households that fits the picture of those who want to move. Couples and lone parents are not only those who are most likely to want to move and to be on the waiting list, they are also the households who live in the most overcrowded conditions. Green's rates of accommodation below bedroom standard are given in Table 3 below. **In Green's survey therefore there was a relationship between living as a concealed household and being on the waiting list and overcrowding. This is the best evidence we have on patterns of 'hidden homelessness' as questions in relation to whether a household had previously been homeless were not asked.**

**Table 3: Accommodation below bedroom standard**

	Green's study (1991)		1990 study (all England) %
	Camden n %	4 areas London %	
<b>Concealed Couple</b>	69	59	18
<b>Concealed Lone Parent</b>	35	35	35
<b>Concealed Adult with parents</b>	10	12	10
<b>Concealed Adult with other relatives</b>	14	15	8
<b>Concealed Adult with non-relative</b>	21	5	5

*Source: Green (1994)*

Overall therefore it is possible to argue that a high proportion of concealed couples and concealed lone parents are living as 'hidden homeless' although this was not the direct conclusion drawn by this survey. It however remains an interesting method of collecting information on hidden homelessness. Unfortunately questions were not asked that could provide further information.

### **Point-in-time Surveys – Young Runaways**

An important point-in-time survey undertaken at the end of the 1990s was that of school students to establish the proportion who had lived away or moved away from home ('runaways') whilst still at home. (Safe on the Streets Research Team, The Childrens Society, 1999). It was conducted by the 'Safe on the Streets' research team from the

University of York's Social Welfare and Social Care Research Unit, for The Children's Society.

This survey of 13,000 young people was undertaken through schools and was supplemented by a survey of professionals working with young people throughout the UK, including England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland. As with other surveys it was conducted through selecting areas to be surveyed – 16 in England, 3 areas in each of the other 3 countries. Because of the limited number of areas in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland the sampling method had to be more purposive, selecting the largest city, a rural and a suburban area, and the researchers reported that the results in these three countries were not as reliable as those of the survey in England – however comparable results were produced. The other problem with the survey was that it was carried out in school therefore excluded young people and young people who truant are under-represented.

The main survey concerned 14-15 year olds and it found:

- The prevalence rate for staying away overnight was 10%.
- Young women were more likely to stay away overnight than young men.
- Rates of staying away overnight were highest for young whites, then young African-Caribbeans, then young Asians.
- A fifth of those who stayed away overnight reported they had been forced to leave home i.e. 2% of the whole survey.
- Four out of five ran away because of problems at home (80%), other reasons were personal problems (35%), and problems at school (23%).
- One fifth of those living with a parent and step-parent (21%) ran away overnight, compared one in eight living a lone parent (13%) and 7% living with both birth parents.
- The main reasons given by the young people were that they were not being fairly treated, and not understood followed by parents too strict and not getting on with them.

The survey of 16-17 year olds could not provide estimates similar to those for the 14-15 year olds because by this age a proportion of young people who would run away are homeless and living in supported accommodation.

This survey was important for demonstrating the importance of family structure in relation to running away, a finding that reinforced the finding of studies of family background and youth

homelessness (Smith, Gilford and O'Sullivan, 1998). A follow up study by the Safe on the Streets research team was undertaken in 2001 and is about to report.

### **A note on estimates**

Several estimates of homelessness have been made using service records. In 1996 an estimate of homelessness among young people aged 16-25 years collected 15,000 records from housing associations, housing departments and NGO advice and housing agencies during a three month period in seven cities and four London boroughs (Smith et al, 1996). This gave a prevalence rate for youth homelessness varying between 3.5% and 7% per city. However estimates based on service records are not a reliable method in all areas. Whereas cities outside London were able to supply good records of homeless/housing applicants, in London many housing associations had closed their waiting lists because of an inadequate supply of accommodation and local authorities rejected a much higher proportion of applicants. Therefore the prevalence rate of youth homelessness for London was 5.5% but this was based overwhelmingly on young single people living in hostel accommodation or seeking advice (over four out of five applicants in London were single person households). Outside of London the proportion of single person households in the count of youth homelessness fell to between a half and two thirds of all households.

A very interesting piece of work has been completed in London that updates the *Single Homeless Survey* of 1991 in relation to that city, but based on profiles of single homeless people collected by project workers. *Single Homeless People in London* (Crane and Warnes, 2001) reports on rough sleepers (4,465 in the previous year) , hostel residents (3,295 in a one day survey), resettled clients (2,300 in the previous year) , and day centre attenders (1,187). It collected core details of age, sex and ethnic group and the presence of alcohol, drug and mental health problems for rough sleepers, hostel residents and resettled clients. One of the potentially interesting findings is that the proportion of clients under 24 years has changed with an increase noted in the 25-44 age ranges. This may fit with US findings that particular cohorts of homeless people, formed during periods of greatest economic dislocation, are ageing through the homeless services.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, I., Kemp, P., and Quilgars, D.** (1993) *Single Homeless People*, London, HMSO.
- Carter, M.** (1997) *The Last Resort: living in bed and Breakfast in the 1990's*, London, Shelter.
- Cloke, P. Milborne, P. and Widdowfield, R.** (1999) 'Homelessness in rural areas: an invisible issue?' in Patricia Kennett and Alex Marsh (eds.) *Homelessness: Exploring the new terrain*, The Policy Press, Bristol, pp. 61-79.
- Crane M. and Warnes A** (2001) Single Homeless People In London. Thames Reach – Bondway and the Sheffield Institute for Studies on Ageing
- Davies, J., and Lyle, S., Deacon, A., Law, I., Julienne, L. and Kay, H.** (1996) *Homelessness amongst young black and minority ethnic people in England*, School of Sociology and Social Policy, University of Leeds, Leeds.
- Evans A. and Duncan S. (1988)** *Responding to homelessness: Local authority policy and practice*. Dept of the Environment. HMSO. London.
- Evans, A.** (1996) *'We don't choose to be homeless': Report of the National Inquiry into Preventing Youth Homelessness*, CHAR, London.
- Fitzpatrick S. and Stephens, M.** (1999) 'Homelessness, Need and Desert in the Allocation of Council Housing', *Housing Studies*, 14, 4, pp. 413- 431.
- Gill B, Meltzer H, Hinds K and Pettigrew M** (1996) *OPCS Surveys of Psychiatric Morbidity in Great Britain. Report No 7 The prevalence of psychiatric morbidity among Homeless People*. HMSO, London
- Green H (1994)**, *Shared Accommodation in Five Local Authorities*, Department of the Environment. London
- Green H., Thomas M. and Iles N (ONS), Down D. (DoE)** (1996) *Housing in England 1994/5* HMSO. London.
- Jenkins R, Lewis G, Bebbington P, Brugha T, Farrell M, Gill B, Lewis G, Meltzer H, Pettigrew M** (1997a) The National Psychiatric Morbidity Surveys of Great Britain – strategies and methods. *Psychological Medicine*, 1997, 27, 765-774
- Jenkins R, Lewis G, Bebbington P, Brugha T, Farrell M, Gill B and Meltzer H** (1997b) The National Psychiatric Morbidity Surveys of Great Britain – initial findings from the Household Survey. *Psychological Medicine*, 1997, 27, 775-789
- Kennet, P. and Marsh, A.** (eds.) (1999) *Homelessness: Exploring the new terrain*, The Policy Press, Bristol.
- Klinker, S. et al.** (2000), *A review of single homelessness research*, The Policy Press and The Joseph Rowntree Foundation, Bristol.

**London Research Centre (1988)** *Access to Housing in London*. LRC

**Meltzer H, Gill B and Pettigrew M (1995)** *OPCS Surveys of Psychiatric Morbidity in Great Britain. Report No 1 The prevalence of psychiatric morbidity among Adults aged 16-64 living in private households in Great Britain*. HMSO, London

**O'Callagan, B. and Dominian L, et al (1996)** *A Study of Homeless Applicants*, London HMSO, Department of the Environment

**Quilgars, D. and Pleace N. (1996)** *Health and Homelessness in London A review*, Kings Fund, London.

**Quilgars, D. and Pleace N. (1999)** 'Youth homelessness', in Rugg, J. (ed.), *Young people, Housing and Social Policy*, Routledge, London and New York.

**Randall, G and Brown, S., (1993)** *The Rough Sleepers Initiative: An Evaluation*, London, The Department of the Environment, HMSO.

**Randall, G and Brown, S., (1995)** *Outreach and resettlement work with people sleeping rough*, Department of the Environment, HMSO.

**Rugg, J. (ed.) (1999)**, *Young People, Housing and Social Policy*, Routledge, London and New York.

**Safe on the Streets Research Team (1999)** *Still Running: Children on the streets in the UK*, Safe on the Streets Research Team, The Children's Society, London.

**Smith, J., Gilford, S., Kirby, P., O'Reilly, A., Ing, P. (1996)** *Bright Lights and Homelessness: Family and Single homelessness among young people in our cities*, YMCA, London.

**Smith, J. et al (1998)** *The family background of young homeless people*, Family Policy Studies Centre, London.

**Smith, J., and Gilford, S. (1998)** Not only street sleepers are homeless: Issues of gender and ethnicity in researching youth homelessness, *Youth & Policy*, No. 59, pp. 71-85.

**Smith J (2000)** *Hidden Statistics*, Centrepoint. London

**Thomas A and Niner P (1989)** *Living in Temporary Accommodation: A survey of homeless people*. London, HMSO, Department of the Environment

**Yanetta, A. Third, H. and Anderson, I (1999)**, *National monitoring and interim evaluation of the rough sleepers initiative in Scotland*, Scottish Executive Central Research Unit, Edinburgh.

**PLUS Many studies are reported through individual chapters in book collections of homelessness studies. For example:**

R. Burrows, N. Pleace and D. Quilgars eds (1997) *Homelessness and Social Policy*. London, Routledge

S.Hutson and D. Clapham eds (1999) *Homelessness. Public policies and private troubles*, London, Cassell

P.Kennet and A. Marsh eds (1999) *Homelessness: Exploring the New Terrain*. Bristol, Policy Press

J.Rugg ed (1999) *Young people, housing and social policy*. London, Routledge