Journal of Social Issues, Vol. 63, No. 3, 2007, pp. 461–481

Toward an International Understanding of Homelessness

Paul A. Toro*
Wayne State University

After a discussion of definitional issues when studying homelessness and a brief review of the existing research literature in the United States, this article provides an overview of the similarities and differences between the research literatures in the United States and other developed nations. Similarities include many shared characteristics of homeless populations (e.g., over-representation of men and those traditionally discriminated against) and differences include the timing of interest in the topic (earlier in the United States and the United Kingdom) and the extent of social welfare systems (generally less developed in the United States than in Europe). The articles in this issue include literature reviews, studies comparing homelessness across nations, articles that examine specific issues in relation to homelessness in particular nations, and policy-oriented discussions.

Toward an International Understanding of Homelessness: An Introduction

Homelessness, once considered a problem confined to Third World nations and to periods of war and economic depression, has recently emerged as a major social issue in most developed nations. In the United States, the number of articles published on the topic in both the popular and professional literatures has increased dramatically since 1980 (Buck, Toro, & Ramos, 2004; Lee, Link, & Toro, 1991; Shinn, Burke, & Bedford, 1990) and support for legislation, such as the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, and other policy initiatives continues to be

*Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Paul A. Toro, Department of Psychology, Wayne State University, 5057 Woodward Ave., Detroit, MI 48202 [e-mail: paul.toro@wayne.edu].

I wish to thank the following persons for comments on earlier drafts of this article: Carolyn J. Tompsett, who also served as Editorial Assistant for the whole *JSI* issue, Marybeth Shinn, Helena Carlson, and six anonymous members of *JSI*'s Editorial Board. I also wish to thank the Urban Studies Research Fund, University of Glasgow, and the Richard J. Barber Fund of Interdisciplinary Legal Research, Wayne State University, for funding that supported this research.

strong (Foscarinis, 1991; Gore, 1990). Social scientists have become very active in research on the topic of homelessness, with hundreds of studies having been completed in the last 20 years and many others now in progress throughout the country.

In the United States there now exists a large body of research on the topic, including a range of books (e.g., Baumohl, 1996; Hopper, 2003; Jencks, 1994; Rossi, 1989; Whitbeck & Hoyt, 1999; Wright, 1989) and special issues on homelessness in psychology journals (e.g., Jones, Levine, & Rosenberg, 1991; Toro, 1999), including one in the *Journal of Social Issues*, which focused on urban homelessness in the United States (Shinn & Weitzman, 1990). The present issue expands on this U.S.-based literature by considering the research literature on homelessness in developed nations outside of the United States. While those studying homelessness outside the United States can learn from the existing research in the United States, there is also much that we studying the problem in the United States can learn from our international colleagues. Furthermore, those not studying homelessness, both in and outside the United States, can learn from the present collection of articles about how different national contexts and research traditions can produce different methodological and policy approaches to an important social problem.

While a complete review of the findings of the recent U.S. literature on homelessness is beyond the scope of this introduction, a brief summary is provided. Areas of U.S. research with particular relevance will be considered in order to provide a starting point for the reader when evaluating the articles in this issue. Interspersed in the summary below, the approaches and findings from the United States will be contrasted with the international research represented in the remainder of this issue. A subsequent section will provide more explicit contrasts and highlight some similarities in the U.S. versus non-U.S. literatures. Following a synopsis of each article in this issue, the article ends by outlining the value of looking at findings beyond the United States.

A Brief Overview of the U.S. Literature on Homelessness

There are several areas in which research on homelessness done in the United States in the last two decades has produced solid findings as well as some areas in which new findings are just beginning to emerge, often based on innovative methodologies. These areas of substantial progress as well as the new frontiers are reviewed in this section.

Defining Homelessness

At first glance, it would appear that defining homelessness should be a straightforward task. However, this is far from the case, in the United States as well as other developed nations of the world. Advocates for the homeless, policy makers,

and researchers in the United States vary in what definition they prefer (Toro & Warren, 1999). Complicating the definition are issues of the duration of homelessness required (should a person homeless for one night be included?), the specific quality of housing (should a person living in grossly substandard housing be included?), and crowding (should someone temporarily "doubled up" with family or friends be included?). Most U.S. researchers have settled these issues by studying the "literally homeless," people staying in shelters for the homeless, on the streets, or in other similar settings (e.g., in abandoned buildings, in make-shift structures, in parks). There are many other persons who are "precariously housed" or at "imminent risk" of becoming homeless, such as the very poor or those temporarily living with a family member or friend for lack of alternatives (Rossi, 1989). Researchers in the United States sometimes include such persons, but then tend to define them as a group separate from the literally homeless. Many researchers and advocates now talk about homelessness in the context of a "continuum of housing," running from the stably housed to the literally homeless, with many persons falling between these two extremes. The "international" articles represented in this issue sometimes adopt a definition similar to the "literal homeless" favored by most U.S. researchers (e.g., see Firdion & Marpsat, 2007; Philippot, Lecocq, Sempoux, Nachtergael, & Galand, 2007; Toro, Tompsett, et al., 2007). Others, however, use a broader definition that, according to most U.S, researchers, would include many of the "precariously housed" (e.g., Hladikova & Hradecky, 2007).

When defining homelessness, in the United States as well as other developed nations, it is important to distinguish among three key subgroups among the overall homeless population: Homeless single adults, homeless families, and homeless youth. These three subgroups are generally distinct on many dimensions. In most cities in the United States, homeless families do not often include children of the age of 10 years or more, and children (under the age of 12 years) are very rarely found homeless on their own. Largely distinct service systems and research literatures have developed in the United States for each of these three subgroups, and recent research has documented many differences among the subgroups (Tompsett, Fowler, & Toro, 2007).

Homeless families in the United States typically include a single young mother with young children (often under the age of 5 years; see Haber & Toro, 2004, and Rog & Buckner, 2007, for recent reviews of the U.S. literature; also see Buckner, Bassuk, Weinreb, & Brooks, 1999; Masten, Miliotis, Graham-Bermann, Ramirez, & Neemann, 1993; Shinn & Weitzman, 1996). These families end up being homeless for a variety of reasons, including extreme poverty, loss of benefits, eviction, and domestic violence. Homeless families often include multiple siblings. Unlike single homeless adults and, to some extent, homeless adolescents, homeless families are rarely found on the streets. Rather, they tend to be found in shelters, often those specially designed for families. Many can also be found temporarily "doubled up" with friends or family or in domestic violence shelters. African Americans,

and possibly other ethnic minorities (e.g., Native Americans), are found disproportionately among the population of homeless families (Toro, Lombardo, & Yapchai, 2003). In Europe and Japan, at least, homeless families still appear to be quite rare. However, it appears that homeless families may be on the rise, especially in some nations with much recent immigration from nearby nations in Eastern Europe, Africa, the Middle East, and/or other regions plagued by conflict and/or poverty (FEANTSA, 2002). In such nations, homeless families generally, like in the United States, appear to be composed of women with their young children.

Homeless youth in the United States differ from homeless adults due to their age (typically under 21 years of age) and from homeless children (in families) because they are homeless on their own (see Haber & Toro, 2004; Robertson & Toro, 1999; and Toro, Dworsky & Fowler, in press, for recent reviews of the U.S. literature; also see Feitel, Margetson, Chamas, Lipman, 1992; Robertson, Koegel, & Ferguson, 1989). Although studies on homeless youth in the United States often include youth as old as 25 years, the legal, policy, and intervention issues are quite different for minors (under the age of 18 years) who are homeless on their own, as compared to those who are 18 years or older. A variety of terms have been used to describe homeless youth, including *runaways*, who have left home without parental permission, *throwaways*, who have been forced to leave home by their parents, and *street youth*, who are found on the streets. These are not mutually exclusive groups. The definition of homelessness for adolescents is necessarily different from that for homeless adults and families in that minors away from home without parental permission are typically breaking the law and so must be returned to their parents except under special circumstances (e.g., when there is evidence that they are being abused at home). Once they turn 18 years, their legal status changes dramatically. Although most homeless youth have spent little or no time on the streets, much of the existing U.S. research has focused on "street youth" who can be found in certain large cities (especially on the east and west coasts). Most research has found roughly equal numbers of girls and boys among homeless adolescents, though boys are much more common among studies of street youth (who are often older as well). Although perhaps less rare than homeless families, homeless youth (especially minors) also appear to be less common in the nations represented in this issue, as compared to the United States (only two of the articles in this issue focus mainly on this subgroup: McGrath & Pistrang, 2007; and Milburn et al., 2007).

Homeless single adults in the United States are mostly male (70–80%) and most have a history of alcohol and/or drug abuse and/or dependence (60–80%), although many are not currently abusing (for recent reviews, see Fischer & Breakey, 1991; Toro, 1998). Although the mentally ill are clearly over-represented, only about 20–40% of the overall population of homeless single adults are severely mentally ill (see Toro, 1998). Severe depression is probably the most common diagnosis (20–25% of the overall population), with schizophrenia less common

(5–15%) but very noticeable to the casual observer of homeless people on the streets. Most homeless single adults are between 18 and 50 (usually over 80%), with persons over 60 years quite rare (less than 5%; note that some homeless people look much older than their years and there is some evidence that the homeless population is older now than it was a decade ago; Meschede, Sokol, & Raymond, 2004; Israel, Ouellette, & Toro, 2006). As with homeless families, African Americans and some other ethnic groups are found in disproportionate numbers among the population of homeless single adults as well as the poor more generally. In American cities with large general populations of African Americans, this ethnic group often comprises a majority of the homeless population (including families, adolescents, and single adults; see Toro, Wolfe, et al., 1999). Most of the existing research on homelessness in the United States has been done on single adults, with much less so far done on homeless families and youth. In the nations covered in this issue, the emphasis on homeless single adults is even more apparent, with researchers almost exclusively focusing on this subgroup. This more extensive focus outside the United States could very well be due to a lower prevalence of homeless youth and families, but it could also be due to a lack of attention by researchers, policy makers, and the general public to the plight of these latter subgroups.

Some Characteristics of Homeless People

The application of rigorous probability sampling methods to obtain large samples of homeless people (of all subgroups; e.g., Toro et al., 1999; Zlotnick, Robertson, & Lahiff, 1999) has led to a reasonable consensus about the general characteristics of the homeless population in the United States. While there are many examples of homeless women or adolescents from middle class backgrounds who are fleeing difficult environments, it is also true that, for all subgroups, the homeless usually come from poor backgrounds and they share many characteristics with the larger population of poor people. In fact, there have been quite a number of studies done that explicitly compared the homeless to similar poor (but not homeless) groups. These studies have often found relatively few differences between the homeless and matched groups of poor persons (e.g., Goodman, 1991; Toro et al., 1995, 2003). Such comparison group studies have yet to be attempted outside of the United States (Philippot et al., 2007, in this issue, calls for more such research in Europe).

Violence in the homes and communities of origin of homeless (and poor) people has been well documented. This is perhaps especially true for homeless women (whether single or with their children; Goodman, 1991; Roll, Toro, & Ortola, 1999) and homeless adolescents (Robertson & Toro, 1999). Despite stereotypes to the contrary, most homeless people (including single adults) are in regular contact with family, although this contact may not always be positive (e.g., Bates & Toro, 1999). Substance abuse is common in the families of origin, as well as among the

homeless people themselves. This appears to be especially true of single homeless men. While it is easy to see how a history of substance abuse would put one at risk for becoming homeless, it has also been suggested that, once homeless, some persons may take drugs and alcohol to temporarily escape the hardships of being in a homeless state (e.g., American Public Health Association, 1990). Homeless mothers and homeless adolescents show less substance abuse in many studies (see Shinn & Weitzman, 1990, 1996). For homeless mothers, these lower rates could be a result of the time and effort needed to care for their children (perhaps they do not have the time for or interest in substances) and/or underreporting due to fears of having their children removed by authorities (substance abuse and abuse/neglect being often associated in the eyes of child protection workers). For homeless teens, the lower rates could be due to having less access to alcohol and drugs and/or being young and not having yet developed entrenched patterns of substance abuse. Many believe criminal behavior to be very common among the homeless. However, even among homeless young adults, only about one quarter to one third have a serious criminal history (i.e., felony conviction; see Toro, 1998). It is also important to note that many homeless people get arrested for victimless crimes due to their homeless lifestyle (e.g., through panhandling, public drunkenness, squatting in abandoned buildings).

Longitudinal Studies

A recent methodological innovation in the U.S. literature involves longitudinal studies that have tracked large representative samples of homeless people over time. A number of these studies have perfected methods and have been able to obtain sound follow-up rates (as high as 70–80% over as long as 1–7 years) for this difficult-to-track population (Shinn et al., 1998; Toro, Goldstein, et al., 1999; Toro, Dworsky, & Fowler, 2007; Zlotnick, Robertson, & Lahiff, 1999). Whether these longitudinal studies involve single adults, adolescents, or families, one common finding is that homeless people improve in many ways over time, including the time spent in being homeless. For example, in two different longitudinal studies of homeless adults followed over 18 months or more (Toro et al., 1997; Toro, Goldstein et al., 1999), about a third of the original sample appeared to have "escaped" homelessness, showing no more homelessness during the following period once their current episode ended. At the other end of the continuum was another third of the sample that was "chronically homeless," having been homeless for a majority of the follow-up period. The final third typically showed an "episodic" pattern, often with one or more additional episodes of homelessness during the follow-up period (but not showing a majority of the time homeless). In these same longitudinal studies of homeless adults, other improvements have been found in reported stress and symptoms of psychological and physical health.

Longitudinal studies of homeless families, such as that of Shinn et al. (1998), typically show that most of the families obtain permanent housing relatively quickly and remain in housing even 5 years later. Longitudinal studies of homeless youth (especially those who are minors) typically find that most of the youth return fairly quickly to their family of origin. In an ongoing longitudinal study (see Toro & Janisse, 2004), nearly all (93%) of the initially homeless adolescents (initial $N = 252$, aged 13–17 years) in a probability sample from throughout the Detroit metropolitan area were no longer homeless at a 4.5-year follow-up, with many living with their parents (33%), others living on their own (34%), and still others living with friends or relatives (21%). At follow-up, the initially homeless adolescents also reported significantly less conflict with their family of origin and fewer stressful events.

The general improvements observed among homeless samples could be a result of the fact that, when initially found, the homeless people are experiencing a particularly difficult period in their lives. Homeless people may be rebounding to a previously (better) level of functioning when followed over substantial periods of time. This is, perhaps, somewhat encouraging news, given the very large numbers of persons who can expect to be homeless at some point in their lives (6–8% of all American adults, or 16–22 million people, based on recent large national surveys; Link et al., 1994; Tompsett, Toro, Guzicki, Manrique, & Zatakia, 2006). Most homeless people can be expected to be doing better in many ways when followed-up later on. Longitudinal research on large homeless samples is virtually unknown outside of the United States (what may be the first such study outside the United States has begun in England in 2007; Warnes & Crane, 2006).

Intervention research. One increasingly common type of longitudinal research involves the evaluation of various intervention programs that have been attempted, often for specific subgroups of currently homeless people. "Intensive case management" has been used effectively with the homeless mentally ill (Morse, Calsyn, Allen, Tempelhoff, & Smith, 1992), homeless street youth (Cauce et al., 1994), and the full range of homeless adults, including those with their children (Toro et al., 1997). A related approach is "supportive housing," which makes a full range of services readily available to homeless people at the same time that permanent housing is provided (Tsemberis, 1999). While such intensive programs may be necessary for many multi-problem homeless people, simpler interventions can also be effective. For example, Shinn et al. (1998) found that one of the best predictors of prolonged stays in permanent housing among formerly homeless families was the provision of housing subsidies to these families. Many advocates for the homeless have called for increases in the very small numbers of federal and other housing subsidies available in the United States. Such subsidies are more readily available in many European nations, such as Germany, which have lower rates of homelessness than what we see in the United States (see Shinn, 2007, and Toro,

Tompsett, et al., 2007). In nations outside of the United States, systematic research evaluating the impact of interventions assisting the homeless, however, is virtually nonexistent.

Developing Theoretical Perspectives

The existing U.S. literature can easily be criticized for a lack of theoretical underpinnings. However, there have recently been a number of theoretical approaches, some coming from psychology and some from other fields, that have been suggested to guide research on homelessness (see Haber & Toro, 2004). Based on earlier social learning theories, such as that of Patterson and his colleagues (Dishion et al., 1991; Patterson, 1982; Patterson et al., 1989); Whitbeck and Hoyt (1999) have advocated a "risk amplification" model to understand the development of problem behaviors among homeless adolescents. This model posits that various noxious parental and other characteristics (such as those identified by Patterson et al.) initially put the adolescent at risk for becoming homeless. However, once homeless, there are additional risks that amplify the likelihood of harmful developmental outcomes. These additional risks include associating with deviant peers while homeless, engaging in subsistence survival strategies (e.g., prostitution, petty crime), and being victimized by others in the dangerous contexts in which they often find themselves. A somewhat similar theoretical approach has been suggested by Goodman, Saxe, and Harvey (1991). These authors suggest that homelessness typically involves psychological trauma that can lead to mental disorder and other harmful outcomes. They draw on trauma theory (e.g., Van der Kolk, 1987) to suggest new intervention approaches for homeless people.

Another theoretical approach comes out of community psychology (e.g., Kelly, 1970; Moos, 1974) and the earlier work of Kurt Lewin (1951). Toro, Trickett, Wall, and Salem (1991) proposed an ecological perspective for understanding homelessness as well as intervening to reduce its prevalence. This perspective emphasizes the need to assess the context in which homeless people exist and to consider the full range of personal, social, economic, and service resources that affect them. Although this perspective may not yield specific testable hypotheses in the same way that traditional theories in psychology do, it can provide a useful guide for designing research and intervention. The conceptual framework advocated by Shinn (2007) in the concluding piece in this issue is consistent with an ecological perspective.

In part due to their training in fields other than psychology, European researchers studying homelessness, if they discuss theories at all, tend to turn to sociological and related theories (e.g., see Firdion & Marpsat, 2007, for a discussion of the theory of Bourdieu, 1985). In the terms outlined by Shinn (2007) in her concluding piece, those in Europe tend to look at broader socio-cultural and policy levels, as exemplified by the policy-oriented piece by Anderson (2007),

while we in the United States tend to adopt a more individual level of analysis in our research and theorizing. Here, perhaps, we in the United States can learn more from our international colleagues than they can from us.

The first article in this issue (Philippot et al., 2007) notes the lack of theoretical orientation in the existing research on homelessness in Europe. Future research done in both the United States and elsewhere could make good use of theoretical approaches such as those described above and perhaps work harder to develop other theoretical approaches. A broad international view of the research may help instigate such development. Using theory could not only help promote the collection of more useful data in research on homelessness, but could also help us focus on the core issues causing homelessness and those strategies that are likely to promote solutions to homelessness. The growing volume and range of research studies on homelessness in the United States can make it difficult to "see the forest for the trees." Theory could help us to see the "forest."

Homelessness in Developed Versus Developing Nations

This introduction and the other articles in this issue focus on homelessness in *developed* nations. This focus was adopted for a number of reasons. As noted earlier, defining homelessness is a difficult enterprise in developed nations. The difficulties are compounded in developing nations, where defining homelessness and distinguishing it from extreme poverty become very problematic. For example, a person living in abject poverty in a long-established shantytown would not really be homeless, despite their horrendous living conditions (arguably much worse than what many homeless people in developed nations experience). Another reason for excluding developing nations from this issue is that there is little research literature that focuses explicitly on homelessness, as distinct from the broader topics of poverty, hunger, ethnic conflict, and related problems. While we do not wish to deny the pervasiveness of homelessness and these other serious problems in developing nations, there are few works written from a scientific standpoint on homelessness in these nations.

Contrasts and Similarities: The United States Versus Other Developed Nations

In most other developed nations of the world, with the exception of the UK, social scientists became interested in homelessness more recently than in the United States, perhaps because homelessness was not generally perceived as a significant social problem until recently. In the United States, the boom in interest came in the late 1980s and early 1990s (Buck, Toro, & Ramos, 2004), while the rise in interest in Europe, Australia, and Japan generally was not evident until later in the 1990s (for example, see Okamoto, 2007, and Phillipot et al., 2007). The size and

number of studies done, even in the UK, remains much smaller than what we have seen in the United States. Nonetheless, the topic is of growing concern outside of the United States and much interesting work is now being done. While researchers outside of the United States have the opportunity to learn from the mistakes of U.S. researchers, those of us in the United States have the opportunity to learn about innovative approaches that are being used by our international colleagues (such as qualitative methods; see McGrath & Pistrang, 2007) and to make cross-national comparisons to better understand homelessness.

In terms of similarities, findings in the United States and other developed nations show some common features in the characteristics of homeless populations. For example, studies in and outside of the United States generally find more men than women among the adult homeless, high rates of substance abuse and mental illness, and an overrepresentation of groups that have traditionally been discriminated against (e.g., African Americans in the United States; Aborigines in Australia; recent immigrants from Africa, the Middle East, eastern Europe, and Asia in western European nations). Across all developed nations, the highest concentrations of homeless people tend to be found in the largest urban settings and they tend to be segregated in some of the traditionally poorest areas. In many, if not most, developed nations, the majority of the services provided to the homeless come from an uncoordinated set of not-for-profit agencies, including those with religious affiliations. The trend in the United States to see more and more homeless families (usually young women with their children) and homeless youth (including runaways) also appears to be becoming evident in many other developed nations (Helvie & Kunstmann, 1999).

Another similarity in the research and policy literatures that have evolved in the United States and other developed nations involves the diversity of opinion on what is still seen by many as a relatively new social problem. In the United States, there has long been controversy about the appropriate estimates on the prevalence of homelessness (see Toro & Warren, 1999). This controversy has not only pitted advocates for the homeless (who often provide high estimates) against government officials (such as those associated with the Census and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, who provide low estimates), but has also drawn in researchers (e.g., Burt et al., 2001; Toro & Warren, 1999).

One of the most obvious differences between the U.S. and European research literatures involves the differing social welfare systems that impact homeless. In most European nations, there is some form of guaranteed income as well as provisions for low-income housing available to all citizens (see Shinn, 2007). These social policies protect many people in need from ending up on the streets. Especially since the implementation of various welfare reforms in recent years, this is far from the case in the United States, where support is available only to persons with children (now time-limited), to the disabled, and to senior

citizens. Unlike the United States, most European nations also have free health care available to all citizens. As described by Okamoto (2007), Japan is an interesting case since it has a very undeveloped social welfare system (arguably less so than even the United States). Perhaps this can account for the apparently very large and rapidly developing number of "rough sleepers" (street people) observed by Okamato.

While there are some differences in terminology across the literatures from the different nations, these differences do not appear "insurmountable." The British literature, and associated policy, makes extensive use of the terms "rough sleeper." These terms translate fairly closely to what we in the United States call "street people." The British terms may actually be more descriptive and precise, since they refer to anyone who sleeps outside or in other "rough" circumstances (which would include abandoned buildings or make-shift shacks). The U.S. terminology, at least in some instances, not only includes homeless people sleeping on the streets, but also people who "hang out" in areas where drug dealing, prostitution, and other "undesirable" behavior takes place with some frequency. Not all such "undesirables" are homeless. Other differences in terminology involve the perceived newness of the concept of homelessness in some developed nations relative to the United States. For example, because there existed no word approximating "homeless" in Japanese, the English term has simply been adopted as one of the preferred ways of referring to homeless people in Japan (see Okamoto, 2007), just as the Japanese have adopted other English words into their language (e.g., trauma, database, literacy). It also appears that the term "homeless" was not widely used in the U.S. vocabulary before the 1980s (see Buck et al., 2004). Instead, we used terms such as "vagrant," "hobo" or "bum" to refer to persons who may have been homeless, or at least "precariously housed," prior to the 1980s. Gypsies throughout Europe similarly have long been considered as "vagrants" or "undesirables," although it is debatable whether they actually are "homeless" (since they often have a community and regular place to stay, even if that place may not be permanent nor of normally acceptable quality). Yet other differences in terminology simply involve language differences. Thus, in France and French-speaking Belgium, the terms "sans domicile fixe" (without fixed domicile, sometimes abbreviated as "SDF") and "sans abri" (without a roof) are the commonly used terms that, more or less, describe the "homeless" and "street people," respectively.

Another difference involves immigration patterns. While the United States has its share of recent immigrants from conflict-ridden nations (e.g., Central and South America, southeastern Asia), some European nations, given their close proximity to many areas of recent conflict (e.g., Bosnia, the Middle East, Africa) and to the now collapsed Soviet Union and Eastern Bloc communist satellite nations, have seen very dramatic increases of certain recent immigrant groups among their homeless populations (Harding, 2000). Many of these recent immigrants are illegal and they often come from nations with traditional ties to the

nation in question or from those in very close proximity (e.g., from its former colonies, in the case of France; see Firdion & Marpsat, 2007). Being illegal, such homeless persons often have tremendous difficulty in obtaining government-supported assistance.

One final set of differences between the U.S. and European research literatures involves methodology. Although there has been some qualitative research done on homelessness in the United States (e.g., Banyard, 1995; Koegel, 1992), the vast majority of the U.S. literature has been quantitative. Qualitative methods have only recently begun to gain legitimacy in the United States (e.g., Camic, Rhodes, & Yardley, 2003). Perhaps we in the United States can learn about the appropriate use of such methods from our European and other non-U.S. colleagues. Large-scale quantitative surveys, such as those reported by Firdion and Marpsat (2007), which estimate the prevalence and characteristics of homeless people, are relatively rare outside the United States. This may be due in part to the relative lack of funding for such research outside the United States (Fitzpatrick & Christian, 2006). Another difference involves the disciplines from which researchers studying homelessness tend to come. In the United States, the researchers tend to come from academic psychology and sociology departments and schools of medicine and public health while, in Europe, they are more often found in policy, urban, and housing studies. Perhaps due to their different educational and professional backgrounds, researchers outside the United States are also less likely to use rigorous quantitative methods, adopt psychometrically sound measures, and report statistical findings; but they are also more likely to examine political or cultural aspects of social issues and attempt to understand the impact of social issues on the lives of their communities.

Overview of This Issue

Many of the articles in this issue focus on nations in Western Europe because, outside the United States, most of the research done has come from these nations. There are, arguably some nations and regions that are underrepresented in this issue. Japan, a very heavily populated developed nation with what appears to be a rapidly growing problem with homelessness, is represented here by only one article (Okamoto). Eastern Europe, with many nations new to Western-style democratic and capitalistic systems, is also represented by only one article. This is in spite of the apparently rapid growth of the problem of homelessness in these nations that appears to be accompanying the Western-style changes. These nations are underrepresented primarily because there is so little research activity as yet. This situation is likely to change in the near future as these nations confront the increasingly obvious problem of homelessness. Canada is not represented, but only because a suitable article could not be identified. It appears that the volume of research in Canada is nowhere near as large as in the United States, but larger

than most other nations represented in this volume (perhaps with the exceptions of France, the UK, and Australia), and approaches to research share similarities to what is seen in the nations represented here.

Although some nations may not be represented in the issue, a total of eight different developed nations (aside from the United States) are in some substantial way considered in one or more of the articles. These eight nations include: Australia, Belgium, the Czech Republic, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, and the UK. After the United States, these nations include the five most populous among the world's fully developed nations (i.e., Japan, Germany, France, the UK, and Italy) as well as a few smaller ones (i.e., Australia, the Czech Republic, and Belgium). With the exception of Canada, these nations also include those that have so far produced the greatest volume of research on homelessness (i.e., the United States, the UK, France, and Australia). Most of the authors contributing to this issue are from developed nations outside of the United States or have spent substantial time working and/or collecting data in such nations. The issue has assembled a broad mix of articles by authors from a broad array of professional backgrounds, including many who are not psychologists.

The general organizational plan of the issue is to (a) start off with general review articles (the first two articles, including this introduction), then (b) present data-based works comparing two or more nations on homelessness, then (c) present more focused articles considering a particular issue or group in a particular nation, and (d) end with policy-oriented discussions (the last four articles, including the conclusion).

Literature Reviews

In their article, Phillipot et al. (2007), a group of academic social and clinical psychologists from Belgium, attempt a thorough review of the research literature from Europe over the last three decades. The authors were able to identify only 98 works, highlighting the small size of the research literature in Europe. More than half of these works came from just two nations (the UK and France), most were completed in the last 10 years, and most were not found in normal professional outlets (they got many unpublished reports from various agencies). In their review, the authors are rather critical about the lack of quantitative studies and lack of appropriate comparison groups (e.g., poor non-homeless persons). They suggest the need for more rigorous quantitative methods and more theoretical grounding in future European research.

Comparative Studies of Multiple Nations

The next three articles present quantitative data comparing nations. Toro, Tompsett, et al. (2007), mostly psychologists from various universities, compare

five nations (the United States and four in Europe) on the prevalence of and public opinion on homelessness. They obtained large nationally representative samples of persons with telephones and asked the respondents about their prior experiences with homelessness and "precarious housing" and obtained the respondents' views about the causes of homelessness, the characteristics of homeless people, and appropriate social policies. They found the highest lifetime rates of homelessness in the two English-speaking nations (the United States and the UK) and the lowest rate in Germany, with intermediate rates for Belgium and Italy. The nations arrayed themselves on "compassion" for the homeless in a similar fashion, with respondents in the United States (and sometimes the UK) the least compassionate. Such findings support (but do not prove) the idea that public opinion can have a major impact on social policy and, ultimately, lead to more or less of social problems like homelessness. Perhaps researchers should make more efforts to present their findings in the media as one avenue for reducing the prevalence of homelessness.

Okamoto (2007), a professor of housing, presents a comparative analysis of "rough sleepers" (street people in U.S. usage) in Japan and the UK. Using some of his own data from studies done in Japan, Okamoto suggests that the number of rough sleepers is growing in Japan and is now much larger than the number in the UK. Okamoto's analysis also suggests that the populations of rough sleepers differ across the two nations (e.g., they are older in Japan). Although it is hard to be certain about the comparability of methods used to produce these national differences and Okamoto's data do not tap the *total* homeless populations in the nations (just those found on the streets), his review does serve to suggest how Japan might deal better with the problem of homeless rough sleepers, which has apparently been more effectively addressed in the UK (see the article by Anderson, 2007, later is this issue, for a description of the relevant policies in Scotland).

Milburn et al. (2007), mostly psychologists from the United States and Australia, used structural equation modeling to examine predictors of HIV risk behaviors in homeless youth (ages 12 to 20 years). Based on large samples from both Los Angeles ($N = 498$) and Melbourne ($N = 398$), they present a complex model that showed, among other things, that the American youth were much less likely to engage in HIV risk behaviors. Other predictors of risk behaviors included indicators of the youth's own problem behaviors (e.g., reporting more delinquent behaviors and substance use and associating with delinquent peers) and reporting more victimization on the streets. Having positive peer relationships and better quality housing predicted fewer HIV risk behaviors. This study highlights how homeless populations may have different problems and needs across nations but, at the same time, there may be some common predictors of success for homeless people across nations.

Articles Focusing on Individual Nations

The next group of articles (including the first two described under the next heading, Policy Analyses) examines homelessness in individual countries. Firdion and Marpsat (2007) present the findings of a series of studies they and others have done on homeless youth and adults in France. As demographers, their approach to sampling is very thorough: They use careful probability sampling methods and obtain large samples (the most recent is nationwide and surveys over 4,000 persons). These authors provide a useful profile of the characteristics of France's homeless population. By comparing this profile with the profile of the overall French population, they identify correlates of homelessness including: coming from a large family and from France's overseas "departments" (formal governmental units, like states; e.g., Martinique) and former colonies in the Caribbean and Africa (e.g., Senegal, the Ivory Coast), various negative events earlier in life (e.g., child abuse, illnesses, or accidents), poor educational attainment and work histories, and doubling up with friends or family just prior to becoming homeless. These correlates suggest some mechanisms by which people might become homeless and suggest some possible intervention strategies.

In the only qualitative study in the issue, McGrath and Pistrang (2007), both trained as clinical psychologists, systematically examine the relationships between 12 homeless youth (ages 16–23 years) and their social workers (called "keyworkers") in two London youth shelters. The authors identified three dimensions that define the client–worker relationship and use these dimensions to provide suggestions on how workers can help create more effective relationships with their young clients.

Policy Analyses

The last three regular articles (coming just before the conclusion) provide general overviews of policy issues in specific nations. Hladikova and Hradecky (2007) review the status of the homeless in the Czech Republic where, like in other nations in Eastern Europe, there have been dramatic political and economic changes accompanied by equally dramatic increases in homelessness during the past decade since the fall of communism. In spite of the apparent growth in homelessness, there remains a near vacuum of research on the topic in the Czech Republic and the other nations of Eastern Europe. Research is beginning to appear and the pace of research will likely accelerate in this region as the first group of Eastern European nations become full members of the European Union (a process that began in 2004). This review documents the developing awareness of the problem in the Czech Republic during the 1990s, discusses some of the policies that hinder people from attempting to maintain housing, and describes some future research planned.

In the next article, Anderson (2007), an academic in Housing Studies, describes and analyzes recent policies on homelessness in Scotland. As in the UK generally, there has been an emphasis in Scotland on policy initiatives targeted to those homeless people who "sleep rough." She reviews the history of policy initiatives on the topic that began during the Thatcher era in the 1980s, around the same time when homelessness was brought to the public's attention by the U.S. media (see Buck et al., 2004) and the first legislation was passed in the United States (the McKinney Act mentioned above). Anderson discusses how the Rough Sleepers Initiative evolved during subsequent years and ends with some suggestions for policy changes needed in Scotland in the future.

In the article just prior to the conclusion, Minnery and Greenhalgh (2007) from Australia review recent policy-oriented reports (since 1998) written in English. Their analysis includes reports from the European Union, the UK, the United States, and Australia. They attempt to compare the nations represented in these reports based on the evolution and current status of policies toward the homeless and they note that narrow definitions of homelessness (favored in the U.S. policy community, for example) may lead to very different policy responses than the broader definitions they advocate.

In her conclusion, Shinn (2007) considers the reports in this issue from a "levels of analysis" framework. She points out that, in the United States, there has been an overemphasis on seeking what is wrong with individual homeless persons, with less attention given to examining homelessness at broader sociocultural and policy levels of analysis (and the opposite may be true in Europe). She proposes that we learn to combine levels of analysis if we are to truly understand a phenomenon as complex as homelessness and she suggests that policies to assist those most unfortunate in the income distribution would help to reduce or to eliminate homelessness in developed nations.

The Promise of Cross-Cultural Research

Learning about homelessness in nations outside of the United States and seeing how researchers approach their work can help broaden the perspectives of those of us studying homelessness in the United States. As already noted, one area of learning that can occur for U.S. researchers is how to apply qualitative methods in our own work. Seeing how different policy and cultural features function to influence homelessness can also be enlightening. For instance, after reviewing the group of articles in this issue along with other international research on homelessness, it becomes apparent that if we in the United States wish to seriously reduce the high incidence of homelessness in our nation, we should seriously consider adopting universal health care (like most of the nations in Europe) and expanding our welfare benefits rather than cutting them back.

When comparable data on homelessness are collected across nations, as was done in three of the articles in this issue (see Milburn et al., 2007; Okamoto, 2007; and Toro, Tompsett, et al., 2007; also see Shinn, 2007), light can be shed on the possible causes of homelessness. Both inside and outside of the United States, we have very little firm data that allow us to make causal inferences. As noted by Toro et al. (2007), however, there is a great deal of speculation on causal factors by politicians, journalists, and researchers, both in the United States and in other developed nations. While not providing the sort of firm causal data that derives from experiments, cross-cultural comparisons on homelessness can, at least, suggest plausible causal factors. To date, there are very few published reports that attempt to compare nations on homelessness and most of these fail to use sound methods in the comparisons that are made (Adams, 1986; Avramov, 1998; Cohen, 1994; Daly, 1990; Helvie & Kunstmann, 1999; Marpsat, 1999; Sleegers, 2000; Toro & Rojansky, 1990). This issue represents a major step forward in advancing a sound international understanding of homelessness.

It is hoped that this special issue will help to expand the understanding of homelessness and its impact on men, women, and children. By publishing the work of international researchers working outside of the United States, we may come to understand how other cultures perceive and struggle with the growing problem of homelessness. This may have some positive impact on how we in the United States approach research on the topic and what policy solutions we might propose. Triandis (1994) has long argued for the need to end the insularity of American psychology. Perhaps, in a small way, this special edition might help expand our knowledge on homelessness in the United States and encourage social scientists in the United States to look outside our borders at research on other social issues. Outside of the United States, researchers around the world may also benefit from gaining perspectives on the variety of approaches being used to study the homeless in countries other than their own. Promoting discussion of alternatives to U.S.-based methodologies can enrich the work of homelessness researchers and advocates everywhere.

References

Adams, C. T. (1986). Homelessness in the post-industrial city: Views from London and Philadelphia. *Urban Affairs Quarterly, 21*, 527–549.

American Public Health Association. (1990). Alcohol and other drug problems among the homeless population (position paper). *American Journal of Public Health, 80*, 243–246.

Anderson, I. (2007). Tackling street homelessness in Scotland: The evolution and impact of the Rough Sleepers Initiative. *Journal of Social Issues, 63*, 625–642.

Avramov, D. (Ed.) (1998). *Coping with homelessness: Issues to be tackled and best practices in Europe*. London: Ashgate.

Banyard, V. L. (1995). "Taking another route:" Daily survival narratives from mothers who are homeless. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 23*, 871–891.

Bates, D., & Toro, P. (1999). Developing measures to assess social support among homeless and poor people. *Journal of Community Psychology, 27*, 137–156.
Baumohl, J. (Ed.) (1996). *Homelessness in America*. Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
Bourdieu, P. (1985). The forms of capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education*. New York: Greenwood Press.
Buck, P. O., Toro, P. A., & Ramos, M. (2004). Media and professional interest in homelessness over three decades (1974–2003). *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy, 4*, 151–171.
Buckner, J., Bassuk, E., Weinreb, L., & Brooks, M. (1999). Homelessness and its relation to the mental health and behavior of low-income school-age children. *Developmental Psychology, 35*, 246–257.
Burt, M., Aron, L. Y., Lee, E., & Valente, J. (2001). *Helping America's homeless: Emergency shelter or affordable housing*? Washington, D C: Urban Institute Press.
Camic, P. M., Rhodes, J. E., & Yardley, L. (Eds.) (2003). *Qualitative research in psychology: Expanding perspectives in methodology and design*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
Cauce, A. M., Morgan, C. J., Wagner, V., Moore, E., Sy, J., Wurzbacher, K., Weeden, K., Tomlin, S., & Blanchard, T. (1994). Effectiveness of intensive case management for homeless adolescents: Results of a 3-month follow-up. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 2*, 219–227.
Cohen, C. I. (1994). Down and out in New York and London: A cross-national comparison of homelessness. *Hospital and Community Psychiatry, 45*, 769–776.
Daly, G. (1990). Programs dealing with homelessness in the United States, Canada, and Britain. In J. Momeni (Ed.), *Homelessness in the United States: Data and issues*. New York: Praeger.
Dishion, T. J., Patterson, G. R., Stoolmiller, M., & Skinner, M. L. (1991). Family, school, and behavioral antecedents to early adolescent involvement with antisocial peers. *Developmental Psychology, 27*, 172–180.
FEANTSA (European Federation of National Organisations Working with the Homeless) (2002, October). Immigration and homelessness in the European Union. Retrieved July 17, 2003 from http://www.feantsa.org/immigration/imm_rept_en_2002.pdf.
Feitel, B., Margetson, N., Chamas, R., & Lipman, C. (1992). Psychosocial background and behavioral and emotional disorders of homeless and runaway youth. *Hospital and Community Psychiatry, 43*, 155–159.
Firdion, J-M., & Marpsat, M. (2007). A research program on homelessness in France. *Journal of Social Issues, 63*, 567–588.
Fischer, P. J., & Breakey, W. R. (1991). The epidemiology of alcohol, drug, and mental disorders among homeless persons. *American Psychologist, 46*, 1115–1128.
Fitzpatrick, S., & Christian, J. (2006). Comparing homelessness research in the U.S. and Britain. *European Journal of Housing Policy, 6*, 313–333.
Foscarinis, M. (1991). The politics of homelessness: A call to action. *American Psychologist, 46*, 1232–1238.
Goodman, L. A. (1991). The prevalence of abuse in the lives of homeless and poor housed mothers: A comparison study. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 61*, 489–500.
Goodman, L., Saxe, L., & Harvey, M. (1991). Homelessness as psychological trauma: Broadening perspectives. *American Psychologist, 46*, 1219–1225.
Gore, A. (1990). Public policy and the homeless. *American Psychologist, 45*, 960–962.
Haber, M., & Toro, P. A. (2004). Homelessness among families, children and adolescents: An ecological-developmental perspective. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review, 7*, 123–164.
Harding, J. (2000). *The uninvited: Refugees the rich man's gate*. London: Profile Books Ltd.
Helvie, C. O., & Kunstmann, W. (1999). *Homelessness in the United States, Europe, and Russia: A comparative perspective*. Westport, CT: Bergin & Garvey.
Hopper, K. (2003). *Reckoning with homelessness*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
Hladikova, A., & Hradecky, I. (2007). Homelessness in the Czech Republic. *Journal of Social Issues, 63*, 607–204.
Israel, N., Ouellette, N., & Toro, P. A. (2006). Changes in the size and composition of the homeless population: 1992–2002. Unpublished manuscript under editorial review, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI.

Jencks, C. (1994). *The homeless*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Jones, J. M., Levine, I. S., & Rosenberg, A. A. (1991). Homelessness, research, services, and social policy: Introduction to the Special Issue. *American Psychologist, 46*, 1109–1111.
Kelly, J. G. (1970). Antidotes for arrogance: Training for a community psychology. *American Psychologist, 25*, 524–531.
Koegel, P. (1992). Understanding homelessness: An ethnographic approach. In R. I. Jahiel (Ed.), *Homelessness: A prevention-oriented approach*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Lee, B., Link, B. & Toro, P. A. (1991). Images of homelessness: Public opinion and media portrayals. *Housing Policy Debate, 2*(3), 3–36.
Lewin, K. (1951). *Field theory in social science, selected theoretical papers*. New York: Harper.
Link, B. G., Susser, E., Stueve, A., Phelan, J., Moore, R., Struening, E., & Colten, M. E. (1994). Lifetime and five-year prevalence of homelessness in the United States. *American Journal of Public Health, 84*, 1907–1912.
Marpsat, M. (1999). Les sans-domicile à Paris et aux Etats-Unis [The homeless in Paris and the United States]. *Données Sociales: La Société Française*, 480–489.
Masten, A. S., Miliotis, D., Graham-Bermann, S. A., Ramirez, M., & Neemann, J. (1993). Children in homeless families: Risks to mental health and development. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 61*, 335–343.
McGrath, L. & Pistrang, N. (2007). Policeman or friend? Dilemmas in working with homeless young people in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Social Issues, 63*, 589–606.
Meschede, T., Sokol, B., & Raymond, J. (2004, July). *Hard numbers, hard times: Homeless individuals in Massachusetts emergency shelters, 1999–2003*. Center for Social Policy, John W. McCormack Graduate School of Policy Studies, University of Massachusetts, Boston. Retrieved August 6, 2004 from http://www.csp.umb.edu/Masshelter/.
Milburn, N. G., Stein, J. A., Rice, E., Rotheram-Borus, M. J., Mallett, S., Rosenthal, D., & Lightfoot, M. (2007). AIDS risk behaviors among American and Australian homeless youth. *Journal of Social Issues, 63*, 543–566.
Minnery, J. & Greenhalgh, E. (2007). Approaches to homelessness policy in Europe, the United States, and Australia. *Journal of Social Issues, 63*, 643–658.
Moos, R. H. (1974). *Evaluating treatment environments: A social ecological approach*. New York: Wiley.
Morse, G., Calsyn, R. J., Allen, G., Tempelhoff, B., & Smith, R. (1992). Experimental comparison of the effects of three treatment programs for homeless mentally ill people. *Hospital and Community Psychiatry, 43*, 1005–1010.
Okamoto, Y. (2007). A comparative study of homelessness in the United Kingdom and Japan. *Journal of Social Issues, 63*, 525–542.
Patterson, G. R. (1982). *Coercive family process*. Eugene, OR: Castalia.
Patterson, G. R., DeBaryshe, B. D., & Ramsey, E. (1989). A developmental perspective on antisocial behavior. *American Psychologist, 44*, 329–335.
Philippot, P., Lecocq, C., Sempoux, F., Nachtergael, H., & Galand, B. (2007). Psychological research on homelessness in Western Europe: A review from 1970 to 2001. *Journal of Social Issues, 63*, 483–504.
Robertson, M. J., Koegel, P., & Ferguson, L. (1989). Alcohol use and abuse among homeless adolescents in Hollywood. *Contemporary Drug Problems, Fall*, 415–452.
Robertson, M. J., & Toro, P. A. (1999). Homeless youth: Research, intervention, and policy. Chapter 3 In L. B. Fosburg & D. L. Dennis (Eds.), *Practical lessons: The 1998 National Symposium on Homelessness Research*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
Rog, D. J., & Buckner, R. C. (2007). Homeless families and children. *The 2007 National Symposium on Homelessness Research*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
Roll, C. N., Toro, P. A., & Ortola, G. L. (1999). Characteristics and experiences of homeless adults: A comparison of single men, single women, and women with children. *Journal of Community Psychology, 27*, 189–198.

Rossi, P. H. (1989). *Down and out in America: The origins of homelessness*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Shinn, M. (2007). International homelessness: Policy, socio-cultural, and individual perspectives. *Journal of Social Issues, 63*, 659–679.
Shinn, M., & Weitzman, B. C. (1990). Research on homelessness: An introduction. *Journal of Social Issues, 46*, 1–11.
Shinn, M., & Weitzman, B. C. (1996). Homeless families are different In J. Baumohl (Ed.), *Homelessness in America* (pp. 109–122). Phoenix, AZ: Oryx Press.
Shinn, M., Weitzman, B., Stojanovic, D., Knickman, J. R., Jimenez, L., Duchon, L., James, S., & Krantz, D. H. (1998). Predictors of entry into and exit from homelessness among families in New York City. *American Journal of Public Health, 88*, 1651–1657.
Sleegers, J. (2000). Similarities and differences in homelessness in Amsterdam and New York City. *Psychiatric Services, 51*, 100–104.
Tompsett, C. J., Fowler, P. J., & Toro, P. A. (in press). Age differences among homeless individuals: Adolescence through adulthood. *Journal of Prevention and Intervention in the Community*.
Tompsett, C. J., Toro, P. A., Guzicki, M., Manrique, M., & Zatakia, J. (2006). Homelessness in the United States: Assessing changes in prevalence and public opinion, 1993 to 2001. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 37*, 47–61.
Toro, P. A. (1998). Homelessness. In A. S. Bellack & M. Hersen (Eds.), *Comprehensive clinical psychology*, Ch. 8 in Vol. 9, Applications in diverse populations (pp. 119–135). New York: Pergamon.
Toro, P. A. (1999). Advances in research on homelessness: An overview of the special issue. *Journal of Community Psychology, 27*, 115–118.
Toro, P. A., Bellavia, C., Daeschler, C., Owens, B., Wall, D. D., Passero, J. M., & Thomas, D. M. (1995). Distinguishing homelessness from poverty: A comparative study. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 63*, 280–289.
Toro, P. A., Dworsky, A., & Fowler, P. J. (2007). Homeless youth in the United States: Recent research findings and intervention approaches. *The 2007 National Symposium on Homelessness Research*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.
Toro, P. A., Goldstein, M. S., Rowland, L. L., Bellavia, C. W., Wolfe, S. M., Thomas, D. M., & Acosta, O. (1999). Severe mental illness among homeless adults and its association with longitudinal outcomes. *Behavior Therapy, 30*, 431–452.
Toro, P. A., & Janisse, H. C. (2004). Patterns of homelessness. In S. Barrow et al. (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of homelessness*. Great Barrington, MA: Berkshire Publishing/Sage.
Toro, P. A., Lombardo, S., & Yapchai, C. J. (2003). Homelessness, childhood. In T. P. Gullotta & M. Bloom (Eds.), *Encyclopedia of primary prevention and health promotion* (pp. 561–570). New York: Kluwer.
Toro, P. A., Passero Rabideau, J. M., Bellavia, C. W., Daeschler, C. V., Wall, D. D., Thomas, D. M., & Smith, S. J. (1997). Evaluating an intervention for homeless persons: Results of a field experiment. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 65*, 476–484.
Toro, P. A., & Rojansky, A. (1990). Homelessness: Some thoughts from an international perspective. *Community Psychologist, 23*(4), 8–11.
Toro, P. A., Tompsett, C. J., Lombardo, S., Philippot, P., Nachtergael, H., Galand, B., et al. (2007) Homelessness in Europe and the United States: A comparison of prevalence and public opinion. *Journal of Social Issues, 63*, 505–524.
Toro, P. A., Trickett, E. J., Wall, D. D., & Salem, D. A. (1991). Homelessness in the United States: An ecological perspective. *American Psychologist, 46*, 1208–1218.
Toro, P. A., & Warren, M. G. (1999). Homelessness in the United States: Policy considerations. *Journal of Community Psychology, 27*, 119–136.
Toro, P. A., Wolfe, S. M., Bellavia, C. W., Thomas, D. M., Rowland, L. L., Daeschler, C. V., & McCaskill, P. A. (1999). Obtaining representative samples of homeless persons: A two-city study. *Journal of Community Psychology, 27*, 157–178.
Triandis, H. C. (1994). *Culture and social behavior*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
Tsemberis, S. (1999). From streets to homes: An innovative approach to supported housing for homeless adults with psychiatric disabilities. *Journal of Community Psychology, 27*, 225–242.

Van der Kolk, B. A. (Ed.) (1987). *Psychological trauma*. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.
Warnes, A., & Crane, M. (2006). Factors in the outcomes of the resettlement of homeless people. Unpublished grant proposal approved for funding, Economic and Social Research Council, London, UK.
Whitbeck, L. B., & Hoyt, D. R. (1999). *Nowhere to grow: Homeless and runaway adolescents and their families*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
Wright, J. D. (1989). *Address unknown: The homeless in America*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
Zlotnick, C., Robertson, M. J., & Lahiff, M. (1999). Getting off the streets: Economic resources and residential exits among homeless adults. *Journal of Community Psychology, 27*, 209–224.

PAUL A. TORO is Professor of Psychology at Wayne State University in Detroit. He was President of the Society for Community Research and Action (Division 27, Community Psychology, of the American Psychological Association) in 2003–2004. He and his Research Group on Homelessness and Poverty have conducted a wide range of studies on homelessness over the past two decades, including studies on homeless adults, families, and youth. His studies have compared homeless to matched housed samples, assessed prevalence and public opinion, evaluated interventions, provided careful assessment of mental and substance abuse disorders, tested social psychological theories, collected data across nations, analyzed media and professional coverage, and followed large homeless samples in longitudinal designs. For additional details on his research, see his web site at http://sun.science.wayne.edu/∼ptoro/.