3. OUTCOMES OF EXPERT PANEL

3.1   Expert Panel Overview

To guide the conceptualization of the typology, a one-day Expert Panel meeting was held in Washington, DC on July 25, 2005. Experts in homeless families research, homelessness research in general, welfare, and typology development were invited to participate along with several Federal representatives. The Expert Panelists discussed what constitutes a typology, potential goals for the typology, and the types of studies that would best inform these efforts. Panelists were also asked to identify critical knowledge gaps. To aid the discussion, five of the eight Expert Panelists contributed four papers focusing on a review of conceptual issues and methodological strategies for developing typology for homeless families; what is known about homeless children; families at risk of homelessness; and a review of opportunities and impediments related to permanent housing.

The meeting was intended to generate discussion that would help inform the conceptualization of a typology, including key elements to consider in its development, study options that could provide useful data, and next steps to take. The Expert Panelists focused on four goals for the development of a typology of homeless families and indicated that more than one typology is needed to guide policy and practice. The goals are as follows:

- Prevention policy-oriented typology that would focus on identifying the risk factors for homelessness;

- Resource allocation typology to help understand homelessness epidemiologically and guide the allocation of available resources locally;

- Services policy typology geared toward policymakers that would identify the menu of services needed to assist homeless families; and

- Treatment matching typology that would facilitate the matching of treatment and service intensity to particular families.

Although all goals were considered important, typologies that would guide prevention policy and resource allocation were considered the highest priorities for homeless families.

The panelists agreed that typologies should be simple in structure, easy to use, derive from available data, and have practical utility. Each typology should demonstrate predictive and construct

validity and reliability and should include characteristics of homeless families, characteristics of the environment of such families, and characteristics of the interaction with the environment. Although the panel thought a range of study designs (e.g., longitudinal, cross-sectional) could inform a typology, the majority also believed a nationally geographic, representative longitudinal study that followed first-time homeless families from the shelter would provide the most guidance for constructing a comprehensive typology.

3.2 Factors Considered for Inclusion in a Homeless Families Typology

First, the panelists thought it was important to know **how large a typology** is needed—that is, how many variables should be considered? The caution was to keep it simple and focus on variables that provide the most differentiation. A good typology should have practical utility, be easy to derive from the data, and have the ability to predict future behaviors. A typology also should be able to facilitate conversation and command a common language among service providers, researchers, and policymakers.

There was a major emphasis on discussing the importance of considering the **goals of the typology** in determining the factors to be included. A key point made was that the factors that block a family from exiting homelessness or getting back into housing (e.g., bad credit, criminal record) are different from factors that predict becoming homeless or losing housing (e.g., problems with landlords; drugs). Thus, different ways of framing the problem can lead to different goal formation.

Other key factors discussed for inclusion revolved around **ordering families according to levels of risk:** different gradients of risk of homelessness; risk to parent/child well-being (physical risk, domestic violence, housing conditions); and probability of a quick exit (some might need a single day of shelter). This system would allow for teasing apart families in desperate need from those with moderate needs.

A major area of discussion was the **interaction between family and environment** and the need to overlay any family typology with an understanding of the local context (domestic violence, neighborhood, social stratification, and market). It is important to focus on the interaction and not solely the environment, as individual characteristics contribute to different personal vulnerabilities and help explain why some families experience homelessness and others in similar environments do not.

At the **individual level**, it is important to understand whether a family is experiencing homelessness for the first time or experiencing repeated homelessness. Routes into homelessness were also identified as a key area of differentiation. Families report different reasons for leaving housing, including economic reasons, abuse, poor health, or mental health problems. Violence is also an important factor for inclusion at the individual level. Furthermore, it is important to be sensitive to how the population views their own problems. Women in a domestic violence shelter might think violence prevention is their primary concern, for example, and not necessarily consider themselves homeless.

Even though most of the Expert Panel discussion revolved around factors needed for inclusion, **some factors were also identified as unnecessary.** Dr. Babor reminded the group not to include sociodemographic variables just because they are available unless they help with meaningful differentiation. Typologies should have practical utility, and extraneous variables will only hinder their effectiveness.

3.3   Types of Studies That Could Best Inform a Typology

The discussion of research studies focused on the advantages and disadvantages of **longitudinal and cross-sectional designs**. Some participants argued that cross-sectional designs are not helpful because they confound those who remain homeless with those who are newly homeless. It was suggested that a longitudinal study that followed first-time homeless families (not limited to urban centers) would be ideal. Others agreed that this design would be helpful but acknowledged the difficulty in tracking the population.

Others panelists believed that cross-sectional designs can be appropriate to obtaining an understanding of the current population. It was argued that cross-sectional designs are especially helpful for providing data for service providers who need to best understand the population in front of them. The majority of panelists agreed that different questions require different designs and that no single design is superior to all others.

Another main issue revolved around the importance of using **administrative data.** Proponents of administrative data believe that large, preexisting data sets could easily inform typology efforts. It was noted that, if administrative data were used, characteristics of those experiencing homelessness could be collected retrospectively. Others agreed, however, that most data sets are missing

a housing stability field and recommended adding one to track those who are highly vulnerable and experiencing residential instability. Another recommendation was to add this field to preexisting child welfare data sets to better understand this vulnerable population.

Advantages and disadvantages of **nationally representative samples versus local studies** were also discussed. National samples offer the widest coverage of geographic locations and the larger populations provide greater validity and reliability. Panelists noted that the focus of a draft final report chapter (presented during the meeting) was solely on the potential of using national data sets for enhancement and secondary analysis. This emphasis was questioned by local-level advocates who believe that decisions on resource allocation are being made at the local level and by state/local dollars. Disadvantages of local sampling were noted, including the need to have consistency in answers across localities for any generalizable outcomes and the tendency for rural populations to be undersampled in these studies because of the placement of researchers in the field. Local-level studies are also problematic because of different community norms and regulations associated with homelessness services.

3.4 Potential Problems to Anticipate in Developing a Typology

The panelists emphasized the importance of **identifying the goal** of a typology before beginning to develop one. Different goals would demand different designs and more than one goal could translate into multiple typologies that need to be developed. It was agreed that more than one typology was needed to inform the policy world.

Another potential problem addressed was determining whether the goal of developing and using a typology is to house families and reduce homelessness or to also provide the services needed to achieve other outcomes (e.g., increase employment).

Another anticipated problem was the need to be aware of **differences at the local level that could confound findings,** such as different policies in different localities (e.g., restrictions in shelters) that interact with family homelessness. For example, local-level data in Worcester, Massachusetts and Washington, DC, would not be comparable because of differences in shelter policies (e.g., age restrictions, family status requirement), availability, and quality.

Typologies and classification systems can **have potentially damaging effects** if improperly designed. Problems inherent in other typologies can be used as lessons for this typology by designing one that is flexible and not static.

Some of the current typologies have **little intuitive appeal** and, therefore, are not used by service providers and policymakers. Finally, any typology that is practical and simple is likely to **omit subgroups** based on the impossibility of including all existing subtypes in a single functioning typology.

3.5　　　Summary and Discussion of Literature Review

Toward a Typology of Homeless Families: Building on the Existing Knowledge Base
Authors: Debra Rog, C. Scott Holupka, Kelly Hastings, Lisa Patton, Marybeth Shinn

Summary of Presentation. Chapter two of this report summarizes the available literature on homeless families, focusing on what is known about their characteristics, service needs, and service use. According to the literature, homeless families are typically female-headed with an average of two children under five years of age. These families are disproportionately young and members of ethnic minorities. Homeless families have a greater probability of experiencing child separations than nonhomeless families, even when a variety of other factors (e.g., substance abuse) are considered.

Homeless mothers have residential histories marked by mobility and general instability. Compared to other poor mothers, homeless mothers generally have limited education and work histories, are more likely to suffer from health problems despite access to health care, and have similar rates of mental health problems and substance use. Social networks can be an important resource for families but can also be a source of conflict, trauma, and violence. Homeless children also have high rates of health problems. Homeless families, like poor families overall, have high exposure to violence.

Knowledge gaps noted include the need for more research on families from different regions of the country, research on key subgroups, families at risk, moderate needs families, those who fall back into homelessness despite intervention, working homeless families, two-parent families, and families in extended family networks. Longitudinal data are needed on homeless families, as is greater information on the dynamics of their service use and residential history.

Summary of reactions and comments. Panelists concurred with the paper and mentioned additional knowledge gaps, including the need for data on family separations, especially on children who are no longer residing with their mothers. A majority of the panelists agreed that it is important to understand the various reasons, in addition to homelessness, why children can be separated from their mothers. A longitudinal design was recommended for data gathering on potential family separations. It was acknowledged, however, that family separation data can be difficult to accurately obtain as mothers may be hesitant to report the information in fear of child protection services.

Other knowledge gaps noted were data on fathers and fathers' family networks. It is important to note that fathers can enter the criminal justice system and then return to support the family, or the father's family could be an additional asset to the children and mother. More research is also needed on two-parent families and single adults versus married couples. Married couples are more likely to be in shelter, but could potentially be poorer because assets are divided across more individuals.

The importance of clarifying how past research studies have defined homelessness (e.g., whether homelessness is restricted to literally homeless or includes doubled-up situations) was noted as central to having a clear understanding of the literature and its implications for the typology.

3.6 Summary and Discussion of Prospects for Secondary Analysis

Toward a Typology of Homeless Families: Prospects for Secondary Analysis
Authors: Debra Rog, C. Scott Holupka, Kelly Hastings, Lisa Patton, Marybeth Shinn

Summary of Presentation. Chapter four of this report presents a review of 15 secondary data sets for potential enhancement and/or secondary analysis. National and state/local data sets were reviewed at both the general population and special population levels. For each data set, information was obtained on its purpose, use, size, scope, domains, and items. Each data set was then screened based on three main criteria: Were the data accessible for secondary analysis within the proposed timeframe? Did the data set include domains related to housing insufficiency, residence, and/or homelessness? Was the unit of analysis at the family level? National data sets such as the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), surprisingly, have data on characteristics and service use but do not contain data on homelessness or housing instability. The Fragile Families and Child Well-Being data set and the National Survey of America's Families (NSAF) seemed to be the best prospects for informing the typology efforts.

The Fragile Families and Child Well-Being Study follows a birth cohort of new parents and their children over a period of 5 years. A stratified random sample of 20 cities was selected from U.S. cities with 200,000 or more people and then hospitals within cities were sampled. Data were collected at baseline from both the mother and father, with followup interviews occurring at 12, 30, and 48 months. The data set included extensive information on demographics, familial relationships, child well-being, heath and development of the child, residential mobility of both parents, and a variety of homelessness identifiers. This study offers the most promise for informing the typology because it samples a high-risk population through a longitudinal design of young pregnant mothers. Finally, the study is currently available and national in scope and would offer some city-level information.

The National Survey of America's Families was designed to gather data on economic, social, and health characteristics of families and children from representative cross-sectional samples of the civilian, noninstitutionalized population under the age of 65. The NSAF provides a rich data set on both parents and children. The NSAF contains information on a range of domains, including employment, welfare receipt, social relationships, and emotional and physical well-being, and provides child-level data on social, emotional, behavioral outcomes, mental and physical health outcomes, and children's academic outcomes. A potential strength of the NSAF is that, although the homeless population is not specifically surveyed, the three administered surveys do focus on housing and economic hardship variables. The NSAF would therefore provide a rich data set to study families who are doubled-up and valuable information on those at-risk for homelessness.

Summary of reactions and comments. Even though the Fragile Families study was not as widely known by panelists, the majority agreed that the data set appeared potentially informative to typology efforts. Also noted was that, although NSAF does not directly identify homelessness, it does contain helpful doubled-up population identifiers (though it is a surprisingly small percentage of the sample). Other panelists were surprised that SIPP did not include relevant variables.

Other existing data collection efforts suggested for secondary analysis included the following:

- Hennepin County, Minnesota homelessness program

- Chapin-Hall, University of Chicago database on foster children

- Multi-city Study of Urban Inequality (including life history interviews)

- Detroit Area Studies (has ended)

- Sampson/Raudenbush research in Chicago, IL (cluster study design of neighborhoods across city)

- National Survey of America's Families (NSAF)

- Survey of Income Program Participation (SIPP)

In general, the panel discussed the importance of analyzing administrative data at the local level. In particular, the Hennepin County homelessness program was identified as a good source for re-examination.

3.7   Summary of and Feedback on Commissioned Papers

3.7.1   Paper Title: Toward a Typology of Homeless Families: Conceptual and Methodological Issues *(full text of paper can be found in Appendix B of this report)*
Authors: Thomas Babor and Rene Jahiel

Summary of Presentation. This paper reviews conceptual issues and methodological strategies for developing a typology of homeless families. A typology is defined as a classification system and a set of decision rules used to differentiate relatively homogenous groups called subtypes. Taxonomic standards for an effective typology were reviewed, including the need for simplicity and practical utility, among others.

Potential functions of a homeless families typology were also discussed, including summarizing diagnostic information, providing an empirical basis for client-service matching, minimizing effects on children, and helping to prevent homelessness. Some of the decisions that need to be made in developing a typology include whether the approach should be driven by theory or blind empiricism; whether the typology is based on a single domain or is multidimensional; whether the data informing the typology come from longitudinal or cross-sectional variables; and whether one typology is sufficient or multiple typologies are needed.

Dr. Babor and Dr. Jahiel proposed that a typology should be based on three types of variables: exogenous (housing environment, housing and health/human service access); endogenous (family and individual characteristics); and situational (fit between homeless families' needs and resources accessible). As a heuristic device, the authors suggested a four-cell model identifying interactions between endogenous and exogenous factors. Using existing data sets, this model could be used to identify interactions between types of individuals and environments, resulting in subtypes that could provide a basis for matching families to appropriate levels and types of interventions and prevention efforts.

Methodological issues to develop a typology were examined, with a main focus on disadvantages and advantages of various approaches, criteria for selecting variables, measurement procedures, and statistical methods.

Summary of reactions and comments. Panel members expressed appreciation for the authors' review of conceptual and methodological issues of typology development. There was general discussion on the importance of having a typology that policymakers will use, that has practical importance, and that will actually work. Selecting criterion variables based on ease of use by policymakers (i.e., easy language like days versus stays) was discussed. There was particular interest in the interaction between individual and environmental factors and how it can be handled in a typology. In particular, community factors (e.g., earning power, rental prices, and local amount of subsidies) may be especially helpful to understand as an overlay to individual factors.

Some panelists were concerned with the wide variety of environmental factors that could be included, such as a family's culture, state of residence, and shelter requirements. Cultural differences, for example, can be important as they affect shelter usage. Asians and Latinos are less likely to come to shelters, whereas African Americans and Native Americans are more likely to come.

Also discussed by the panel were the disadvantages of the typology literature as being tautological and outlining classification techniques, but failing to describe classification with a purpose.

3.7.2   **Paper Title: Permanent Housing for Homeless Families: A Review of Opportunities and Impediments** *(full text of paper can be found in Appendix C of this report)*
Authors**:** Jill Khadduri and Bulbul Kaul

Summary of Presentation. The presentation highlighted permanent housing options, subsidies, and other resources offered by programs for low-income renters, and outlined the barriers that homeless families experience when attempting to access these resources.

The authors argue that a typology of homeless families should differentiate between families who need permanent mainstream housing and those who need permanent supportive housing. In addition, how do we identify families for whom the inability to afford housing is not a barrier to get out of homelessness? For example, domestic violence victims might be able to afford housing but other barriers preclude their ability to access safe housing.

Another consideration for the typology should be the barriers (e.g., criminal records) that families face when attempting to use mainstream programs. Appropriate location of mainstream housing may also depend on individual circumstances of both the parent and child (e.g., domestic violence victims) and should be accounted for when developing a typology.

Knowledge gaps identified include who needs services packaged with the housing, ways in which there is a locational mismatch (e.g., in suburban and rural areas there may be a mismatch between unit sizes and the numbers of bedrooms needed by families trying to leave homelessness for housing) and how much targeting of the current programs is actually taking place (i.e., what are public housing authorities doing right now, how much preference are they giving to families trying to leave homelessness).

Summary of reactions and comments. The discussion focused on the extent to which there are families who might need services packaged with their housing and on how best to describe the permanent housing that is needed. Also reiterated was the need to differentiate between families who need permanent supportive housing and those who just need housing.

Some participants questioned whether public housing authorities would be interested in going back to establishing a priority of housing for homeless families in the absence of a Federal priority. Some suggested that it may be easier to guarantee specific providers a certain number of housing slots or

to link the housing to Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF). Also suggested was the need to be sensitive to how a typology is framed for favorable public opinion. It is more politically popular to inform the field on how to limit family separation versus assisting a less politically favorable group like substance abusers.

In response to the paper, it was also suggested that the number of housing slots available be considered and represented in light of the number of families on the wait lists. Another element of potential interest would be examining the methods for determining how many families would become homeless based on how long they were on the wait list.

3.7.3 Paper Title: The Impact of Homelessness on Children: An Analytic Review of the Literature *(full text of paper can be found in Appendix A of this report)*
Author: John Buckner

Summary of Presentation. This paper provides a review of the literature on the effects of homelessness on children's mental and physical health, behavior, and academic performance. Reasons for inconsistent findings were offered, such as contextual and policy-related differences in the communities where examinations of homeless children have taken place. Knowledge gaps identified include better understanding of contextual factors, family separations, and how homeless children overlap with housed poor children. In general, no significant subgroups of homeless children have been identified in the literature.

The author concluded that a typology should take advantage of existing data sets and take a person-centered approach. This type of approach would look across different realms of child functioning using techniques like cluster analysis versus the more typical "variable-centered" approach of previous studies. The author recommended adding other realms of child functioning (such as school attendance) to make the typology more comprehensive. The author also warned that it might be difficult to juxtapose typologies of homeless children with typologies of families if based on parental characteristics.

Summary of reactions and comments. The panelists identified a number of areas where more information on homeless children would be useful. There was interest in understanding the effects of residential instability on children's outcomes. Dr. Buckner noted that instability affects a child's school performance as it generally results in more school absences and difficulty adjusting to new environments.

Mental health outcomes, however, are affected by a wider array of violence exposure situations experienced by children, and physical health is negatively affected by overcrowding and generally poor nutrition. The panelists also noted that the typology would benefit from more data on family separations.

Panel members felt that a separate typology for children would not be necessary. It was suggested that if a child was ever living in the homeless system with the parent, then it would be possible to link child welfare data and track where the child was living over time. One panelist noted that the Chapin Hall Center at the University of Chicago study is examining foster care child-level data in this manner. Sue Barrow and Judy Samuels are also conducting ethnographic work on family separation that might be examined. Additional issues discussed included how foster care children would be included in the typology.

3.7.4   **Paper Title: Homelessness and At-Risk Families: The Characteristics and Causes of Homelessness Among At Risk Families With Children in Twenty American Cities**
(full text of paper can be found in Appendix D of this report)
Authors: David Reingold and Angela Fertig

Summary of Presentation, This paper attempts to understand whether (and how) the family homelessness problem has changed over the last ten years and what factors seem to predict family homelessness today. The first section of the paper reviewed the existing poverty literature to determine whether various macroeconomic and social conditions (welfare reform, decreasing wage returns, low-income housing, housing affordability, and incarceration of homeless parents due to drug abuse and violence) have altered the extent and degree of homelessness among families.

The authors conclude that evidence on welfare reform suggests that it has not pushed more at-risk families into homelessness, though there may be a small increase in homelessness among welfare leavers in some states. Wages upon returning to work for those at the bottom of the wage distribution has worsened over the past few years but, because the working poor rate is below the 1993 high, it is unlikely that changes in the labor market have exacerbated family homelessness in recent years. Data on the effects of low-income housing reform on homelessness suggests that the changes in HUD HOPE VI Program may be increasing homelessness for illegal residents. The authors recognized the link between the lack of affordable housing and family homelessness; however, they believe that the shortage has not worsened over the past ten years and thus is unlikely to have forced more families into homelessness.

Finally, there may be a link between increases in the number of families who become homeless and patterns of reentry of incarcerated parents, but not enough is known to understand the link.

The second part of the paper focused on a brief reanalysis of data from the Fragile Families and Child Well-Being Study, examining the factors that predict homelessness. The analysis focused on two different subsamples: those who report being homeless at the 12-month interview (n=140) and those who report being homeless at the 36-month interview (n=110). Homelessness in this sample is associated with race, educational attainment, welfare receipt, less employment, lower earnings, experiences of hardships (e.g., inability to pay utilities or rent), living in public housing, paying a greater proportion of income toward rent, higher rates of prior incarceration of the father, drug use, emotional distress, domestic violence reports, and less access to social support. Regression results seem to indicate that health, drug use, and domestic violence are the best predictors of family homelessness though these account for only a small amount of the variance explaining whether or not a family becomes homeless.

Summary of reactions and comments. For the literature review analysis portion of the paper, there was discussion about the problem of limiting the timeframe to the past ten years, especially if the conclusion is true that the affordable housing and homelessness situations have had less change during this period. It is difficult to examine the effects of a condition on the problem if the condition has been relatively constant. Taking a longer time perspective may provide a more valid assessment of the relationship among these conditions.

Much of the discussion focused on concerns about the analyses conducted on the Fragile Families database and strategies for strengthening them. First, the analysis compared the families who had reported being homeless at one point or another with all other families. As this data set was not restricted to poor families, some of the findings (such as receipt of a housing subsidy increasing the risk of being homeless) may actually be indicators of poverty. If the control group was restricted to just poor families (e.g., those who are at 50% of the poverty level) the analyses could find that a housing subsidy actually acts as a protective factor. It was also noted that, because the community was known, it may be possible to adjust the poverty definition by the area median income.

There was some concern voiced that the sample size was small and thus might be sensitive only to moderate and large effects.

Some of the discussion focused on whether it would be possible to link people to the housing market conditions in which they live to be able to understand the housing market factors related to homelessness.

In addition to examining individuals who had experienced homelessness, it might be useful to know if families are doubled up. If the individual is on a lease, it may be possible to determine if he or she is living with others or has others living in the residence. It would also be useful to see if the person is paying anything toward rent. The fact that a family is not contributing toward rent may help them stay housed.

Finally, there was a great deal of discussion sparked about the ability to predict homelessness among families and the implications for the typology. The authors noted that the R-squares on their regressions were quite small and questioned whether homelessness was an event that was due to the idiosyncrasies of the population and environments. It was noted that R-square or variance explained may not be as useful as success of prediction. Even excellent predictors can't predict much variance when their distributions are quite different from the distribution of the criterion variable.

It was also noted that homelessness is relatively rare in a restricted time frame but can become a much more common event for poor families over a longer period of time. It was noted again that, from a prevention standpoint, it may be hard to predict who will become homeless and thus it may be necessary to wait until families present as homeless to intervene and triage.

3.8   Directions for Typology Development

Following the paper presentations and discussions, the group discussed how best to proceed with the task of typology development. The following general guidelines emerged from the discussion.

The two top goals for a typology should be a focus on prevention (in hopes of minimizing the population) and resource allocation. From the Federal perspective, having data on how best to match the resources that exist with the needs of the population is important. With multiple, equally important goals, it was concluded that more than one typology is necessary to best inform the field.

Dr. Babor's recommendation of a four-cell model between environment (facilitators/barriers) and service needs of families (minor and major needs) should be explored. Dr. Babor thought the empirical question is whether these levels are adequate and appropriate for differentiation. The suggestion was to identify the services that are available for allocation, including mental health, substance abuse, medication, STD clinics, prenatal services, domestic violence, trauma, employment, education, and legal services. Then put all variables together and see if different clusters form. The results might show two large groups emerging, one of high needs and the other of low needs. The high needs group might cluster around history of domestic violence, mental health, substance abuse, and poor employment, whereas the other group might have relatively few problems. For children, include child person-variables such as education needs, domestic situation, CBCL scores, and ages and see how those variables cluster. Dr. Babor reiterated that a goal of the typology is to define subgroups.

A prevention focus might be best addressed by waiting until families are present at the shelter door for the first time and then triage from there. In this vein, it was recommended that we pursue the use of existing administrative data of Hennepin County, Minnesota and other communities (e.g., Arizona) where they are attempting to assess needs and triage in real time. Hennepin has developed a classification system for treatment matching of shelter usage by assessing needs and triaging in real time. Classification is used at a very practical level and provides a method for service providers to use when deciding who receives shelter (i.e., level 1 and level 2 are referred elsewhere, level 3- referred to the shelter).

The group determined that a priority is to continue to explore methods for informing the knowledge gaps discussed and described earlier in Chapter 2:

- Family separation;

- Different family structures (couple vs. married);

- Father's support network;

- Data on families across different regions of the country;

- Families at risk;

- Moderate needs families;

- Those who fall back into homelessness despite intervention;

- Working homeless families;

- Two-parent families;

- Families in extended family networks;

- Longitudinal studies of homeless families; and

- Studies that focus on homeless children.