JOURNAL OF APPLIED SCIENCE AND SOCIAL SCIENCE

Volume16 Issue02, February-2026, pg. 1-11

Published Date: - 01-02-2026

E-ISSN: 2229-3213
P-ISSN: 2229-3205

Integrating Outreach, Engagement, And Systems Coordination For Homeless Persons With Severe Mental Illness: A Comprehensive Evidence-Informed Framework For Health System Guidance

Dr. Elara Montreval

University of Geneva, Switzerland

Abstract: Homelessness among people living with severe mental illness remains one of the most persistent and morally challenging public health problems confronting contemporary health and social service systems. Over several decades, a wide range of outreach models, engagement strategies, and systems-level reforms have been proposed and implemented to address this problem, yet fragmentation, inequity of access, and inconsistent outcomes continue to characterize service delivery. This article develops an original, evidence-informed framework for understanding and improving outreach and engagement for homeless persons with serious mental illness by synthesizing and theoretically elaborating the bodies of work represented in the provided references. Drawing on foundational contributions in outreach practice, community psychiatry, social psychology, and health systems research, the article conceptualizes outreach not merely as a set of field-based techniques but as a relational, institutional, and epistemic bridge between marginalized individuals and complex service systems.

The conceptual core of this analysis is the integration of micro-level engagement processes, meso-level program design, and macro-level systems coordination. At the micro level, the literature emphasizes trust, communication, identity, and voluntary participation as decisive determinants of whether individuals accept and sustain contact with services (Morse et al., 1996; Christian, 2003; Kraybill and Olivet, 2005). At the meso level, outreach programs vary widely in their organizational structures, staffing models, clinical orientations, and degrees of assertiveness, with corresponding implications for effectiveness and ethical legitimacy (Goering et al., 1997; Bybee et al., 1994; Fisk, 2006). At the macro level, structural barriers such as fragmented funding streams, eligibility rules, housing shortages, and disability benefit systems profoundly shape what outreach can realistically accomplish (Cocozza et al., 2000; Czerwinski, 2002; Cooper et al., 2009).

Using this multilevel lens, the article proposes a comprehensive model of “evidence-integrated outreach,” grounded in the Canadian Health Services Research Foundation’s conceptualization of

Published Date: - 01-02-2026

E-ISSN: 2229-3213
P-ISSN: 2229-3205

combining diverse forms of evidence for health system guidance (Lomas et al., 2005). Quantitative outcome studies, qualitative practice wisdom, client and family perspectives, and policy analyses are treated as equally necessary sources of knowledge. The article also incorporates psychometric approaches to outcome measurement, particularly the Brief Symptom Inventory, to illustrate how mental health change can be rigorously assessed within outreach contexts (Derogatis, 1993; Derogatis and Melisaratos, 1983).

The results synthesized across the cited literature demonstrate that outreach consistently improves engagement, housing stability, service utilization, and, in many cases, psychiatric symptoms and substance use outcomes, particularly when programs are sustained over time and embedded in supportive housing and integrated service systems (Bybee et al., 1995; Buhrich and Teesson, 1996; Corporation for Supportive Housing, 2005). However, the effects are not uniform and depend heavily on program fidelity, system capacity, and the degree to which interventions respect client autonomy and social identity (Tsemberis and Elfenbein, 1999; Christian and Abrams, 2004).

By advancing a theoretically grounded, evidence-integrated framework, this article seeks to move beyond debates over whether outreach "works" toward a deeper understanding of how, why, and under what conditions outreach can most effectively support homeless people with severe mental illness. The analysis concludes that sustainable progress requires not only skilled outreach workers and effective engagement techniques but also coordinated housing, income, and health systems capable of transforming initial contact into long-term recovery and social inclusion.

Keywords: Homelessness; severe mental illness; outreach; engagement; health systems; supportive housing.

INTRODUCTION

Homelessness and severe mental illness intersect in ways that produce some of the most entrenched forms of social exclusion found in modern societies. Individuals who experience both conditions simultaneously face not only the internal burdens of psychiatric symptoms and psychological distress but also the external barriers of poverty, stigma, institutional neglect, and fragmented service systems. Over the past several decades, researchers, clinicians, policymakers, and advocates have increasingly recognized that conventional clinic-based models of care are insufficient for this population, giving rise to a diverse array of outreach and engagement strategies designed to bring services directly to people living on the streets, in shelters, or in other precarious forms of housing (Morse et al., 1996; Wasmer, 1998; Kraybill, 2002).

Outreach, in this context, refers to the proactive effort by trained workers to locate, contact, and engage individuals who are disconnected from mainstream health and social services. Unlike traditional service delivery, which assumes that clients will seek help, outreach reverses the direction of initiative, acknowledging that structural and psychological barriers often prevent homeless individuals with serious mental illness from accessing care even when it is theoretically available (McMurray-Avila, 2001; Ng and McQuiston, 2004). The street, the shelter, and other informal living environments become sites of intervention, and the relationship between worker and client becomes the primary vehicle through which services are negotiated and delivered.

Despite the intuitive appeal and moral urgency of outreach, its conceptualization and implementation have been far from uniform. Some programs emphasize voluntary engagement and client choice, reflecting a recovery-oriented philosophy that prioritizes autonomy and self-determination (Tsemberis and Elfenbein, 1999). Others adopt more assertive or even coercive approaches, justified by concerns about safety, incapacity, or chronic disengagement (Fisk, 2006). Still others focus primarily on specific outcomes such as housing placement, substance use reduction, or disability benefit acquisition (Chen et al., 2007; Corporation for Supportive Housing, 2006).

The diversity of outreach models is mirrored by a complex and sometimes contradictory evidence base. Randomized and quasi-experimental studies have demonstrated improvements in engagement, service utilization, and housing stability, yet effects on psychiatric symptoms and quality of life are often more modest or variable (Bybee et al., 1994; Bybee et al., 1995; Buhrich and Teesson, 1996). Qualitative and practice-based literature highlights the centrality of trust, communication, and cultural competence, but these dimensions are difficult to quantify and are often marginalized in policy debates (Able-Peterson and Bucy, 1993; Erickson and Page, 1999; Kraybill and Olivet, 2005).

At the same time, outreach operates within broader systems of housing, income support, and health care that are themselves fragmented and under strain. Mainstream systems frequently fail to accommodate the complex needs of homeless persons with mental illness, producing what has been described as a “safety net with holes” through which the most vulnerable routinely fall (Charles and Helen Schwab Foundation, 2003). Even the most skilled outreach worker cannot secure housing in a market where affordable units are scarce or obtain disability benefits in a bureaucratic system that is slow and rigid (Cooper et al., 2009; Dennis et al., 2007).

The challenge, therefore, is not simply to evaluate whether outreach programs work but to understand how they function as part of a multilayered ecology of relationships, institutions, and policies. Lomas et al. (2005) argue that effective health system guidance must combine multiple forms of evidence, including research, professional expertise, and contextual knowledge. Applying this principle to homelessness and mental illness suggests the need for a framework that integrates clinical outcomes, social processes, and systems-level dynamics.

This article responds to that need by developing a comprehensive, evidence-informed framework for outreach and engagement with homeless persons who have severe mental illness. Drawing exclusively on the provided references, it synthesizes decades of scholarship and practice into a coherent theoretical model that connects micro-level engagement, meso-level program design, and macro-level systems integration. The central argument is that outreach is most effective when it is understood not as an isolated intervention but as a relational and institutional bridge that links marginalized individuals to coordinated networks of housing, income, and health supports.

The literature gap addressed here lies in the fragmentation of existing knowledge. While numerous studies examine specific programs or techniques, fewer attempt to integrate these findings into a unified conceptual structure that can guide policy and practice across diverse contexts (Morse et al., 1996; Wasmer, 1998). By bringing together clinical, social psychological, and systems-level perspectives, this article aims to provide such a structure and to offer a foundation for more coherent and effective health system responses to homelessness and severe mental illness.

METHODOLOGY

The methodological foundation of this article is grounded in the principles of evidence integration articulated by Lomas et al. (2005), who argue that health system guidance must be based on the deliberate combination of multiple types of evidence rather than on any single hierarchy of methods. In the context of homelessness and mental illness, this means drawing simultaneously on quantitative outcome studies, qualitative descriptions of practice, policy analyses, and theoretical frameworks. The present article therefore employs a narrative-integrative approach that synthesizes findings and concepts from the provided references into a unified analytical structure.

The primary data sources consist of the peer-reviewed articles, program evaluations, training manuals, policy reports, and measurement guides listed in the reference set. These sources were treated not merely as discrete empirical contributions but as elements of a broader intellectual and practical tradition. Outreach and engagement are understood here as evolving constructs shaped by clinical innovation, social movements, and policy reforms over time (Jahiel, 1992; Bassuk, 1994; Wasmer, 1998).

A key methodological decision was to avoid privileging randomized controlled trials or any other single form of evidence. While studies such as those by Bybee et al. (1994; 1995) and Buhrich and Teesson (1996) provide valuable quantitative insights into program effects, they cannot capture the full complexity of outreach relationships or the systemic barriers faced by homeless individuals. Conversely, practice manuals and qualitative accounts offer rich descriptions of engagement processes but may lack generalizability (Able-Peterson and Bucy, 1993; Erickson and Page, 1999; Kraybill, 2002). Following Lomas et al. (2005), the article integrates these diverse forms of knowledge to produce guidance that is both empirically grounded and contextually sensitive.

Outcome measurement is another methodological pillar of the analysis. The Brief Symptom Inventory, developed and validated by Derogatis and colleagues, is used in several outreach evaluations to quantify changes in psychiatric symptoms (Derogatis and Melisaratos, 1983; Derogatis, 1993). The inclusion of this instrument in the reference set underscores the importance of reliable and valid measurement even in non-traditional service settings. Rather than presenting statistical results, the article interprets how such instruments function within outreach programs and how they contribute to evidence-based practice.

At the systems level, the methodology incorporates policy analysis and programmatic case studies such as the ACCESS initiative described by Cocozza et al. (2000) and the supportive housing models advanced by the Corporation for Supportive Housing (2005; 2006). These sources provide insight into how outreach interacts with housing, income support, and mental health systems, allowing for a multilevel analysis that connects individual engagement to institutional change.

The synthesis process involved identifying recurring themes across the references, including engagement and trust, assertiveness and voluntariness, family involvement, housing and income supports, and interagency coordination. These themes were then organized into a conceptual framework that links micro-, meso-, and macro-level processes. Throughout the analysis, every major claim is grounded in the cited literature, ensuring that the resulting framework remains firmly anchored in the evidence base provided.

RESULTS

The integrated analysis of the referenced literature reveals a complex but coherent set of findings regarding the effectiveness and dynamics of outreach to homeless persons with severe mental illness. At the most basic level, there is broad consensus that outreach increases engagement with services compared to passive or clinic-based approaches (Morse et al., 1996; Wasmer, 1998; Ng and McQuiston, 2004). Engagement here is not limited to initial contact but includes sustained relationships, acceptance of treatment, and participation in housing and support programs.

Quantitative evaluations provide some of the clearest evidence for these effects. Bybee et al. (1994) found that outreach programs produced significant short-term improvements in service utilization and housing stability, while longer-term follow-up indicated that these gains could be sustained when programs maintained contact and support over time (Bybee et al., 1995). Similarly, Buhrich and Teesson (1996) reported that a psychiatric outreach service for homeless individuals with schizophrenia led to improvements in clinical and social outcomes, demonstrating that even severe and chronic mental illness is responsive to field-based intervention.

The process through which these outcomes are achieved is illuminated by qualitative and practice-oriented literature. Able-Peterson and Bucy (1993) emphasize that street-based engagement requires specialized skills in communication, crisis management, and cultural sensitivity. Outreach workers must be able to enter the client’s world without imposing institutional norms prematurely, creating a space in which trust can develop. Erickson and Page (1999) describe this process as “dancing with grace,” highlighting the delicate balance between persistence and respect that characterizes effective outreach.

Social psychological research further clarifies why engagement is often so difficult and why outreach can make a difference. Christian (2003) and Christian and Abrams (2004) show that social identification, perceived norms, and attitudes toward service providers strongly influence whether homeless individuals will use outreach services. When programs are perceived as aligned with the client's identity and values, uptake is higher; when they are associated with stigma or coercion, resistance increases. These findings underscore the importance of relational and symbolic dimensions of outreach, beyond the mere availability of services.

Assertive outreach models, which involve more intensive and proactive engagement, have been shown to be particularly effective for individuals with substance use disorders and histories of disengagement (Fisk, 2006). However, Tsemberis and Elfenbein (1999) caution that assertiveness must be balanced with respect for autonomy, as overly coercive approaches can undermine trust and long-term recovery. The evidence suggests that programs that emphasize voluntary participation while maintaining consistent contact achieve better and more ethically defensible outcomes.

Family involvement emerges as another important dimension of effective outreach. Dixon et al. (1998) found that including families in outreach interventions for homeless persons with severe mental illness can enhance engagement and support recovery, particularly when family members are themselves provided with education and resources. This finding challenges the assumption that homelessness necessarily entails social isolation and highlights the potential of relational networks as assets in outreach work.

At the systems level, the results are equally compelling. The ACCESS program described by Cocozza et al. (2000) demonstrates that integrated service systems can dramatically improve outcomes for homeless persons with mental illness by coordinating mental health care, housing, and income supports. Similarly, supportive housing initiatives documented by the Corporation for Supportive Housing (2005; 2006) show that when stable housing is combined with ongoing services, costs decrease and outcomes improve across multiple domains.

Income support, particularly disability benefits, is another crucial factor. Chen et al. (2007) found that outreach programs can significantly increase the receipt of disability benefits among homeless veterans, providing a stable income that facilitates housing and treatment adherence. Dennis et al. (2007) further show that targeted strategies to expedite access to Social Security benefits can remove a major barrier to stability for homeless individuals with disabilities.

However, these positive results are constrained by broader structural conditions. The housing crisis for people with psychiatric disabilities documented by Cooper et al. (2009) illustrates that even the best outreach programs cannot succeed in isolation from the housing market. When affordable and supportive housing is scarce, outreach workers are left with limited options, and clients may cycle between the street, shelters, and temporary placements despite ongoing engagement.

Finally, the use of standardized outcome measures such as the Brief Symptom Inventory provides a way to document changes in psychological distress and symptom severity within outreach contexts (Derogatis, 1993; Derogatis and Melisaratos, 1983). These tools enable programs to demonstrate clinical impact, which is essential for securing funding and legitimacy within health systems.

Taken together, the results indicate that outreach is a powerful but context-dependent intervention. Its effectiveness is maximized when relational engagement, program design, and system integration are aligned in support of long-term stability and recovery.

DISCUSSION

The findings synthesized in this article invite a deeper theoretical interpretation of outreach and engagement as multidimensional phenomena that cannot be reduced to simple programmatic formulas. At the micro level, outreach operates through relationships. Trust, communication, and mutual recognition are not ancillary to service delivery; they are its core mechanisms (Morse et al., 1996; Kraybill and Olivet, 2005). The street-based context of outreach amplifies this relational dimension because traditional markers of authority and professionalism are less salient, and the worker’s credibility depends largely on their ability to listen, respect boundaries, and demonstrate reliability over time (Able-Peterson and Bucy, 1993; Erickson and Page, 1999).

From a social psychological perspective, these relationships are embedded in processes of identity and stigma. Homeless persons with severe mental illness are often positioned by society as deviant or incapable, and these labels shape their expectations of service providers (Christian, 2003; Christian and Abrams, 2004). Outreach that challenges these narratives by affirming clients’ agency and worth can alter not only behavior but self-concept, creating conditions for sustained engagement.

At the meso level, program design mediates between individual relationships and broader systems. The literature demonstrates that outreach programs vary widely in their philosophies and practices, from voluntary, recovery-oriented models to more assertive and directive approaches (Tsemberis and Elfenbein, 1999; Fisk, 2006). Rather than viewing these as mutually exclusive, the evidence suggests that effective programs calibrate their level of assertiveness to the needs and preferences of clients, maintaining flexibility and responsiveness over time (Ng and McQuiston, 2004).

Outcome studies by Bybee et al. (1994; 1995) highlight the importance of program duration and continuity. Short-term gains in engagement and housing can dissipate if contact is lost, underscoring the need for sustained investment. This has important implications for funding and policy, as many outreach programs operate on time-limited grants that are misaligned with the long-term nature of recovery and stability.

At the macro level, outreach is inseparable from the structure of housing, income, and health systems. The success of integrated initiatives such as ACCESS (Cocozza et al., 2000) and supportive housing programs (Corporation for Supportive Housing, 2005; 2006) illustrates that outreach is most powerful when it functions as a gateway into coordinated networks of care. Conversely, the persistence of fragmented systems and housing shortages limits what outreach can achieve, regardless of the dedication of individual workers (Czerwinski, 2002; Cooper et al., 2009).

The evidence-integration framework proposed by Lomas et al. (2005) provides a useful lens for understanding these dynamics. Quantitative data, qualitative insights, and contextual knowledge each illuminate different aspects of outreach, and none can be safely ignored. For example, symptom measures such as the Brief Symptom Inventory provide essential information about clinical change (Derogatis, 1993), but they must be interpreted alongside qualitative accounts of client experience and system barriers to capture the full meaning of those changes.

Limitations of the existing literature must also be acknowledged. Many studies focus on specific populations, such as veterans or individuals with schizophrenia, limiting generalizability (Buhrich and Teesson, 1996; Chen et al., 2007). Others are constrained by short follow-up periods or by the difficulty of maintaining contact with highly mobile populations (Bybee et al., 1995). Moreover, ethical debates about coercion and autonomy remain unresolved, particularly in contexts where public safety and individual rights intersect (Tsemberis and Elfenbein, 1999).

Future research and practice should therefore prioritize longitudinal designs, participatory methods, and system-level interventions. Outreach must be evaluated not only in terms of individual outcomes but also in terms of its capacity to transform the institutional environments that produce and sustain homelessness (Jahiel, 1992; Charles and Helen Schwab Foundation, 2003). Only by aligning relational, organizational, and policy dimensions can the full potential of outreach be realized.

CONCLUSION

Outreach to homeless persons with severe mental illness represents one of the most ethically significant and practically complex endeavors in contemporary health and social policy. The literature synthesized in this article demonstrates that outreach can and does make a difference, improving engagement, housing stability, service utilization, and, in many cases, mental health outcomes (Morse et al., 1996; Bybee et al., 1994; Buhrich and Teesson, 1996). Yet these achievements are neither automatic nor guaranteed. They depend on the quality of relationships, the design of programs, and the capacity of broader systems to support long-term stability and recovery.

By integrating evidence across micro-, meso-, and macro-levels, this article has proposed a comprehensive framework for understanding and guiding outreach practice. Central to this framework is the recognition that outreach is not merely a technique but a relational and institutional bridge that connects marginalized individuals to the resources and rights of citizenship. When that bridge is strong, flexible, and supported by coordinated systems of housing, income, and health care, it can carry people out of homelessness and toward inclusion. When it is weak or isolated, even the most dedicated efforts may falter.

Published Date: - 01-02-2026

E-ISSN: 2229-3213
P-ISSN: 2229-3205

The challenge for researchers, practitioners, and policymakers is therefore not simply to expand outreach but to embed it within evidence-informed, ethically grounded, and systemically integrated strategies. The references provided here offer a rich foundation for this task, and their collective insights point toward a future in which homelessness and severe mental illness are addressed not through fragmented interventions but through coherent and compassionate systems of care.

REFERENCES

1. Able-Peterson, T., & Bucy, J. (1993). The streetwork outreach training manual. Washington, DC: CASSP Technical Assistance Center, Georgetown University Child Development Center.
2. Bassuk, E. L. (1994). Community care for homeless clients with mental illness, substance abuse, or dual diagnosis. Newton, MA: The Better Homes Fund.
3. Buhrich, N., & Teesson, M. (1996). Impact of a psychiatric outreach service for homeless persons with schizophrenia. Psychiatric Services, 47, 644–646.
4. Bybee, D., Mowbray, C. T., & Cohen, E. (1994). Short versus longer term effectiveness of an outreach program for the homeless mentally ill. American Journal of Community Psychology, 22, 181–209.
5. Bybee, D., Mowbray, C. T., & Cohen, E. H. (1995). Evaluation of a homeless mentally ill outreach program: Differential short-term effects. Evaluation and Program Planning, 18, 13–24.
6. Charles and Helen Schwab Foundation. (2003). Holes in the safety net: Mainstream systems and homelessness. San Mateo, CA: Charles and Helen Schwab Foundation.
7. Chen, J. H., Rosenheck, R. A., Kasprow, W. J., et al. (2007). Receipt of disability through an outreach program for homeless veterans. Military Medicine, 172, 461–465.
8. Christian, J. (2003). The effects of social identification, norms and attitudes on use of outreach services. Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 13, 138–157.
9. Christian, J., & Abrams, D. (2004). A tale of two cities: Predicting homeless people’s uptake of outreach programs. Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 26, 169–182.
10. Cocozza, J. J., Steadman, H. J., Dennis, D. L., Blasinsky, M., Randolph, F. L., Johnsen, M., & Goldman, H. H. (2000). Successful systems integration strategies: The ACCESS program for persons who are homeless and mentally ill. Administration and Policy in Mental Health, 27, 395–407.
11. Cooper, E., Korman, H., O’Hara, A., & Zovistoski, A. (2009). Priced out in 2008: The housing crisis for people with psychiatric disabilities. Boston: Technical Assistance Collaborative, Inc.
12. Corporation for Supportive Housing. (2005). How public leaders change multiple systems: Reducing costs and improving outcomes through supportive housing. New York, NY: Corporation for Supportive Housing.
13. Corporation for Supportive Housing & The National Center on Family Homelessness. (2006). The role of permanent supportive housing in addressing family homelessness. New York, NY: Corporation for Supportive Housing.
14. Czerwinski, S. J. (2002). Homelessness: Improving program coordination and client access to programs. Washington, DC: U.S. General Accounting Office.

Published Date: - 01-02-2026

E-ISSN: 2229-3213
P-ISSN: 2229-3205

15. Dennis, D., Perret, Y., Seaman, A., & Wells, S. M. (2007). Expediting access to SSA disability benefits: Promising practices for people who are homeless. Delmar, NY: Policy Research Associates, Inc.

16. Derogatis, L. R. (1993). Brief Symptom Inventory administration, scoring, and procedures manual (3rd ed.). Minneapolis, MN: National Computer Systems.

17. Derogatis, L. R., & Melisaratos, N. (1983). The Brief Symptom Inventory: An introductory report. Psychological Medicine, 13, 596–605.

18. Dixon, L., Stewart, B., Krauss, N., et al. (1998). The participation of families of homeless persons with severe mental illness in an outreach intervention. Community Mental Health Journal, 34, 251–259.

19. Erickson, S., & Page, J. (1999). To dance with grace: Outreach and engagement to persons on the street. 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; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

20. Fisk, D. (2006). Assertive outreach: An effective strategy for engaging homeless persons with substance use disorders into treatment. American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse, 32, 479–486.

21. Goering, P., Wasylenki, D., Lindsay, S., et al. (1997). Process and outcome in a hostel outreach program for homeless clients with severe mental illness. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 67, 607–617.

22. Jahiel, R. I. (1992). Homelessness: A prevention-oriented approach. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins Press.

23. Jones, A., & Scannell, T. (1997). Outreach interventions for the homeless mentally ill. British Dental Nursing Journal, 6, 1236–1243.

24. Kraybill, K. (2002). Outreach to people experiencing homelessness: A curriculum for training health care for the homeless outreach workers. Nashville, TN: National Health Care for the Homeless Council.

25. Kraybill, K., & Olivet, J. (2005). Communication and connection. In K. Kraybill & J. Olivet (Eds.), Shelter health: Essentials of care for people living in shelter (pp. 141–156). Nashville, TN: National Health Care for the Homeless Council.

26. Lomas, J., Culyer, T., McCutcheon, C., et al. (2005). Conceptualizing and combining evidence for health system guidance. Ottawa: Canadian Health Services Research Foundation.

27. McMurray-Avila, M. (2001). Outreach. In M. McMurray-Avila (Ed.), Organizing health services for homeless people: A practical guide (pp. 166–180).

28. Morse, G. A., Calsyn, R. J., Miller, J., et al. (1996). Outreach to homeless mentally ill people: Conceptual and clinical considerations. Community Mental Health Journal, 32, 261–274.

29. National Resource Center on Homelessness and Mental Illness. (1999). In from the cold: A tool kit for creating safe havens for homeless people on the street. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

30. Ng, A., & McQuiston, H. (2004). Outreach to the homeless: Craft, science, and future implications. Journal of Psychiatric Practice, 10, 95–105.

31. Randell, G., & Brown, S. (1995). Outreach and resettlement work with people sleeping rough. London: Department of Environment.

Published Date: - 01-02-2026

E-ISSN: 2229-3213
P-ISSN: 2229-3205

32. Sacks, S., Skinner, D., Sacks, J., & Peck, A. (2002). Manual for engaging homeless mentally ill chemical abusers in a modified TC shelter program. New York, NY: National Development and Research Institutes, Inc.

33. Tsemberis, S., & Elfenbein, C. (1999). A perspective on voluntary and involuntary outreach services for the homeless mentally ill. New Directions for Mental Health Services, 82, 9–19.

34. Wasmer, D. (1998). Engagement of persons who are homeless and have serious mental illness: An overview of the literature and review of practices by eight successful programs. Chicago, IL: De Paul University.