

**‘Hard-to-Reach’ or ‘Hardly Reached’? Underservice,
Marginalisation and Inequity in Care**

JACKSON, Debra <<http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5252-5325>>, BOND, Carmel <<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9945-8577>>, WATSON, Adrianna and CLEARY, Michelle <<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1453-4850>>

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<https://shura.shu.ac.uk/37606/>

This document is the Accepted Version [AM]

Citation:

JACKSON, Debra, BOND, Carmel, WATSON, Adrianna and CLEARY, Michelle (2026). ‘Hard-to-Reach’ or ‘Hardly Reached’? Underservice, Marginalisation and Inequity in Care. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing*, 35 (3): e70286. [Article]

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

‘Hard-to-reach’ or ‘Hardly Reached’? Underservice, Marginalisation, and Inequity in Care

Abstract

In mental health care, the term ‘hard-to-reach’ is frequently used in relation to individuals and populations who have reduced access and engagement with services. While positioned as a neutral term, this term can conceal and minimise the multiple factors influencing access to and engagement with care. It also clearly places the responsibility for disengagement as an individual decision or failing, removing responsibility from services themselves. In this paper, we consider the term ‘hard-to-reach’ and provide a counter-framing of ‘hardly reached’ to centre patterns of underservice within mental health services and systems. Using the phenomenon of being unhoused as a lens, we consider how language informs assumptions about people and populations. We propose that the label ‘hard-to-reach’ operates discursively to redirect attention from service limitations and reinforce deficit-based positioning of marginalised people and populations. Contrary to this framing, the concept of ‘hardly reached’ refocuses attention back to the ways in which service design contributes to disengagement with care services. We highlight the obligations of mental health services and systems to recognise and effectively address structural barriers. We argue that embracing a ‘hardly reached’ position provides us with a more ethically responsive and socially just framework for understanding and addressing systemic inequities in mental health care.

Aims

The aim of this paper is to critically examine the use of the term ‘hard-to-reach’ in mental health contexts, and to advance the counter-framing of ‘hardly reached’ to foreground patterns of systematic underservice. Using homelessness as a lens, we critically examine how the term ‘hard-to-reach’ operates to produce and sustain marginalisation and exclusion within mental health care systems. Drawing on a critical social perspective, our analysis interrogates how the label ‘hard-to-reach’ shapes assumptions about responsibility, engagement, and risk, while obscuring the structural, organisational, and ethical conditions that shape mental health care delivery. In doing so, we reframe engagement as a shared and socially situated process and consider the implications of this reframing for mental health nurses as clinicians, advocates, and ethical actors.

Background and conceptual framing

Mental health nursing has a longstanding commitment to relational care, advocacy, and responsiveness to people experiencing vulnerability and social exclusion. People who experience homelessness often present with complex and intersecting mental health needs shaped by trauma, poverty, substance use, physical illness, family violence, and repeated encounters with systems that have failed to meet their needs (Hollingdrake et al., 2025). Within mental health and other health services, however, these populations are frequently characterised as ‘hard-to-reach’ (Lin et al., 2019).

In health and social research, the term ‘hard-to-reach’ is commonly used to describe population groups who experience limited or inconsistent engagement with services or research initiatives. Yet the concept is applied variably and often without theoretical clarity, contributing to inconsistencies in who is rendered visible within the evidence base (Törnävä et al., 2025). Critically, such labels risk obscuring the structural, relational, and institutional conditions that shape access to care, implicitly locating difficulty within individuals rather than within research practices and service systems. As Fry

et al. (2022) argue, it may be more accurate to interrogate how researchers and institutions themselves are positioned as inaccessible through methodological, ethical, and gatekeeping processes that exclude the voices most in need of being heard.

When disengagement is framed as an individual or group characteristic, limited engagement with services can appear to occur in isolation, rather than as a reflection of broader patterns of marginalisation, social exclusion, and the cumulative effects of stigma associated with particular life circumstances and identities. Marginalisation contributes to physical and emotional health inequalities by constraining lifestyle choices and fostering social isolation (Cleary et al., 2014). Those living on the social and economic margins frequently encounter daily challenges linked to relative or absolute poverty, discrimination, alienation, and victimisation. These conditions indirectly affect health by reinforcing disempowerment and disengagement, leading to lower participation in mainstream mental health services, treatment, and recovery programmes; services that may exist but are not always accessible in practice (Cleary et al., 2014).

Beyond shaping patterns of service engagement, marginalisation functions as a direct mechanism of psychological harm. Social disconnection, including isolation, exclusion from meaningful social roles, and stigmatising or low-quality relationships, exerts independent and, in some cases, causal effects on mental health outcomes. Effects have been shown to persist even after adjustment for socioeconomic status, physical health, and baseline mental illness, indicating that social disconnection and marginalisation create a distinct pathway to psychological morbidity (Holt-Lunstad, 2024). Thus, people experiencing homelessness can enter cycles in which marginalisation both worsens mental health and is intensified by it, further constraining recovery, maintenance, and sustained engagement with care.

Groups most commonly described as ‘hard-to-reach’ include people experiencing homelessness, those who use illicit substances, and individuals engaged in sex work. These populations are not absent from society but positioned at its margins, where poverty, unstable housing, criminalisation, and unmet mental health needs disrupt sustained engagement with services (Lin et al., 2019). Framing these populations as ‘hard-to-reach’ risks shifting attention away from institutional practices and service design, while subtly positioning disengagement as an individual failure. Language in health care does not merely describe reality; it actively shapes how problems are understood, where responsibility is located, and which responses are considered legitimate (Koerber & Renshaw, 2021). Labels such as ‘hard-to-reach’ function discursively, shaping assumptions about engagement, risk, and ethical care, while leaving the limitations of services largely unexamined.

In this paper, we adopt the counter-framing of ‘hardly reached’ to redirect attention from presumed individual disengagement to patterns of systematic underservice within mental health systems. Using homelessness as a lens, we critically examine how the term ‘hard-to-reach’ operates to produce and sustain marginalisation and exclusion within care. We consider how this reframing reshapes understandings of engagement, responsibility, and ethical practice, and consider the implications for mental health nurses as clinicians, advocates, and ethical actors working within structurally constrained environments. While critiques of the term ‘hard-to-reach’ exist, this paper extends that work by offering a sustained ethical and nursing-focused analysis of how language, risk practices, and service design interact to produce systematic underservice in mental health care.

Design

This perspectives paper contributes a critical discursive analysis of a commonly used term in mental health practice, demonstrating how language shapes ethical responsibility, service expectations, and patterns of exclusion in care. It is informed by a critical social perspective. In this paper we do not present empirical data or a systematic review; rather, we offer a critical analysis of how the term ‘hard-to-reach’ operates within mental health contexts and advances the counter-framing of ‘hardly

reached' to illuminate patterns of marginalisation, underservice, and ethical care, with particular relevance for mental health nurses. While homelessness is used here as an illustrative lens, the analysis has relevance for other populations routinely positioned as 'hard-to-reach' within mental health systems.

Method

In this paper we draw on critical engagement with nursing, mental health, and homelessness literature, alongside ethical reflection relevant to mental health nursing. A critical social lens is used to examine how language, policy contexts, and organisational arrangements shape understandings of engagement, responsibility, and care. The analysis focuses on the discursive function of the term 'hard-to-reach', and the counter-framing of 'hardly reached', and their implications for marginalisation, underservice, and ethical responsibility, rather than on evaluating specific interventions or service models.

'Hard-to-reach' and Hardly Reached: A Discursive Reframing

The term 'hard-to-reach' is widely used in health services to describe populations who experience barriers to sustained engagement with care. On the surface, it appears neutral and pragmatic, signalling complexity rather than blame. However, as a discursive label, it does important work. It frames disengagement as a characteristic of particular groups rather than as a relational or systemic outcome, and it subtly positions services as the default norm against which individuals are measured.

Empirical evidence also suggests that labels and shorthand descriptors can shape clinicians' interpretations and actions in real time, contributing to disparities in assessment and responsiveness for people experiencing homelessness (Martineau Jackson et al., 2025). In this way, 'hard-to-reach' can function less as a neutral description than as a cue that normalises reduced expectations of care, drawing attention away from how services are organised, accessed, and, at times, effectively withheld within health systems.

When people experiencing homelessness are described as 'hard-to-reach', the implication is often that services are available and appropriate, but that individuals are unwilling or unable to engage in expected ways. This framing risks masking the extent to which mental health services are organised around assumptions of stability, predictability, and compliance that are fundamentally misaligned with the realities of lived homelessness. Research on women's experiences of homelessness highlights how pathways into homelessness are often shaped by cumulative trauma across the life course, including abuse, neglect, mental and physical illness, and economic precarity (Phipps et al., 2021). Such histories increase vulnerability while also exposing individuals to stigmatised and stereotyped representations that further undermine access to care. Interventions designed to offer protection or support can themselves become sites of harm when they fail to account for cumulative trauma, autonomy needs, and the lived realities of those they seek to serve (Welker et al., 2025). Well-intentioned service responses may inadvertently reproduce control, surveillance, or stigma (Welker et al., 2025), thereby generating new psychological distress or exacerbating existing mental health challenges rather than alleviating them.

The counter-term 'hardly reached' has been used in health services research to shift attention from presumed individual disengagement to the ways services and their boundaries shape who is reached and on what terms (Wallace et al., 2019). Related critiques have similarly reframed so-called 'hard-to-reach' groups as 'easy to ignore' and point instead to 'hard-to-reach-services' thus highlighting the institutional design and practice, rather than individual deficit, that determine who is reached and on what terms (MacFarlane & LeMaster, 2022). From a 'hardly reached' perspective, then, the problem is less that people fail to engage and more that systems fail to integrate and adapt. Staff in one homeless health service identified service gaps centred on mainstream integration, workforce configuration, and organisational governance constraints that shape who can be reached and how (Thompson et al., 2025). For people experiencing homelessness, this configuration means that mental

health care is often reliably available at the point of crisis, through emergency departments, police-linked triage pathways, or involuntary admission, so that being ‘hardly reached’ becomes a predictable feature of service design rather than a matter of personal disengagement (McNeill et al., 2022).

Less visible in the ‘hard-to-reach’ framing are the limits of system capacity, flexibility, and moral courage, particularly within services operating under resource constraint, risk aversion, and organisational pressure. Appointment-based systems, rigid eligibility criteria, time-limited interventions, and fragmented care pathways shape who is reached and who is not. These patterns are also reproduced at the point of contact, where busy, high-pressure environments amplify reliance on rapid judgements, and people experiencing homelessness may be assessed less thoroughly or effectively set aside, despite clinicians stated intentions to remain impartial (Martineau Jackson et al., 2025).

From a critical social standpoint, the language of ‘hard-to-reach’ can therefore be understood as a form of symbolic boundary-making. It delineates those who fit within dominant models of care from those who do not, while rendering service structures themselves largely invisible. For mental health nurses, working within this discourse can constrain how care is conceptualised and justified, even when nurses recognise its limitations. As a result, exclusion can become normalised within everyday practice, not through lack of care or intent, but through discourses that make some forms of need appear misaligned with what services are able or willing to provide.

Reframing these populations as ‘hardly reached’ shifts the analytic focus from individualised notions of disengagement to the patterned ways in which mental health systems underserve those positioned at their margins. The term foregrounds how service design, eligibility criteria, risk frameworks, and organisational priorities shape access to care, often resulting in delayed, fragmented, or absent support. Rather than reflecting distance from care, being ‘hardly reached’ signals systematic exclusion and helps make visible the links between language, service organisation, and persistent mental health inequities. These inequities are lived as well as structured; qualitative accounts of transitioning out of homelessness describe being “discarded from everyday life” and struggling to reconnect with society (Hyun et al., 2025), alongside profound invisibility, loneliness, and a sense of being unseen within systems intended to provide care (Jackson & Usher, 2024; Jackson 2025).

When Systems are Hard to Access

Reframing the issue as one of systems that are hard to access rather than people who are ‘hard-to-reach’ shifts attention to the structural and organisational dimensions of care. Mental health services are often designed around assumptions of stable housing, reliable professional communication, recovery-oriented person-centred care, collaboration, and consistent patterns of attendance. For people experiencing homelessness, these assumptions rarely hold. Instead, everyday life is often dominated by the exhausting and consuming work of securing safety, shelter, and basic survival, alongside the management of constant threats, leaving little capacity for navigating complex (and siloed) health systems. Stigma, discrimination, and communication barriers, including a lack of phones or stable contact details, can further complicate engagement. Eligibility thresholds based on acuity, substance use, or perceived risk can exclude individuals with complex but fluctuating needs. Access to care may be effectively crisis-gated, with service capacity constraints and long waiting times disrupting continuity and limiting sustained engagement (Ferris-Day et al., 2025).

Intersectional considerations also need to be examined when considering unmet needs (Graells-Sans, Insa-Calderón, Sanclemente-Dalmau, et al., 2025). Gender, age, culture, sexuality, disability, and dual diagnosis can all influence how language (and subsequent care) is used, which can disempower individuals, amplify stereotypes, and perpetuate stigma. This can lead to shame and exclusion, further increasing risk. For example, when a woman experiencing homelessness encounters discrimination, it

cannot be attributed to a single factor, as her experiences of care and treatment are also shaped by the intersection of multiple identities and circumstances, such as gendered assumptions, socioeconomic status, culture, and stigma around homelessness, which interact to create systemic forms of disadvantage and bias. These identities can intersect with her housing insecurity, shaping how she is perceived and treated. For instance, medical misogyny might lead healthcare providers to dismiss her symptoms as emotional, while racial stereotypes and socioeconomic bias further influence the quality of care she receives.

These systemic features are not neutral; they actively shape patterns of engagement and disengagement. When services are inflexible, individuals must adapt to systems rather than systems adapting to people. The label 'hard-to-reach' can then function as a shorthand that normalises this misalignment, deflecting attention away from critical reflection on service design. Evidence from a specialist Homeless Health Service shows that "access problems" are often produced by service design and system fragmentation, particularly weak integration with mainstream health services and the need to adapt existing models of care (Thompson et al., 2025).

Mental health nurses are often acutely aware of these constraints yet may have limited capacity to alter them (Cleary, 2025). Recognising systems as potential barriers rather than neutral providers helps reframe disengagement as a shared outcome of structural conditions rather than individual failure, opening space for ethical reflection, advocacy, and resistance to deficit-based narratives. Thompson et al. (2025) also highlight that even when nurses are positioned to provide wraparound, preventative, and crisis-oriented care, their capacity to do so depends on workforce development, clearer specialty pathways, and governance processes that manage risk without defaulting to exclusion. This is where mental health nursing advocacy becomes indispensable: nurses can (and arguably must) contest policies, throughput logics, and risk frameworks that institutionalise underservice, and advocate for service models that make sustained, relationship-based care possible.

Risk, Control, and Ethical Tensions in Practice

Risk occupies a central place in mental health care, shaping decisions about admission, treatment, and discharge. In the context of homelessness, risk assessments are often heightened, with concerns about self-harm, substance use, violence, and vulnerability intersecting in complex ways. Within risk-averse organisational cultures, these concerns are frequently managed through practices that prioritise containment, surveillance, and control over relational engagement and sustained care. For people experiencing homelessness, encounters with mental health services may therefore be characterised by surveillance, coercion, or conditional care (Kerman et al., 2023). Involuntary admissions, compulsory treatment, and discharge to unstable environments raise significant ethical questions about autonomy, beneficence, and justice. While such decisions are commonly justified as necessary for safety, they can also reinforce mistrust, deepen disengagement, and reproduce the very risks they seek to manage. When viewed through a 'hardly reached' lens these risk-saturated encounters illustrate how people may be seen (and acted upon) in moments of acute risk yet remain structurally underserved in the ongoing 'relational' care that may prevent future crises from reoccurring (Martineau Jackson et al. (2025).

Mental health nurses frequently find themselves navigating these ethical tensions at the frontline of care. They are tasked with balancing professional commitments to care and advocacy with organisational expectations around risk management and throughput. Within this context, the language of 'hard-to-reach' can obscure these tensions by framing disengagement as a patient characteristic, rather than as an outcome of ethically complex, risk-saturated practice environments. Viewing these dynamics through a critical social lens highlights how power operates within mental health systems and how ethical responsibility is distributed. It also makes visible the moral labour undertaken by nurses who must enact care within systems that simultaneously demand control, efficiency, and risk minimisation. In such contexts, being 'hardly reached' is not an unintended consequence of risk

management, but a predictable outcome of systems in which safety is prioritised over care, and control over connection.

Engagement as a Shared and Social Responsibility

Dominant discourses in mental health care often conceptualise engagement as an individual responsibility (Salmon & Hall, 2003), linked to insight, motivation, and compliance. From this perspective, disengagement signals a lack of readiness for care. A critical social reframing challenges this assumption, positioning engagement as relational, contextual, and socially produced, rather than as a fixed attribute of individuals. Engagement is shaped by trust, past experiences of care, material conditions, and the responsiveness of services. For people experiencing homelessness, engagement may look different from what services expect. It may be episodic rather than continuous, pragmatic rather than therapeutic, or focused on immediate needs rather than long-term recovery goals. Recognising these forms of engagement requires flexibility and attentiveness, rather than deficit-based judgements about motivation or compliance. In health services targeting people experiencing homelessness, staff describe the central challenge as system integration and model-of-care limitations, conditions that make people hardly reached rather than inherently ‘hard-to-reach’ (Thompson et al., 2025).

In practice, reframing engagement as a shared responsibility opens space for critical reflection on language use, practice norms, and ethical priorities. It invites consideration of how services might adapt to better meet people where they are, rather than expecting individuals to conform to service expectations that may be unrealistic or exclusionary. Such a reframing also legitimises advocacy, self-determination, flexibility, and relational work as core dimensions of ethical mental health care and nursing practice, rather than as discretionary or exceptional practices.

Conclusions

The use of the term ‘hard-to-reach’ in the mental health context with people experiencing homelessness reflects more than descriptive convenience; it reveals underlying assumptions about responsibility, normality, and care. We argue that the use of this language risks obscuring the structural and organisational factors that shape engagement, while placing the burden of disengagement on individuals who are already socially marginalised.

Reframing the issue as one of systems that are difficult to access, and of engagement as a shared and socially situated process, allows for a more ethically attuned understanding of care and responsibility within mental health systems. This perspective does not deny the challenges inherent in working with complex needs, nor does it diminish the constraints faced by nurses. Instead, it offers a way to make visible the ethical tensions embedded in everyday practice and to resist narratives that individualise structural failure, while reaffirming care, advocacy, and relational engagement as ethical imperatives rather than optional extras.

Relevance for Clinical Practice

For mental health nurses, adopting a critical social perspective on language and engagement may support more reflective and ethically responsive practice. Attending to how terms such as ‘hard-to-reach’ shape thinking and decision-making can prompt critical examination of service assumptions, risk practices, and documentation norms. This may include deliberately avoiding deficit-based descriptors in clinical documentation, advocating for flexible engagement pathways, or making visible system barriers during multidisciplinary decision-making.

Recognising engagement as relational and context-dependent may also legitimise flexible, creative, and advocacy-oriented approaches to care, particularly when working with people who are routinely and systematically ‘hardly reached’ by existing services. For mental health nurses, this involves

recognising that language is never a neutral description but a form of everyday clinical practice in its own right, one that can either reproduce deficit-based framings (hard to reach) or foreground the structural and organisational barriers (hardly reached) in documentation, handovers and multidisciplinary discussions.

At a broader level, this reframing highlights the importance of organisational and policy contexts in shaping what care is possible. Mental health nurses are well-positioned to contribute to critical conversations about service design, equity, and ethical responsibility, particularly in relation to populations experiencing homelessness and others who are marginalised within mental health systems. Engaging with these issues collectively, rather than locating responsibility solely at the level of individual practice, aligns with nursing's longstanding commitment to care, social justice, and responsiveness to those at the margins.

References

- Cleary, M., Horsfall, J., & Escott, P. (2014). Marginalization and associated concepts and processes in relation to mental health/illness. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 35(3), 224–226. <https://doi.org/10.3109/01612840.2014.883792>
- Cleary, M. (2025). Psychiatric mental health nursing: Using our experience to shape our future focus. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.16980>
- Ferris-Day, P., Harvey, C., Minton, C., & Donaldson, A. (2025). Exploring the Challenges of Context in Accessing Mental Health Support in Rural New Zealand: A Case Study Approach. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 81(7), 4038-4051. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.16577>
- Fry, S. L., Kelly, D. M., & Bennett, C. (2023). Inclusive research: Repositioning the “hard to reach”. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 79(8), 2779-2781. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.15555>
- Graells-Sans, A., Insa-Calderón, E., Sanclemente-Dalmau, M., & Coll-Planas, G. (2025). Inequalities in the Everyday of Care: Dimensions of the Incorporation of Intersectional Theory in Nursing Practice. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 81, 6789-6802. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.16821>
- Hollingdrake, O., River, J., Vasquez-Hernandez, A., Grech, E., & Currie, J. (2025). A Qualitative Study Exploring Nursing Scope of Practice for the Care of People Experiencing Homelessness. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.70039>.
- Holt-Lunstad, J. (2024). Social connection as a critical factor for mental and physical health: evidence, trends, challenges, and future implications. *World Psychiatry*, 23(3), 312–332.. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.21224>
- Hyun, M. S., Nam, K. A., Park, E., & Kim, J. J. (2025). Transition from homelessness to becoming housed: A qualitative study. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 81, 1450–1462. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.16326>
- Jackson, D., & Usher, K. (2024). Homelessness: A health and social crisis. *International Journal of Mental Health Nursing*, 33(6), 2382-2385. <https://doi.org/10.1111/inm.13437>
- Jackson, D. (2025). Homelessness and the Moral Imagination of Nursing: Bearing Witness in an Unequal World. *Public Health Nursing*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/phn.70048>
- Jackson, D., Watson, A., Bond, C., & Cleary, M. (2025). When Care Colludes: Nursing and Medical Misogyny. *Nursing Inquiry*, 33(1), e70066. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nin.70066>.
- Kerman, N., Kidd, S. A., & Stergiopoulos, V. (2023). Involuntary hospitalization and coercive treatment of people with mental illness experiencing homelessness—going backward with foreseeable harms. *JAMA Psychiatry*, 80(6), 531-532. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2023.0537>
- Koerber, A., & Renshaw, K. (2021). Clinician–patient communication: Gender influences. In *How sex and gender impact clinical practice: An evidence-based guide to patient care* (pp. 9–19). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-816569-0.00002-4>
- Lin, D., Zhang, C. Y., He, Z. K., & Zhao, X. D. . (2019). How does ‘hard-to-reach’ status affect antiretroviral therapy adherence in the HIV-infected population? Results from a meta-analysis of observational studies. *BMC Public Health*, 19, 789. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-7135-0>
- MacFarlane, A., & LeMaster, J. (2022). Disrupting patterns of exclusion in participatory spaces: involving people from vulnerable populations. *Health Expectations*, 25(5), 2031. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hex.13578>

- Martineau Jackson, K. Y., Vogelsmeier, A., Brandt, L., Popejoy, L., & Sherwin, L. B. (2025). Experiences of Emergency Triage Nurses and Evidence of Bias in the Assessment of People Experiencing Homelessness. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.70336>.
- McNeill, S., O'Donovan, D., & Hart, N. (2022). Access to healthcare for people experiencing homelessness in the UK and Ireland: A scoping review. *BMC Health Services Research*, 22(1), 910. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-022-08265-y>
- Phipps, M., Dalton, L., Maxwell, H., & Cleary, M. (2021). A qualitative exploration of women's resilience in the face of homelessness. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 49(5), 1212–1227. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jcop.22574>
- Rokach, A. (2019). *Loneliness of marginalized*. In A. Rokach (Ed.), *The psychological journey to and from loneliness* (pp. 173–206). Academic Press. [https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-815618-9536\(03\)00063-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-815618-9536(03)00063-7)
- Salmon, P., & Hall, G. M. (2003). Patient empowerment and control: A psychological discourse in the service of medicine. *Social Science & Medicine*, 57(10), 1969–1980. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536\(03\)00063-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(03)00063-7)
- Thompson, C., Morris, D., Larkin, M., McWilliams, L., Vasquez-Hernandez, A., & Currie, J. (2025). Optimising the Nursing Scope of Practice in a Homeless Health Service: A Qualitative Descriptive Study. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 81, 4187-4197. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.16633>
- Törnävä, M., Palonen, M., Harju, E., Haapa, T., Rissanen, M.-L., & Kylmä, J. (2025). Hard-To-Reach and Hidden Groups in Health-Related Research: A Scoping Review. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 81(9), 5793–5805. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jan.16779>
- Wallace, C., Farmer, J., & McCosker, A. (2019). Boundary spanning practices of community connectors for engaging 'hardly reached' people in health services. *Social Science & Medicine*, 232, 366–373. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2019.05.034>
- Welker, D., Fitzpatrick, S., & Watts-Cobbe, B. (2025). Shared Domestic Abuse Refuge in the Age of Housing First: An Outdated Model? *International Journal on Homelessness*, 3(3), 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.5206/ijoh.2023.3.22252>