

Bibliography

- Hale, N. G., Jr. (1971). *Freud and the Americans: The beginnings of psychoanalysis in the United States, 1876–1917*. New York: Oxford University Press. Coverage of Holt's role as an early popularizer of Freudian theory in the United States.
- Kuklick, B. (1977). *The rise of American philosophy*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Treats Holt's relationship to James and Münsterberg, and his troubled career at Harvard.
- Langfeld, H. S. (1946). Edwin Bissell Holt. *Psychological Review*, 53, 251–258. The best obituary of Holt, written by his long-time friend and Princeton colleague.
- Reed, E. S. (1988). *James J. Gibson and the psychology of perception*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press. Treatment of Holt's contributions to theory and research on perception, and his influence on Gibson.
- Smith, L. D. (1986). *Behaviorism and logical positivism*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press. Coverage of Holt's neorealism, early operationism, and behaviorism, including his influence on Tolman.

Laurence D. Smith

HOLZKAMP, KLAUS (1927–1995), German psychologist. As a leading founder of critical psychology, Holzcamp's theoretical endeavors were motivated by a perceived permanent crisis in psychology. In his first theoretical monograph (1964), he analyzed the relationship between experiments and theories and argued that experiments in psychology only vaguely represent the theories that they supposedly test. He attributed these problems to an inappropriate empiricist philosophy of science, and consequently promoted a new philosophy of science known as *constructivism* (Holzkamp, 1968).

After being influenced by the German student movement of the late 1960s, Holzcamp (1972) reflected on critical-theoretical and emancipatory issues in psychology. He challenged the relevance of traditional psychology for practical application and attributed the lack of practical relevance to the logic of laboratory research. Holzcamp argued for the existence of an ontological difference between the subject matter of psychology and that of the traditional natural sciences, and suggested that psychology requires a different methodology. He identified psychologists' hidden assumptions and considered the conceptualization of an individual as a concrete entity abstracted from societal contexts as resulting from bourgeois ideology. As an alternative, Holzcamp proposed a program which featured the binding of theory to practice, a symmetric dialogue in research, the development of a socially responsible discipline, and a psychology that enlightens individuals about their societal dependencies.

Following a period of radical self-criticism, Holzcamp entered a critical-conceptual phase (from 1973 to 1983) during which he emphasized the principles of the cultural-historical school (Leontyev) and of classical Marxist literature (Marx, Engels). During this time, Holzcamp concentrated on a critique and clarification of the conceptual foundations of psychology. In his reconstruction of perception, Holzcamp (1973) argued that an understanding of psychological concepts is possible only by including the natural history, prehistory, and history of humans. Holzcamp considered Darwin's theory of evolution as an adequate framework for the natural-historical analyses and Marx's historical materialism as decisive for historical analyses. Holzcamp identified several characteristics of perception in bourgeois societies. His monograph inspired a research group at the Psychological Institute at the Free University of Berlin to analyze a variety of other psychological concepts, in a movement that became known as *German Critical Psychology*.

Holzcamp (1983) summarized and elaborated the results of his research group in *Foundations of Psychology*. Using an analysis of basic categories, Holzcamp developed a systematic-paradigmatic foundation for psychology's subject matter and methodology. Applying a historical-empirical method, and following the evolutionary development of the psyche up to its human level, he proposed a new system of categories and derived general definitions of human subjectivity within contemporary societies.

From 1983 to 1995 Holzcamp demonstrated the significance of his analyses by elaborating on a science of the subject, that is, a psychology from the standpoint of the subject. Critical psychology as a subject-oriented research program promotes research in which subjects are both participants and co-researchers simultaneously. Psychology in this sense is understood as conducting research for people and not about people. In his last monograph, Holzcamp (1993) elaborated a learning theory from the standpoint of the subject.

Holzcamp was a classical psychologist who provided valid criticisms of mainstream psychology and who suggested productive alternatives that are relevant for theory development in contemporary psychology.

Bibliography

- Holzcamp, K. (1964). *Theorie und Experiment in der Psychologie: Eine grundlagenkritische Untersuchung* [Theory and experiment: A foundation-critical study]. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Holzcamp, K. (1968). *Wissenschaft als Handlung: Versuch einer neuen Grundlegung der Wissenschaftslehre* [Science as action: Essay for a new foundation of the philosophy of science]. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Holzcamp, K. (1973). *Sinnliche Erkenntnis: Historischer Ur-*

sprung und gesellschaftliche Funktion der Wahrnehmung [Sensorial knowledge: Historical origins and societal function of perception]. Frankfurt am Main: Athenäum.

Holzkamp, K. (1983). *Grundlegung der Psychologie* [Foundations of psychology]. Frankfurt am Main: Campus.

Holzkamp, K. (1993). *Lernen: Subjektwissenschaftliche Grundlegung* [Learning: The subject-scientific foundation]. Frankfurt am Main: Campus.

Thomas Teo

HOME CARE. See Elder Care.

HOMELESSNESS. We all have images and stereotypes of the homeless person. From a skid row population of hoboes, tramps, and drunk old men to images of the wandering insane and the urban myth of the miserly old bag lady living on the streets, we have created caricatures of the homeless in popular culture (Hopper, 1990) that create a general sense of antipathy toward the homeless. New images have become increasingly negative, which more easily allow us to blame the individual for his or her condition. Fortunately, recent explanations have moved from myths and mere descriptions to definitions based on structural factors common across the population.

Continuum of Definitions: Moving from Homes to the Streets

The literature includes widely divergent definitions of homeless people. The greatest difficulty caused by the lack of standardized definitions is that we do not know how many people are homeless. In 1988, the number of homeless people had been estimated from as low as 192,000 to as high as 2.2 million (Alliance Housing Council, 1988). This discrepancy is accounted for, in part, by varying definitions of homelessness. Size of the population is not critical, however, because there does not exist some acceptable number. The true problem is understanding how anyone can become homeless.

Characteristically, the term *homeless* means without a home. Thus, for our purposes, there are three main groups of homeless, and they can be conceptualized as creating a continuum from marginally housed to living on the streets:

1. *Displaced people*—individuals who are not the primary tenants of a domicile that they share (i.e., doubled-up).
2. *Sheltered people*—individuals who take residence in some sort of semi-institutional setting (e.g., shelter, church, hospital, jail, etc.).
3. *Street people*—individuals who are living on the

streets and take residence in public places not intended for such a purpose (e.g., parking garages, alleyways, malls, parks, etc.).

Faces of the Homeless

The attention of the media and researchers has turned increasingly toward the plight of homeless women and children. However, an overwhelming number of the homeless are men. Baker (1994) pointed out that in a number of selected city samples, the proportion of men ranged from 52% to nearly 100%, depending on the areas sampled and the sampling method.

Men are more likely to be on the streets without any family members. In a nationwide survey, 89% of men were reported to be alone as compared to 45% of women (Burt & Cohen, 1989). Thus, men are more likely to be isolated and withdrawn. Homeless men are more likely to be arrested than domiciled men. In a Baltimore sample, 58% of the homeless men as compared to 24% of the domiciled men had been arrested. This is usually due to the circumstances of homelessness, such as breaking into abandoned buildings for shelter or stealing food (Fischer et al., 1986).

The number of women on the streets is increasing at an estimated rate 10% faster than men (Crystal, 1984). The plight of women, in contrast to that of men, is much more a saga of exploitation and victimization. For example, a national survey of 163 battered women's programs found that of the nearly 47,000 women that these programs served, approximately 80% were considered to have nonresidential status (Wright, 1990). Sadly, once they are on the streets, Merves (1992) pointed out, women are more susceptible to further victimization. Unlike most men who are on the street alone, many women are homeless with their children. Reportedly, at least 38% of the homeless are children and their families, usually single mothers (Children's Defense Fund, 1988; National Network of Runaway and Youth Services, 1985). Although motherhood is not a cause of homelessness, the chances of homeless mothers finding gainful employment are slimmer than for single women, which makes it more difficult for them to exit the streets. Whereas social service or charitable resources may be more readily available to women with children, the lack of employment becomes a critical factor (Baker, 1994).

Children have been leaving home on their own and hitting the streets in growing numbers.

1. *Runaway youth* spend at least one night on the streets without parent or caretaker permission.
2. *Homeless youth* have no parental, foster, or institutional home. This group is commonly referred to as *pushouts* who are urged to leave by guardians, and *throwaways* who leave with parents' approval and/or knowledge, and have no alternative domicile.
3. *Street kids* who believe, for whatever reasons, that