2008

Sorting the poor: A study of the management of the homeless in mid-sized Canadian city shelters

Anita Desai
University of Windsor

Sorting the Poor: A Study of the Management of the Homeless in mid-sized Canadian City Shelters

By

Anita Desai

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
through Sociology and Anthropology
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Arts at the
University of Windsor

Windsor, Ontario, Canada

2008

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-47022-0
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-47022-0

Author's Declaration of Originality

I hereby certify that I am the sole author of this thesis and that no part of this thesis has been published or submitted for publication.

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge, my thesis does not infringe upon anyone's copyright nor violate any proprietary rights and that any ideas, techniques, quotations, or any other material from the work of other people included in my thesis, published or otherwise, are fully acknowledged in accordance with the standard referencing practices. Furthermore, to the extent that I have included copyrighted material that surpasses the bounds of fair dealing within the meaning of the Canada Copyright Act, I certify that I have obtained a written permission from the copyright owner(s) to include such material(s) in my thesis and have included copies of such copyright clearances to my appendix.

I declare that this is a true copy of my thesis, including any final revisions, as approved by my thesis committee and the Graduate Studies office, and that this thesis has not been submitted for a higher degree to any other University of Institution.

ABSTRACT

The ability to access social services when in need is a fundamental component of the social safety net available to Canadians. When approaching such services, consideration is seldom given to the subtle forms of governance that accompany the administration of aid. This thesis questions: Through what means are shelter seeking persons categorized beyond the division between the 'deserving' and 'undeserving' poor and how is their treatment moralized, categorized, and legitimized within the shelter system? This study uncovers the inherent complexities in sorting, categorizing, and assisting the homeless beyond the traditional dichotomy of the deserving and undeserving poor. This thesis argues that moral regulation is occurring within contemporary social services, and homeless shelters provide an ideal site from which to observe moral regulation and its transition into the 21st Century. By studying moral regulation of the homeless, it is evident that previous studies have overlooked the roles of surveillance and external institutions in the regulation process, and their role in measuring resident's progress and the overall (re)construction of residents as liberal subjects. Using a moral regulation approach, the importance of considering social services staff as moralizing agents is uncovered.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would first like to thank my advisor, Randy Lippert whose support, encouragement, and patience has been unwavering from the moment I considered returning to Windsor. I am privileged to have been able to work under his guidance and insight, both which have been extended to me well beyond this paper. In addition, I would like to thank my second reader, Gerald Cradock, whose enthusiasm for literature has been an inspiration, and offered me avenues I would not have otherwise explored. I am also grateful to my external reader, Valerie Scatamburlo-D'Annibale for contributing her time and efforts to this paper. I would like to express my thanks to the administrative staff and professors in the department that I have been fortunate to get to know and learn from, and my friends, old and new, that have been a part of this journey with me.

To my parents, who with open hearts and minds trusted me to make my own choices in life, and though at times I know that made them nervous, I have always loved their willingness to let me spread my wings and be who I am. To my brother Anand, who has always been there to lend a hand and edit at any hour when I needed him, and who has always had an answer when I needed one. I appreciate the love and dedication he has shown over the years. I am also grateful to have the support of Jennifer and Leo Innocente, whose love and kindness helped me through so much of the past year, usually by way of a much needed home cooked meal, countless glasses of wine, and good conversation. And finally, to Jonathan, whose love and support travelled across oceans to me. The best reason for deciding to undertake this goal was that it brought us together, thank you for being there every step of the way even when you could not be right by my side.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

The supports and resources offered to the homeless population within any particular community has varied over centuries. Today, shelter seekers and the public are met with terms such as "compassion", "help", "new beginnings", and "giving hope", when exploring services for homelessness. This thesis critically examines how scrutiny by governing agents and agencies significantly impacts the lives of persons seeking residence within homeless shelters[1], and queries: Through what means are shelter seeking persons categorized beyond the division between the 'deserving' and 'undeserving' poor and how is their treatment moralized, categorized, and legitimized within the shelter system? By studying the practices used across four homeless shelters in a mid-sized Canadian city, this paper argues that moral regulation is occurring within contemporary settings, and homeless shelters provide an ideal site from which to observe historical trends of moral regulation – as they have been traditionally studied – by observing its progression into the 21st Century. By studying moral regulation of the homeless, it is evident that previous studies have overlooked the roles of surveillance and external institutions in the process of regulating and re-constituting individuals. In addition, this moral regulation study uncovers the inherent complexities in sorting, categorizing, and assisting the homeless beyond the traditional dichotomy of the deserving and undeserving poor.

The sorting, categorization, and overall management of the homeless was examined from a moral regulation perspective. This perspective takes into account how

[1] For convenience this project will refer to such persons as 'homeless', however, I am aware of the conceptual debate over the term and how it applies to a variety of groups.

particular values and morals influence the actions of others who do not conform to the normative lifestyle of the successful liberalized subject. For the purposes of this project, moral regulation takes into account the actions and narratives of the staff that impose regulations on residents, highlighting the sometimes coercive manner in which residents' behaviour is managed. This thesis explored how staff narratives, as seen in their texts and talk, contribute to and possibly expand the traditional binary of the 'deserving' and 'undeserving' poor to reveal and redefine categories. Thus, it became relevant to determine how shelters, including their staff, use levels of deservedness and how these gradients are built into the way they document and act towards those seeking shelter. Furthermore, an investigation was undertaken into how the sorting process of streamlining individuals into various emergency housing centres constitutes persons based on their levels of deservedness.

A mid-sized city provided an ideal site for this research project, as it offered access to a homeless shelter for families, a homeless shelter for men, and two homeless shelters providing services to women, men, and youth. These shelters provide emergency beds as well as transitional housing, and a variety of support services that attempt to meet the housing, vocational, and mental health needs of their residents. This was considered within the context of a mid-sized city, as opposed to the more traditional studies of the governance of the homeless undertaken in large metropolitan centres.

In addition, this project examined how each of the four shelters sort the homeless, as well as the liaising practices among them that govern the homeless population across the city. It also became necessary, therefore, to observe how surveillance operated to contribute to the sorting process, and whether the homeless were shifted in and out of

shelters based on conduct deemed inappropriate in one shelter but acceptable in another. How staff member's discretion varied across discourses of good and bad, acceptable and unacceptable conduct – so deemed by staff and shelter policies – was also examined.

Sorting the homeless is also about surveilling the homeless. Research can determine whether individuals are flagged and thus not allowed into a specific shelter of their choice due to past behaviour or conflict with staff, and therefore sent elsewhere or altogether excluded from services and shelter. Using different shelters within one particular city allowed for observation of sorting practices in a manageable way due to the organization and liaising practices that occur among different shelters in this city. This made a mid-sized city an ideal centre for researching sorting practices through a moral regulation framework, as it requires cooperation of different agencies to manage the homeless population. By examining the deserving/undeserving dichotomy within a smaller urban context it became possible to clarify how this distinction is created within and among shelters.

Overall, this project attempted to understand how scrutiny by staff as governing agents and the shelter agencies significantly impacted the lives of persons seeking residence within homeless shelters. The goals of this project are to explore the role that moral regulation plays in constituting elements of the homeless population, and to lend insight into homeless shelter practices. By examining moral regulation of the homeless, this study questions how previous studies have overlooked the roles of surveillance and external institutions in the regulation process, to help uncover the inherent complexities in sorting, categorizing, and managing the homeless beyond the traditional dichotomy of the deserving and undeserving poor.

CHAPTER TWO

A MORAL REGULATION PERSPECTIVE

> *We try to do our best and we will give them chances, and then it is a choice for them and the choice is you are either going to take the help, because they really have to make that choice. If they do not, then they have to move on because then that becomes enabling. We do not want to enable, so it comes down to: Here is your chance, here is your goal, here is your choice. If the choice is yours to stay and get the services available, take what you can, if not, you have to leave (Shelter A, Front Line 1).*

This thesis adopts a moral regulation perspective (See Valverde, 1991; *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 1994; Curtis, 1997; Hunt, 1997; 1999; Ruonavaara, 1997). Arguably, Hunt has most clearly delineated this perspective and, therefore, has been drawn upon for the purposes of this project. Hunt defines moral regulation as a form of politics whereby individuals act to problematise the conduct, values, or culture of others and seek to impose regulation upon them (1999:1). He argues there are three major justifications for seeking to understand moral regulation: first, projects of moral regulation are typically initiated by the middle classes, or from below those holding institutional power; secondly, they offer a traditional example of an intimate link originally suggested by Michel Foucault in his writing on governmentality, between the "governance of others" and the "government of the self"; and finally, Hunt argues that moral regulation is historically significant, claiming that social problems have only become framed under different labels to better suit current political and legislative times (1999:1-2). Homelessness and poverty have always been social problems, but the discourse surrounding them has helped shape how the public views them as social issues.

These three justifications are directly pertinent to this project. First, middle class values (taken up in the next chapter) become important to this project not only because

they can initiate projects of moral regulation, but because they also offer a platform from which staff can attempt to reconstruct residents into "improved" liberal subjects[2]. Second, by interviewing shelter staff, links between how these institutions govern their practices, and how their actions encourage the homeless to govern themselves according to typically middle class standards were explored. Third, this research focuses on the social problem of homelessness which has become a new label for dire conditions in which people have found themselves for centuries.

In explaining how projects of moral regulation become of interest to people, Hunt notes that "there is an irreducible core in that people are mobilised and drawn into action by the passionate conviction that there is something inherently wrong or immoral about the conduct of others" (1999: ix). In particular, he discusses the moralized subject, who acts upon an object or target and engages in moralizing practices when the object has been deemed fundamentally wrong or bad (1999: 6-7). For example, in the case of homeless shelters the moralizing agents consist of the front-line worker, counsellor, or administrator who seeks to responsibilize the shelter resident (in this case, the "object"). Hunt argues that "the moral element in moral regulation involves any normative judgement that some conduct is intrinsically bad, wrong, or immoral" (7). In this way, the staff members are able to use normalizing efforts to undo resident's wrongs, and make them 'right' or make them 'good' before residents attempt to re-enter the community outside the shelter. They do this via several components of moral regulation: knowledge (informal or expert); a discourse within that knowledge that is given a normative content; a set of practices to follow; and a 'harm' to be avoided or overcome (1999:7). In regard to

[2] This term relies on a more contemporary, governmentality based definition of liberalism, seen as a rationality of government (See Foucault, 1989b; Rose 1993a). It does not necessarily equate to a particular classical liberal theorist's view such as J.S. Mill or Locke.

homelessness, knowledge and discourse revolve around middle class acceptance for the ability to seek and maintain employment to sustain the expectation surrounding a proper work ethic and earning a living. Anyone falling outside of this is seen as wrong in comparison, and the assumption is typically made that their life choices are likely the cause of their present circumstances. With the time provided, the opportunity therein lies for the staff members to guide and thus moralize the homeless for the duration of their stay as they seek assistance through social service agencies.

Hunt examines the concept of division from a Foucaultian perspective. He pursues the idea of how a "deserving" and "undeserving" division is created and suggests that it is important to look at this notion on different levels. Two main divisions are between the poor and the rest of society; and amongst those categorized as poor. The first division is evident in an example of state action against the poor through welfare cutbacks that articulates and fuels hostility from those in the "respectable working class" in opposition to those viewed as "welfare scroungers". By framing the poor as "scroungers", the actions of the government thus influences public opinion towards the homeless. This justifies how the community and the government treat the poor, at the risk of the public not knowing if such justifications are legitimate (1999:5).

Secondly, the division between the "deserving" and "undeserving" poor highlights the influence societal morals have on those individuals. Hunt notes that there are dividing practices among the poor wherein those who are considered deserving are granted more relief than those considered undeserving. For example, a poor family with greater benefits may be considered the "deserving poor" and these individuals may find ways to justify their privileged treatment, as well as support the denial of relief to those

who are "undeserving" such as individuals who are substance abusers (1999:8). As a result, he argues there can be two reactions to such a practice. The first is that people can oppose this type of subjugation and seek to resist it and form an alternate subjectivity, and secondly, people can accept their placement within these categories and support them. Hunt suggests that dividing practices impact these individuals and become a means for the targets of moral regulation to become 'subjects'. This project attempted to explore this distinction further by examining other possible criteria that expand the deserving/undeserving binary as suggested by Hunt, and to observe gradients or levels of deservedness of the subjects as suggested through the narratives produced in interviews and texts.

Those accepting their assigned categories also accept claims for relief through a process of self-reflexivity and self-understanding. Hunt argues that the process of reflexivity and struggle is unavoidable, and that it is likely mediated through the participation of others, or external 'experts' who may construct, reinforce, or interpret the dividing practice (1999:8). For the purposes of this project, experts consisted of the staff members who interact with residents on a daily basis during their stay in the shelter, and an examination was undertaken into how oral discourses of staff construct and reinforce the categorization process to assist in the development of self-reflexive behaviours of residents.

Dividing practices that include using deserving and undeserving categories become a way of constructing people, both through the actions of others as well as their own actions as subjects. Although this has been an effective way to categorize – and generalize – homeless identities, it is argued that the categorization process exists on a

deeper level. It became pertinent to study practices that legitimate and expand the labels of deserving and undeserving homeless, in order to help redefine how these categorizations may differ conceptually. It is likely that by observing the categorization of the homeless in such a way, the complexities of homeless populations can be highlighted in a more useful manner. Legitimating practices were examined through the processes undertaken by agents of moral regulation (i.e., shelter staff) and how they talk about as well as document those seeking shelter, revealing how these individuals are constituted within social services.

Although the constitution of individuals within social services may hint at methods of social control, moral regulation is better suited to address the less coercive aspects associated with the regulation of residents. Moral regulation does not overtly assert control over individuals (like social control), and is a more nuanced method of imposing regulation that observes a practice that is not necessarily monopolized by specific state initiatives. Moral regulation allows for a more comprehensive approach to understanding the regulation of "deviant" groups, as well the actions of moralizing agents. Arguably, moral regulation is "built into" staff values and ideas of how to help people, resulting in the regulation of those who are deemed to require that help, in this case, the homeless. I argue that this help is offered and measured against a consistently middle class approach that advocates for the removal of "bad" habits and replacing them with activities that attempt to recreate individuals as an improved liberal subject.

Although moral regulation in its purest sense may not involve methods of state coercion and control, I argue that within an institutional setting like a homeless shelter, coercion is linked to moral regulation in a different manner from social control. Coercion

in moral regulation of the homeless has more to do with the conditions that shelter seekers find themselves in. While there is an expected pattern of behaviours required from residents for following rules and encouraging certain actions, it is never explicitly stated that all the behaviours should be carried out upon leaving the shelter. Instead, the coercion is used to maintain a structured living environment that is more easily managed within an institutionalized community setting.

The point of departure in many moral regulation studies is their examination of non-state forces and discourses, giving recognition that the state does not necessarily monopolize 'social' and 'moral' initiatives. While there is division and debate among scholars as to the relevance of the state, it is reasonable to acknowledge the state plays a significant, though not solitary role in moral regulation (Chunn & Gavigan, 2004: 222-3). This project uncovers the importance of considering social services staff as state agents, but whose initiatives may be moral in nature rather than always state driven. This relates to the types of values reflected in staff opinions of the homeless, and whether this helps to further force persons into certain categories. In this respect, moral regulation provides an effective lens for de-centering the state, and it refocuses attention on the influence of external social institutions as branches of the state as well as the importance of the public's moral opinion.

CHAPTER THREE

PERTINENT RESEARCH ON HOMELESSNESS

There is no Canadian literature on the moral regulation of the homeless from the perspective of shelters and their agents. The majority of research focuses directly on perceptions of or the plight of the homeless and poor (Chunn & Gavigan, 2004; Herd et al. 2005; Mason, 2003; Gilliom, 2001; McKeen, 2004), often within a specific historical context (Longmate, 1974; Parr, 1978; Piven & Cloward, 1971; Hunt, 1999; Little, 1994; Valverde, 1991, 1998). There is, however, significant literature stemming from the United States on social work discourse (Margolin, 1997) as well as historical documents of social work as a practice (Richmond, 1899; Richmond, 1922).

To begin, an examination of early social work studies provides the backdrop for understanding where the "morals" in moral regulation come from. Mary Richmond provides an early account of social case work stemming from the early 20th Century, and queries what it is that qualifies as social case work. She examines several individuals on a case by case basis and the involvement of these individuals with their social workers. She effectively sets the template for middle class standards, and what qualifies as a "successful" case is stated through what can very easily be classified as the quintessential middle class notion of conforming to normative ideals and practices occurring within a community. She describes the positive aspects of one case worker's approach to her client, who encouraged that the client's "resemblances to *normal folk* [was] always emphasized; the differences which might so easily have set her apart were minimized" (1922:21; emphasis added). To teach and encourage values that are considered "normal" is inherently linked to the foundation of social work practices that stem from middle class

ideals[3]. Though the staff interviewed for this project were not social workers, this nonetheless provides a historical perspective of how programs and assistance offered in shelters may have developed into what is now a moralized lens through which assistance is offered and measured.

Richmond states the potential outcomes of not "treating" persons through social case work, and hints at the notion of creating a subject in one of two ways. She notes the outcome in the case of a woman who, without assistance, may have developed as "untruthful, hard, perhaps depraved. As it is, she [now] faces a future with the advantages of a high school education, with good health, an attractive personality, and a number of real friends who trust her...On the whole her sense of values is an adjusted sense, her ideas are no longer confused and unreasonable" (1922:42). It is this notion of encouraging education, health, personable demeanour, and having "common sense" that I argue continues to be at the root of moralizing practices in shelters. It stems from historical patterns of trying to create people as proper and acceptable, or as I argue in this contemporary context, as a more suitable liberal subject. This, as Richmond suggests, stems from the practice of social workers (or shelter staff) attempting to extract the normative, middle class values that individuals are expected to inherently possess.

Margolin (1997) also emphasizes the continuity of certain practices within social service work, and argues that despite superficial shifts in style, the basic practice of social work continues to be the same: "people from one social class go into the homes of people belonging to another; they write biographies of those people; they judge what is normal and abnormal; [and] they call it "doing good"" (9). The notion of class values is implicit

[3] The middle class ideals exemplified by Richmond are anchored in values best described by Max Weber's concept of the Protestant Ethic, whereby the rational subject practices self discipline as derived from Puritanism (Weber, 1930).

in his depiction of social work, whether over a historical or contemporary period. It is this continuity of middle class values that forms the basis of moralizing work done in homeless shelters, such that the creation of the service itself is rooted in historical patterns of judgement of "good" and "bad" and continues to be a platform from which shelters operate.

Margolin, however, focuses on social work, and notes the difficulty in finding a concrete meaning for the term itself, as social work encompasses a large range of practices (1997:2). He examines how social workers developed a capacity to enter the private space of individuals, and how these individuals became of such interest to the rest of the community. Social work was the key to entering the private sphere – where no type of political surveillance had previously gone (2-3). While Margolin's book provides an excellent platform from which to structure many aspects of this project, it looks specifically at the career of social work. He does take into account documentation and texts used in social work, however this project revealed that homeless shelters rely more heavily on narrative types of text that are much more subjective in their application of moral regulation on residents. Also, social work differs from shelters in that as a practice, social work goes out to people, whereas in the research sites for this project, the subjects seek out the shelters. In addition, many of the individuals working in shelters are not required to be certified social workers. Shelter staff may be more reflective of the general population or the "middle class" in their perceptions of the homeless, and their understanding of the underlying social issues pertaining to shelter seeking populations.

Despite his direct discussion on social work practices, Margolin does highlight potentially useful knowledge about how shelter staff must perform when relating with

clients. He addresses the concept of "doublethink" whereby a client must convince their social worker that their performance is natural and sincere, saying what the social worker wants to hear. The client must appear as if her compliance comes about independently of the social worker's power to deny particular rights, for example parental rights. Though shelter staff are not in such an extreme role of authority over residents, in many ways residents must follow a similar role in convincing staff that they are attempting to "do good" while in shelter, so as to avoid potential denial of privileges or residence based on their behaviour (Margolin, 1997:130). Alternatively, Margolin notes the challenge for the social worker is to convince themselves that it is possible to "bring the client over to her side" (130) due to the genuine desire from within the client to agree with their strategies. In other words, he suggests that the client need only create the appearance of sincerity, and the social worker need only believe it. He notes that social workers are trained to exercise power, but also trained to deny that it is power that they are exercising. A difference remains, however, such that shelter staff are not trained in the administration of power, yet remain in a position of authority over the resident. This power arguably stems from staff acting as successful liberal subjects, and therefore exercising their own knowledge of how to recreate residents according to this measurement of success.

Dorothy Smith addresses the concept of measurement in her discussion on ideological codes, to which she compares the standard North American family as a measurement tool. She defines ideological codes as being a constant generator of procedures for selecting syntax, categories, and vocabulary in the writing of texts and the production of talk. These texts can be written or spoken, but are ordered by an underlying ideological code (1993:52). She suggests that the standard North American family is an

ideological code in this sense, whereby it is a conception of the family as a legally married couple sharing a household with the adult male primarily as breadwinner, and adult female with primary responsibilities as a caregiver to husband, household, and children. This code becomes a tool in which to measure what she calls "defective" families to understand how they stray from normative ideals (54). She argues that to understand "defective" families, one must know more about the normative or "intact" families. For the purposes of this project, this concept can be applied to shelter seeking individuals who become "defective" subjects, measured against the ideological code of the standard, self-sufficient liberal subject. This type of ideological code is arguably built into the way that shelters question, document, and talk to residents throughout their stay in shelter. The types of information gathered on people, the surveillance and subsequent knowledge produced are linked back through the relatively standardized conception of what are arguably middle class ideals that have remained consistent at least since Mary Richmond's early explanations of social case work. This ideology creates a platform from which staff are trained to question residents and seek out specific information that falls within moralized boundaries that measure their progress as ideal members of a shelter community. I argue that individuals are measured against such an ideological code, and this is linked to moral regulation through the subsequent administration of aid based on a person's level of progress as deemed by staff.

Little contextualizes moral regulation from the historical position of the poor in relation to the Ontario Mother's Act (OMA) of 1920 that helped establish the foundation for state involvement in the lives of the poor (1994:234). The OMA began by investigating the worthiness of those receiving aid, with priority given to widows and

women who had incapacitated husbands. Scrutiny began around the investigation of those women claiming to be deserted by their husbands, divorcees, unwed mothers, and those women whose husbands had been imprisoned. In time, the OMA was broadened to include varying degrees of these categories, including single fathers, but with this came the opportunity to implement new methods for morally regulating the poor. This policy forced single mothers to prove they were both morally and financially deserving of financial aid, and suggests that women continually face having to prove their worthiness (236). Little explains that some single mothers (such as those able to gain the more socially acceptable standard of having a job) are scrutinized less by social workers or neighbours, yet they continue to live below the poverty line (240). Little's work, however, fails to account for the conduct, discourses, and roles of social workers and state agents in structuring moral practices targeting these individuals. There is a greater focus on the circumstances of the poor than on the moralizing agents who likely play a key role in creating those circumstances, as this research uncovers.

Valverde (1991) discusses the history of moral reform development and urban social work in Canada, noting the religious sense of community responsibility that called for the surveillance of immorality. From this historical perspective, it is interesting to compare the similarities operating within social services today. My project reveals to a certain degree how much of this sense of community responsibility is carried out by faith based organizations, and operates through moral regulation. Valverde offers a detailed portrait of moral regulation projects circa 1900, as undertaken by the church, and members of the middle class (1991:129-154). However, it is more helpful to compare her account of homelessness and poverty in Canada to a modern study of moral regulation

practices, to help understand the moralizing nature of contemporary social services. In addition, Valverde offers a historical account of categorization practices and subdivisions created "according to gender and vice" (151) which are relevant to the current research project. Moral regulation studies such as Valverde's examine a specific historical context, whereas this thesis explores moral regulation within a contemporary environment and the new categories that have evolved from past labels or 'vices'.

Herd et al. examine welfare reform's effects on those receiving assistance. The authors suggest there is evidence that the administrative practices of welfare benefits for those seeking and receiving assistance can be humiliating and demoralizing, thus producing a significant area within welfare reform worth studying. They also note that the discretionary nature of welfare assistance programs have always ensured that administrative practices strongly determine access to benefits, particularly by discouraging people from applying for welfare benefits (2005:66). The authors also examine how changes in welfare that promote job-seeking and employment can change the view of welfare recipients as being *on* welfare to working *through* welfare. The promotion of job-seeking helps to demonstrate the role that administrative practices play as moralizing agents, promoting a liberal emphasis of self-sufficiency through employment. The complexity of the application process demonstrates how documentation can be significant when categorizing or constituting people simply through communication formats. However, their project fails to take into account the narratives of the staff, and thus fail to offer a moral perspective. Herd et al. demonstrate the importance of the format of documentation used to record information on individuals in discouraging them from seeking benefits. This thesis project how documentation and

forms used by the shelters furthers the categorization process of the homeless and how it helps to administer the practice of moral regulation within shelters.

In addition to addressing the applicability of residents for assistance, shelter staff and administrators responsible for housing the homeless are inextricably linked to the practice of surveillance. The role of surveillance in the lives of the poor is demonstrated in John Gilliom's work, *Overseers of the Poor*. Gilliom states: "Surveillance programs are ways of seeing and knowing the world. They assert values, identify priorities, define possibilities, and police the departures" (2001: xiii). He suggests that such programs build important structures of meaning that help shape the world and people's places within it. Gilliom argues that for the purposes of welfare administration and surveillance, a simplified depiction of the poor must focus on those characteristics that are both observable and deemed to be important in the execution of state policy (19). Gilliom notes that this has a largely depersonalizing effect on those who are accessing social services, and also reinforces the ability of the state and the public to exclude individuals based on external characteristics. Though Gilliom's work focuses on the 'welfare poor', much of his findings on categorization are applicable to homeless individuals facing similar types of surveillance methods when applying for social assistance or shelter. The homeless arguably are increasingly subject to surveillance when residing in homeless shelters due to staff monitoring.

In order for the state to manage the poor, Gilliom (2001) suggests the poor must be 'made legible' or fit into terms, categories, and characteristics that are observable, assessable, and amenable to the management and information regimes of modern bureaucracy (21). He argues that with a population as large and multifaceted as the poor,

the diversity among this group and catch phrases such as "the welfare poor" becomes a categorization that undermines the complexity of the population. If such populations become defined as a mass, it becomes easier to simplify and focus on just a few aspects of their lives such as their poverty and the acceptance of aid. Gilliom argues that this comes at the expense of knowing the complexity of the situations and lives that make up these groups.

Though Gilliom's work centres on poor women, this thesis argues that the term "homeless" can be related in the way he describes the categorization of the "welfare poor" (2001:60-61). Gilliom looks at the daily interactions and relationships of welfare mothers in reference to the surveillance tactics employed by welfare agency staff, whereas this project explores these relationships from the perspective of shelter staff and texts. Though there are definite shared characteristics among the homeless population, it is the specific ways that the homeless can be defined within their population that is often neglected within literature, or at least not beyond categories such as the mentally ill, substance abusers or single mothers. This project examines how the sorting process affects assistance offered to certain groups, including an understanding of how surveillance is an inextricable part of the process.

Dean (2002) sheds light on the purpose of surveillance, the regulation of vice, and the obligations of citizenship within his discussion on liberal governmentality. He suggests that liberalism is regarded as a general philosophy of rule for governmental institutions and practices whose key principles are committed to individual liberty and to limited accountable government (41). He mentions self-governance and the notion of "freedom", such that individuals are required to govern themselves as certain types of

free persons. However, he notes that concentration on such self governing mentalities does not mean that the more coercive, binding, or obligatory dimensions of liberal government programmes and practices should be neglected. He argues that authoritarian mentalities and practices of rule within liberal democratic states override the exercise of freedoms in order to enforce certain obligations on members of the population. Through state programmes and policies, the common obligations of citizenship can be taught and enforced from what he calls "authoritarian policy" (2002:39). Overall, he argues that the liberal governmental use of authoritarian measures is a necessary component of the liberal attempt to govern free individuals.

This concept of governing free individuals pertains to work done in shelters that subscribe to Dean's notions of liberal governmentality. Dean argues that liberal reliance on authoritarian techniques is a consequence of the understanding of government as a limited sphere that must operate through forms of regulation that exist outside of itself, or through those forms of regulation which are contained within what has conventionally been called "civil society" (2002:39-40). He refers to civil society as exterior to the formal governmental domain of the state, and it can include spheres of society, population, community, and culture, in any combination. It is comprised of different spontaneous social orders including market, morals, law, and language, each of which teaches us rules of conduct. He suggests that the codification of such values makes them the basis for governmental interventions for those who stray from these normative social orders (44). Dean argues that liberal government is anchored in civil society and attempts to guarantee the security of its processes by adopting a "facilitating role", which ensures the construction of regulation to permit "natural" regulation to operate. This concept is

pertinent to the work done in shelters, whereby shelter staff act as moralizing agents who take up this facilitating role to advocate for the re-creation of the liberal citizen. I argue that this is done according to middle class values that comprise parts of what Dean discusses as "civil society".

Dean also looks at liberalism as a legal and political order, or the authoritarian dimension of liberalism that examines how liberal forms of government involve forms of categorization of subjects or dependant populations who simply cannot, or cannot yet, be governed through freedom (2002:46). He discusses the notion of a subject's ability to "improve" based on the liberal norm of autonomy. He argues that those exercising liberal citizenship based on one's ability to improve are regarded as having the capacity to exercise responsible choices. This idea will be explored further as it pertains to shelters, through staff perceptions of "progress". In addition, Dean lists categories of liberal subjects of government grouped according to their capacities for autonomy (2002:48). I argue that shelters are responding to liberal ideals of governance and staff are re-constructing people as liberal subjects according to these capacities. This project examines how capacities for autonomy are measured through perceived notions of progress and the resulting effects on the homeless.

By observing shelters and those surveilling the homeless through a moral regulation perspective, categories used to divide the homeless and the examination of knowledge production that occurs for state involvement and control can be explored. Also, this research can help to determine how the homeless become constituted. The overall research question therefore is: Through what means are shelter seeking persons

categorized beyond the division between the 'deserving' and 'undeserving' poor and how is their treatment moralized, categorized, and legitimized within the shelter system?

CHAPTER FOUR

METHODOLOGY

Research conducted for this thesis consisted of a qualitative study using semi-structured (or open focused) interviews. This format allowed for flexibility to probe beyond initial responses given by interviewees so that the dialogue could proceed in a conversation-like manner (Berg, 2001:70). Interviewees consisted of staff members such as front line workers, managers, outreach workers, and shelter directors. Research also involved the collection and analysis of shelter texts. Blank forms for data collection by the agencies were acquired to examine the categorization process as well as how individuals are documented and regulated within the social services system. Due to a personal background in working in shelter settings, my previous experiences helped facilitate dialogue with interviewees through shared experiences about circumstances they faced; it also helped provide access to texts including forms distributed to residents and staff.

Questions for the interview were broad and covered basic categories (see Appendix F) that included: the background, roles and responsibilities, perceptions, insights, and experiences and challenges of the interviewee as a social service worker in a shelter setting. Texts and interviews were analyzed to reveal patterns in categorizations used by the moral agents towards the homeless (i.e., the moral object) as explained by Hunt (1999) and described earlier. Also, by obtaining blank forms, I inquired about how staff members utilize the forms to assist and categorize/organize residents in the shelter. Sixteen interviews were conducted with front line workers, managers, outreach workers,

and administrative staff at each of the four locations. The identity of staff, the names of the shelters, and the city in which this research was carried out was anonymized.

The city in which the research was conducted was chosen for its population, and because of the network of shelters that operate to manage the city's entire homeless population. Though predominantly separate agencies and organizations, there is a responsibilization of groups of homeless for whom each shelter cares. This was a decision made in partnership among agencies and the city to more effectively manage those seeking shelter by grouping people based on perceived needs. Each shelter was approached through personal contact. Administrators were asked to inform staff of the project, and those who were interested in participating volunteered time to give interviews. Though the interviewees range from a variety of positions within the organizations, the responses were categorized according to the following themes: sorting into and out of shelters; moral regulation within the shelters; the (re)creation of the liberal subject; surveillance; and levels of progress.

The Shelters

The family shelter primarily assists families, including single mothers and fathers over the age of 16 who require shelter with their children, as well as two parent families. The shelter is built to meet the needs of families, and attempts to maintain a 'family environment'. There are exceptions made for single women based on certain criteria deemed appropriate by the staff and shelter policy. Residents are provided a counsellor who assists in finding housing by liaising with the Ontario Works office, and who becomes responsible for overseeing the residents for whom they are assigned. The shelter provides meals as well as distributes donations from the public to the residents. Front line

staff assist residents with basic administration and following rules, conduct intake interviews, and refer people who call into the shelter to appropriate facilities for services based on the caller's criteria.

The family shelter is physically set up as a two storey, forty two bed facility with minimum security features. There is a main door that all people must come through, and a second door through which front line staff can see the individual at the door and then unlock it so that people may come through. The staff office is located in front of this door on the main floor, beyond which there is also a lounge area, activity room, caseworker offices, and kitchen and dining areas. The second floor is the residential area with dorm style rooms. The building is set up for community living, there is no carpeting, and no food allowed anywhere but in the dining areas. The facility is set up such that staff must leave the office to interact more socially with residents, and overall, residents are not actively "watched" throughout their stay in shelter.

Second, the men's shelter is a facility that has been operating in the community for over fifty years and assists single males, sixteen years of age and older who are homeless and in need of shelter. They provide shelter and meals, counselling and community support workers. There is also a detox facility for those needing addictions services. This shelter as well as the women's and family shelter are run by a single social service agency that operates under a faith-based Christian mission.

Physically the men's shelter is set up in a similar fashion to the family shelter, however a plexi-glass window separates staff from residents. There is a secured door through which front line staff grant access to individuals, and then a main lobby where residents can wait to speak with staff. The residential area is separated from the lounge

and dining areas, and residents are fairly removed from the sight of staff. Both this shelter and the family shelter have an institutionalized feel, as they both try to capitalize on their space available to make room for more beds to service as many people as they can, which at the men's shelter can be up to 150 people at any given time.

The third shelter is a newer facility and has been operating in the community for four years. It assists males and females over the age of eighteen and for the purpose of this project it will be referred to as Women's and Men's Shelter A (or Shelter A). A more secular organization, with no formal ties to any religious groups, this shelter operates as an emergency bed shelter as well as transitional housing for couples and individuals, offering life-skills training and peer support for residents. This includes assistance for attaining and maintaining employment, and linking residents with services in the community for addictions, housing, and mental health assistance, among others.

Shelter A is unique in its physical layout; it is a house that has been converted into a shelter, and operates as a large family-type household. There is no security system that grants entry to individuals who show up at the door. The setting is comparable to a group home where people cook together and participate in mealtime clean-up together. There is carpeting throughout the house and overall has a more "home-like" atmosphere. There are thirty beds in this facility, making it the smallest shelter out of the four studied. By having a more closely-knit setting, staff have an increased opportunity to be involved with the daily routines of the residents.

The fourth shelter houses men, women, and youths, and is also one of the oldest and largest facilities in the city. For the purposes of this project it will be referred to as Women's, Men's, and Youth Shelter B (or Shelter B). This shelter accepts individuals

sixteen years of age and older, and provides a detox program, an onsite medical clinic, and caseworkers for the residents. They also provide assistance for finding housing and making connections with services in the community that residents may require. This shelter also operates under a faith-based Christian mission, though neither this nor the other two shelters use religion as criteria for or against who can access shelter.

Shelter B is set up with a capacity of nearly 270 beds, with different floors and wings housing men, women, and youths. It is structurally the largest facility out of the four studied, and arguably has the most "institutional" feel. The facility has glass windows separating front line workers from visitors and residents, and front line staff are responsible for granting people access into the building. Each floor is equipped with staff members who oversee the activities of residents, though the rooms are set up as dorm style or private. There are lounges on each floor where residents can interact with each other as well as with staff.

There are quite obvious differences from living in a shelter as compared to living in the privacy of one's own home. The constant monitoring of incoming and outgoing people, shared dining areas and lounges, long tiled hallways, and at times the physical separation from staff with a glass window can create an institutionalized feel in many of the facilities. Staff indicated their awareness of this, but suggested that residents keep in mind that staying in shelter is temporary, and that the measures taken are to ensure the overall safety of everyone in the building. The overall physical structure of the facilities did not, however, greatly contribute to moral regulation or surveillance practices used by staff, but interestingly Shelter A provided the most intimate knowledge and appeared to

have more accounts of resident's "personality" than the other shelters, arguably due to their ability to manage a smaller population in a more intimate setting.

Data Analysis

The transcriptions of the interviews were analyzed according to a variety of themes found to have emerged across the context of how the homeless are sorted and managed, both internally and externally within shelter systems. The goal of uncovering the sorting and managing process of the homeless has been maintained using a moral regulation perspective, and though there are a variety of themes that materialized from these sixteen interviews alone, moral regulation is best suited for the themes of sorting, surveillance and managing.

Subsequently, the data were organized according to methods of sorting practices; moral regulation practices within and across shelters; re-making the liberal subject; surveillance – sometimes across shelters, and/or with other external social services in the community; and levels of progress. These themes lend insight into moral regulation, the key role of surveillance in moral regulation, and how moral regulation is administered beyond the dichotomy of deserving or undeserving, as well as beyond single institutions.

CHAPTER FIVE

ANALYSIS

By using a moral regulation perspective to analyze how the homeless are sorted within a city, a variety of potential themes surrounding regulation within shelters arose. Within the data, it was evident that current literature on regulation of the poor – particularly the homeless – has barely scratched the surface in regard to the themes of surveillance, the effects of regulation on funding, state involvement for shelter seeking individuals, and the inherent complexities that expand the dichotomy of the deserving and undeserving poor in the administration of aid to the homeless. Consistent with the goals of this project, and from the data obtained during interviews and shelter text analysis, several themes emerged. My thesis reveals that moral regulation practices are inextricably linked to surveillance and knowledge production. This knowledge production relies heavily on perceptions of progress, and it is this concept of progress that also contributes to the expansion of the deserving/undeserving dichotomy. Notions of progress also contribute to the shared knowledge with external institutions and the assistance offered to those who seek shelter. This thesis, however, does not claim these are the sole aspects of moral regulation of the homeless in Canada, but rather are the main themes that emerged in relation to studying the sorting process in this particular mid-sized Canadian city.

The Staff

It is important to understand the backgrounds of shelter staff and themes that emerged when discussing their personal experiences leading to their work with the homeless. One dominant theme that emerged, particularly among front line staff and

caseworkers was their own personal troubles in life that led them to feel they could understand and help out someone who was in crisis. When queried about choosing to work in a homeless shelter, a dialogue with the manager at Shelter B revealed:

> *Q: What attracted you to the field?*
> *A: Really, a lot of University of Life experience, that I thought someone would benefit from....*
>
> *Q: Did you have any specific experiences that led to your decision to work in this field that might be more precise?*
> *A: A rough childhood.*
>
> *Q: Okay.*
> *A: Yeah, I guess it is my whole life. Going from a rough childhood, single parenthood, putting myself through university and then trying to do something more with what I was given.*

This was a common type of response when asked about backgrounds, and many interviewees stated some experience related to being "on the other side" and then "making it". This contributed to feeling that they could help make a difference for other people, and was often linked to later discussion on "success stories", where residents in the stories often reflected similar successes as the staff member. This is not to say that all social service workers come from "difficult" backgrounds, or that it is a pre-requisite to working with the homeless, but many staff suggested they had a better understanding of how to help people based on their own experiences with hardships and success.

The motivation to help people achieve success is taken up further in this project, but this motivation is once again suggestive of the moral nature of people's initiatives to help others. Although it may not be a conscious effort, middle class values that have remained consistent throughout decades continue to be the benchmark for success, and those who deviate from the norm to the point where they require external assistance are measured against the ideological code of the successful liberal subject.

The staff are regulated by the rules they are meant to uphold, and the rules are a demonstration of what is to be expected from residents. Staff are likely required to reflect the values that the rules imply, such as being personable, well dressed, and most importantly, that all staff members maintain a normative, unified, and consistent appearance such that they should reflect each other's actions when assisting residents. In addition, the hierarchy of power exists such that front line staff are regulated by caseworkers; caseworkers by directors; and directors by board members, executive directors, and state agencies responsible for providing funding and resources. This top down approach results in shelters being run in a particular manner that at least to some degree operates in favour of those who are providing the funding.

Sorting the Homeless: Into Shelters

The research question for this thesis is: how are the homeless sorted and categorized within the shelter system beyond the division between the 'deserving' and 'undeserving' poor, and how is their treatment moralized, categorized, and legitimized? Upon conducting the interviews, it was evident that sorting occurred in a variety of forms that are intertwined with the actions of staff members and shelter seeking individuals or residents. In addition, the interviews revealed methods of sorting not previously hypothesized. After the initial decision to admit a resident was made, post-registration sorting was revealed to occur as a narrative evaluation. In other words, the distribution of individuals across different shelters was the result of a "gross sort" whereby there were no quantitative methods (i.e. a "score" assigned to residents' behaviour) that were used to relocate individuals. Thus, the process was based on narrative (qualitative) classifications of residents that became highly dependent on relationships created with staff and

administration. The following sections examine the procedures relevant to how individuals obtain residence within a given shelter, and the subsequent processes involved in restricting and relocating residents according to shelter policies.

There are three principle ways that each shelter acquires residents. These include referrals from another shelter, phone calls by the individual seeking shelter, and those individuals that showed up at the shelter and who meet the criteria of residency when consulting with the front line staff. Overall, basic demographics – age, gender, and family status – are responsible for the majority of the sorting process across all four shelters, particularly for first time shelter seekers. Each shelter is responsible for their own subcategory of the homeless population, a result of a combined effort of the city and the agencies that service this population. One interviewee from Shelter A noted,

> *[City Hall] won't fund anything that is a duplication of services...They are really careful about screening [new] organizations...Screening us out of any possible funding if we are a duplication of services. Even though you probably want six more [family shelters], [men's shelters], [Shelter A's] and [Shelter B's] in town, just to supply the demand for shelter (Shelter A, Outreach Worker).*

Thus each shelter became responsible for the management of particular groups, each attempting to offer something different from the others.

The following section provides background information that is necessary to explain how the sorting process begins, and how it occurs at the shelters studied. It is evident that sorting occurs as an ongoing process, and this section describes how an individual seeking shelter is sorted at each of these four shelters. It is used to describe how sorting occurs in separate stages, initially according to basic guidelines, and then in later stages that involve an increasingly moralized approach.

The Family Shelter

The family shelter was the only shelter that had call-ins – a process whereby the individual seeking shelter would call ahead to discuss a plan to come into the shelter – as a predominant method for how their homeless population arrived at their shelter. Interviewees stated that most families had someone call in ahead of time to schedule a date of arrival, usually because they knew they were being evicted or arrangements with family or friends they were staying with had broken down. In addition to call-ins, the family shelter also had walk-ins or referrals from other shelters ill-equipped to provide care for children.

Children were the main criteria for people being accepted into the family shelter. As one of the only family shelters in the area, this shelter recently created a mandate to revise their previous criteria that allowed single women to reside with them, and to restrict the shelter to family access only. They claimed an increased need to provide shelter for families with young children as their reason for restricting entry, particularly since Shelter B expanded their facility to include services for single women. There are times where the family shelter will make exceptions to this rule for females with restrictions at the other two locations, however there is no exceptions made for single males.

One grey area surrounding the family shelter is the acceptance of individuals who are expecting children. Single women who are pregnant, or couples without children who are expecting a child tend to be given permission to stay in this shelter. As stated it may be a more suitable environment versus some other shelters in the city. The staff noted that the shelter was equipped to deal with people with infants, and there were several

occasions where couples or single mothers had given birth to their children while residing in shelter.

Another unique scenario is the shelter's decision to allow parents with older children to live together. This is typically done when considering new Canadian families, especially when a language barrier exists between parents and staff. As per shelter rules, males over sixteen years are typically required to stay at either the men's shelter, Shelter A, or Shelter B, and then they are allowed visits during daytime hours. An exception can be made based on management and caseworker discretion when they think it may be best to keep a family together. The only example given was for families new to Canada, where caseworkers felt it would be more appropriate for the sake of the family as well as for communication with staff. The director at the family shelter stated:

> *...we have a mom in the shelter right now with her almost 30-year-old son and they are new to Canada and it just made sense to house them together rather than to have the mom here and the son in a men's shelter because they are going to be living together as a family unit and the son is the one who helped to translate a lot for the mom, so we make exceptions like that if they are going to be living together as a family unit (Family Shelter, Director).*

Under other circumstances, this scenario would not be permitted should the mother and son be English-speaking Canadian citizens, whereby the son would be referred to the men's shelter or other shelters available to males, and the mother would reside in a shelter that took single females. Overall, the family shelter is unique in its clientele and therefore provides an interesting component to sorting the homeless in this city. Though it may seem straightforward at first, it is evident that moral regulation plays a role into the process of acquiring and maintaining residents at this shelter, based on levels of discretion used by staff to determine the suitability of residents.

The Men's Shelter

The men's shelter, though less complex in its description of conditions to reside, also provides some interesting factors to the practice of sorting the homeless. The basic eligibility requirements for this shelter are that the resident be over sixteen years of age and male. There are no exceptions made for women. A general requirement is that the resident is able to care for themselves, or be self sufficient in daily routines and require minimal personal physical care, though there are contacts made for people who require a Personal Service Worker (PSW) that are accessed through an outside service. Provided there are no prior suspensions or restrictions on an individual seeking shelter here, men who meet the age requirement are eligible to reside at this location.

Individuals seeking residence at the men's shelter are streamlined into their doors in three primary ways: call-ins, walk-ins, and referrals. Unlike the family shelter, the typical method is a walk-in. Registration for intake begins after 3:00pm, and the intake process takes place in order, on a per person basis with a front line staff member, where information on the residents is collected and their eligibility is assessed. Resident's eligibility will be covered in more detail in the section on moral regulation.

The reasons for individuals being sorted into the men's shelter are broad, as stated by several interviewees from this shelter. For example, when noting some reasons people seek assistance at their shelter, one manager stated:

> *Well, it is pretty diverse, but I mean you get your people in shelter who are here for every reason under the sun. I mean there is guys who are here just because they wanted to be, but some people want to be in a shelter, they just like going from shelter to shelter, because you know that's their goal. And some, they have nowhere else to go, a lot have addiction issues, so they keep getting kicked out of apartments, having no money, having no job. Some are here because of the courts... because their parents kicked them out... because they are travelling across Canada... because they are released*

> *from the hospital; some are here because they came down to visit a friend, friend is not at home, so they come here, some come to [the city] off the bus and don't even know what they are going to do, so someone says, well maybe you should go to a shelter (Shelter B, Manager).*

Others stated that homeless males sought shelter as result of breakdowns in relationships with a spouse or partner. It is evident that the factors causing homelessness are quite diverse, yet the actual methods of streaming single males into this shelter are generally based on demographics and basic eligibility factors based on prior stays and violations of house rules.

Women's and Men's Shelter A

In relation to the men's shelter, Women's and Men's Shelter A handles the sorting process in a similar fashion for its residents. This shelter, however, is also open to single females and couples and access to shelter is based again on basic eligibility and demographics. The methods for accessing shelter at this location involve walk-ins, referrals, or call-ins. People are generally referred to this shelter, as it is not as well known in the city as are the other locations. It can be a point of referral for those who have violated rules and have been suspended from the other shelters. Its capacity to house individuals is far less than the others, and primarily operates on 'crashbeds', an emergency beds program used in the event of an overflow of residents. In addition, a unique quality for this shelter is its willingness to house couples as a unit. This is the only shelter in the city that does so, with the exception of the family shelter who only houses couples with children or who are expecting a child.

Shelter A also houses individuals according to basic demographics. Individuals must be at least eighteen years of age, and have no restrictions based on prior behaviour

at this shelter. There are four different stages of shelter that individuals can access, including crashbeds, emergency shelter beds, and two types of transitional housing. The emergency shelter beds are what individuals seeking shelter can access when they first show up at the door of Shelter A. This is located within a dorm. If emergency dorm beds are full, individuals can access the crashbeds that operate as overflow beds. Individuals need only sign one form that provides government funding to provide those beds.

To access emergency beds in the dorms, the intake process is more extensive with more forms and formal intake with staff and an assigned support worker. The intake for transitional housing typically operates on a waiting list, so people can be sorted into dorm-style living once their names come up on the list. If there is no waiting list, individuals willing to do an intake process can be moved in after the appropriate forms are filled out. Depending on what is required for the individual, they are sorted into these services based on availability of the service, and what is required for that person based on individual needs. There are a variety of other conditions for moving into transitional and emergency beds in the dorms, though these are discussed further in the section on moral regulation within shelters.

Women's, Men's and Youth Shelter B

Finally, the sorting in process for Women's, Men's and Youth Shelter B involves a similar process to the aforementioned shelters. Their basic criteria are demographics and prior suspensions or restrictions to determine eligibility. At times this shelter was referred to by interviewees as the "overflow [shelter] of the city". Residents here can be as young as sixteen, otherwise they are referred to the care of the Children's Aid Society (CAS), and there is no age limit provided people are able to care for themselves. At times

CAS can refer individuals sixteen to eighteen years of age who were formerly in their care, and then they would also be responsible for funding the stay of that resident. As long as individuals are willing to abide by the rules and have no suspensions they are given an intake. As with the other shelters, individuals can access this shelter via walk-ins, call-ins, or referrals.

Once admitted into this shelter, individuals are further sorted within the building according to gender and age. Women and men are housed on separate floors, and the floors are divided by wings housing different age categories of individuals 16-24 years of age on one side, and 25 years and up on the other. According to one staff member, this was done for safety purposes in order to prevent, for example, having a young male sleeping in the same quarters as an older male who might be a sex offender, and to encourage the general safety of individuals while sleeping. Overall, many staff members stated that general safety and the maintenance of security was a priority in running and managing their shelter, given the volume of residents they worked with, which could be at any given time around two hundred people as registered residents.

It is not the intention of this project to minimize the complexity of the factors that cause homelessness. There is evidently a diversity of reasons that render an individual, couple, or family homeless. This was reinforced by nearly all interviewees, and supported by narratives from staff who had taken the time to listen to the stories and hardships of the residents they assist. The purpose of this project, however, is not to explore the avenues which lead individuals to seek shelter, but rather to demonstrate the actual methods employed by staff when meeting people at the point of need.

Despite the initial hypothesis that sorting the homeless population of this city into different shelters might occur on the basis of moral regulation, the sorting that occurred once individuals had become registered residents within a shelter was not initially considered. It was upon further investigation through the interviewing process that the notion of different stages of sorting emerged. Thus, the "first" sort occurred as mentioned above, with all the shelters accessing individuals on the basis of general characteristics, such that the demographics of gender, age, and family status are a necessary component to deciding who goes where, given that the individual seeking shelter had no prior conflicts with the shelter location. Given this, it was revealed that sorting is an ongoing process within shelters, with demographics being necessary but not sufficient to sorting practices.

Sorting the Homeless: Out of Shelters

Sorting does not end with admitting an individual into shelter, but transpires in a process that relies on a relationship among residents, staff, and rules; all inextricably linked to practices of moral regulation that occur after the formal decision to admit a resident has been made. This section explores sorting that can occur post-registration should residents and/or staff decide that an individual is not suitable for taking up residence in a particular place.

Each shelter studied relies on rule enforcement and policy to back up reasons for restricting or suspending an individual from their shelter, yet several interviews with staff members revealed the discretion and flexibility possessed by staff members to formally make the decision to have an individual removed. It could be said that the rules are in place only to state expected behaviour, and to reinforce the decisions made by staff when

suspending an individual from shelter after the fact. In addition to rule breaking, other factors that can lead to individuals being 'sorted out' of a shelter include violations pertaining to legal factors; restrictions made by the police or CAS; prior criminal history that staff feel interferes with the shelter's safety and functioning; or conflict with another resident.

The most common rules upheld in order to place a suspension or restriction on a resident are those surrounding drugs and alcohol, and violence. Generally speaking, anyone caught under the influence of, or in possession of drugs and alcohol can be asked to leave a shelter. This is typically grounds for suspension and restricting an individual for one week or for months depending on the severity of the violation, and is decided by the shelter caseworkers and managers. Violence can lead to more severe restrictions; usually lasting anywhere from one to six months, though no shelter claimed to have ever permanently restricted an individual from their property.

In addition to the aforementioned rules, the most frequent restrictions or conditions resulting in a "second phase" sorting out of shelter included: suspending residents who caused property damage; people with a conflict of interest with another resident – usually solved on a 'first come first serve' basis; thirty day policies whereupon the expiration of a resident's permitted time in shelter they were required to move out or begin paying rent, and then refused to do so; the shelter being full to capacity; a resident's inability to continue being self-sufficient in personal care (due to age or illness); and if mental illness was deemed to become too extreme, thus requiring hospitalization and a medical clearance in order to be re-admitted to shelter. These are a few among many circumstances that play into the sorting out process, but were the most commonly cited

reasons for a person being referred out or restricted from shelter. The most common solution to these incidents is a process of referrals to other shelters, or to appropriate services such as hospitals and nursing homes.

Of central interest to this project are moral regulation processes of staff whereupon knowledge is gained about an individual that requires them to be relocated to a different shelter. An interesting example of this arose from the family shelter that demonstrates the interrelation of agencies and surveillance in deciding the appropriateness of a resident in house. When asked about the types of people that need to be referred elsewhere after registration, the director stated,

> *...there have been cases where we have had to ask the male partners to leave because at that point we will find out that there is [sic] charges pending or that the Children's Aid itself has recommended that we not keep the mom and dad together at this time. We don't see our shelter as a place of family reunification so if the mom and dad have been separated for whatever reason, this isn't the place to come back together. Or if a child has been taken into the care of the Children's Aid and they want to return that child to the mom and dad, this is not a good environment to do that because there is already a lot of crisis and chaos going on in everybody's life here. So if you want to give a new family that is getting back together – or a child is reuniting with their mom and dad – the best chance this would not be the best place because it would add stress to the already stressful situation. However, we have of course made exceptions in both of those cases as well if it makes sense (Family Shelter, Director).*

This excerpt demonstrates a variety of issues raised thus far. In addition to shedding light on the "sorting out" process that occurs on an inter-agency basis, it further depicts moralizing discourse in relation to deciding whether a family can reside together or work through personal conflict while in shelter. The decision is made for a couple by staff members and external agencies, depending on the "level of crisis" in resident's lives, or how much of it is portrayed to the staff by these subjects. The notion of whether something "makes sense" is inherently linked to moral discourse, based on exceptions

that are made if individuals or scenarios are considered appropriate. This also demonstrates the flexibility of policy and rules, and the degree to which the discretion of the staff is about conceptions of right and wrong, and thus, the fate of residents.

Moral Regulation In Shelters

There is undoubtedly moral regulation being undertaken within shelters, ranging from regulating personal choices, meals and bed times, and daily activities. Again, Hunt defines moral regulation as a form of politics whereby individuals act to problematise the conduct, values, or culture of others and seek to impose regulation upon them. In particular this section will focus on the moralized subject (staff), who act upon an object or target (residents) and how they engage in moralizing practices when the said object or target has been deemed fundamentally wrong or bad (1999: 6-7).

Criminality

Post-registration sorting related to criminal history provides an interesting platform from which to discuss practices of moral regulation linked across shelters. The family shelters as well as Shelter B do not accept sex offenders based on their criteria for housing youths. However, the director of Shelter A noted they tend not to house sex offenders if they know the history of the individual beforehand, and try to consult with the Probation Office to assess the risk of that individual. When discussing the types of people never admitted to their shelter, she noted:

> *...we would never not admit someone if we just met them. We'd have to have some sort of history. We have had, at one point in time, had someone who is a registered sexual offender and who was at high-risk for re-offending, and specifically targeted vulnerable people. Because we have vulnerable people...that person will not be allowed back here. So, we had cases like that*

where we have had people that we just won't let them back again, but they were allowed in when they initially came (Shelter A, Director).

This is just one example of how people are sorted into and out of shelter based on perceived characteristics. It is evident that criteria extend beyond "deserving" and "undeserving" qualities, and involves a wider range of categorization and management of personalities and circumstances that are dependent upon staff discretion of who is considered appropriate for their facility. Of the city's shelters, the men's shelter is the only one that will knowingly take sex offenders, but if their stay is compromised due to violations of rules or any of the aforementioned conditions, there are not many options left in terms of sending such individuals to other locations since no other shelters will willingly take people with a criminal history of sexual deviance.

In addition to sex offenders, shelters monitor residents who have legal charges or legal restrictions on them due to criminal offences. At times, residents can be ordered to reside at a shelter by a judge when being released from prison if they have nowhere else to reside, or if being discharged from a federal halfway house. This can come with conditions such as curfew and probation, and shelter staff become responsible for interacting with police to help enforce a resident's conditions. This demonstrates one link between shelters and external agencies, and the network of governance that is responsibilized outside of the individual.

The examples in this section clearly demonstrate the link between sorting and moral regulation and they require contemplating sorting as an ongoing process of managing the homeless. In this way sorting and managing the homeless across shelters is

not fully distinguishable from the practice of moral regulation within shelters. The next section examines this process in further detail.

Regulating Residents

To begin this section, an overall look at basic rules across the shelters will be undertaken. Upon arrival and registration of a resident, each is given a copy of the shelter rules and is asked to sign a waiver requiring them to abide by the rules. Otherwise, staff reserve the right to evict residents from the shelter. The rules vary from respecting other residents, to appropriate and expected behaviour, and oftentimes include rules on personal hygiene.

The most common rules cited by interviewees were those whose violation involved the eviction of residents. These included breaking zero tolerance policies against the use of drugs and alcohol; or violence on property. Staff commonly cited rules prohibiting drugs and alcohol as most important since it is claimed the majority of residents in shelter are trying to "get clean". Typically, interviewees stated that it was important to respect the efforts made by those residents who were abstaining from drugs and alcohol, and that by allowing substances on the property it would make this rehabilitation process more difficult.

While some drug use and trafficking is illegal in Canada, the same does not hold for alcohol consumption, making it an interesting case of moral regulation. Most notably, addictions were deemed by staff to be a major barrier to individuals overcoming homelessness and to interfere with nearly all processes of providing proper assistance to residents. Many stated residents who struggle with addiction have a difficult time budgeting their money, and that money provided can end up feeding bad habits further.

Therefore a lot of the counselling and other programs in place are meant to curb a person's addiction to get them back on track and out of shelter.

(Il)legal Activities

Shelter staff have a unique opportunity to police behaviours of their choice in exchange for providing services. This includes the prohibition of activities or materials that are otherwise legal in Canada. Such activities include possession of pornographic material; regulation of sexual relations among consenting adults (no sex in shelter); relinquishing prescription medications to staff; and the consumption of alcohol. Two rule pamphlets handed to residents upon entry at some shelters make reference to pornographic material – listed as one of several of the most important guidelines to follow. One pamphlet specifically states, "Pornographic material is not appropriate and will be destroyed" (Men's Shelter, 2007). Of these rules, residents are required to sign a waiver to abide by such guidelines or face reprimand. The implications of such guidelines in relation to the influence of middle class ideals on residents will be discussed in a later section.

When considering conditions of legitimacy of character and demonstrating the conditions of appropriateness as determined by staff discretion, a broader discussion on standard rules and the flexibility of those rules was undertaken with a front line worker at Shelter A. Given that alcohol consumption in a private residence is legal in Canada, the shelter restrictions on alcohol use create a unique site to examine moral regulation of the homeless. An interviewee noted the difference between drug use and alcohol use. She noted occasions when she let people come in and go to bed even if they had had a couple

of drinks or were intoxicated upon coming back to the shelter. When pressed about how to decide who stays and who is suspended, she remarked:

> *...it depends on the individual, and I know if you do it for one everybody says you have to do it for all, but it depends on the personality too because we are dealing with real people here. So, I find out somebody has been drinking but he is going to go to bed, it is okay with me, but in the other shelters it is not.*
>
> *Q: [So] how do you use your discretion on that, when you are in that situation? A: Personality definitely. If their personality is not violent and they are not bugging anybody and they are not completely sloshed so that they cannot walk and they come in and say, "you know I have had a drink or two but I am going to bed" it is all good. Because you can tell the difference, it is all on personality and what that person's background was like and what they are capable of (Shelter A, Front Line 1).*

This reflects the flexibility available to staff members when dealing with residents, and how much perceived individual characteristics can effect how they are sorted. In addition, this excerpt also suggests the flexibility of moral regulation, which can be expanded to any behaviour that varies in acceptability, legal or not. In effect, it demonstrates the necessity for the resident to conform to the standards set by staff in order to sustain refuge within the establishment, and that straying from conformity can result in a return to destitution.

Valverde notes that people's drinking behaviour has been problematized for at least 150 years (1998:1). In Canada, the consumption of alcohol is not illegal for those over nineteen years of age, but in shelters even the smell of alcohol on a person's breath can be grounds for meeting with a caseworker to discuss the rules, or eviction from shelter and referral to "detox" or the hospital. Notes are taken by staff on each shift of any rule breaking behaviour. The fact alcohol is a legal substance highlights the moral nature of the regulation imposed on residents' conduct. However, there are several reasons cited for alcohol restrictions including respect for those trying to overcome

addictions, and also for the safety of staff and other residents' should someone under the influence of alcohol become violent or disruptive to the in-house routine. The rules are said to be in place to uphold the overall safety within a community living environment. In any situation at the shelters, even the consumption of one drink, or the smell of alcohol on the breath, can be grounds for an individual to be dismissed and sorted out of one shelter and into another as stated by shelter rules.

Remaking the Liberal Subject

Valverde describes charitable organization's work in the 1880s on the regulation of alcohol in *Diseases of the Will*. She notes that particular organizations working with the poor and lower classes realized a need to create alternative places of leisure time recreation to keep people from resorting to saloons and pubs. By providing an alternative rather than advocating for the closure of such institutions, the look and feel of their provided activities were hoped to provide a new type of lifestyle for the poor (1998:90-91). Given the methods used by the shelters researched in this project, it is evident that such practices continued to be implemented as a means of rehabilitating residents. By creating alternatives and requiring specific activities throughout the day, those trying to "stay clean" are provided with distractions and alternatives to feeding their habits. In addition, these activities lead to a new type of lifestyle, often laced with liberal ideals such as financial responsibility, job-seeking, self-governance, healthy living, and education[4]. Overall, encouragement of self responsibilization continues to be endorsed in

[4] Liberal ideology is a dominant theme throughout interviews that shaped what staff "do" with residents, but this theme is not seamless in how the subject is constructed, as ideals vary according to different staff. It is understood that the liberal ideology is not the only discourse available to staff/policy when providing services and in constructing the subject, however, it is seen playing a particularly important role in the construction of the resident in this project.

the 21st Century. As in the late 1800s, moralizing agents continue to "believe that anyone, no matter how fallen, could be healed and transformed" (Valverde, 1998: 91).

To return to Dean's work on liberal governmentality, it is clear that many of the factors constituting "appropriate" behaviours and activities comply with his categorization of liberal subjects according to their capacities for autonomy. He argues that social programmes are deemed necessary to render the individual autonomous and to manifest good character of those who prefer paid employment to welfare benefits as a source of their livelihood (2002:47-8). In many ways this can be noted through shelter practices and rule enforcement, and the attempts of staff to "teach" residents how to become part of "civil society" (Dean, 2002: 40-4). The authoritarian dimension to liberal governmentality as explained by Dean can be linked to shelter staff as moralizing agents of broader state enforcement of liberal ideologies. He argues that some people must be coerced to fulfil certain obligations in order to reach a condition of freedom (47). In the case of shelters, this coercion can exist in the form of surveillance and set rules, while their conditions of freedom include housing, and often physical safety from potentially harmful conditions that may result from homelessness.

Remaking the liberal subject involves a network of practices that fall under the rubric of moral regulation. By policing behaviours considered "inappropriate" for shelters, middle class standards tend to be imposed on residents through the framework of protecting the shelter community. By observing the prohibition of otherwise legal activities, it is evident that the construction of proper conduct is reflected in what are typically considered middle class ideals, or components of what Dean describes as civil society (1999:48). Activities such as sexual expression, alcohol consumption, even

staying up late or sleeping in, all become 'vices' that will remain vices not to be enjoyed until more acceptable middle class standards are achieved. In other words, the message given to residents is that until they undertake a more "successful" approach to their lifestyle that include components of overall self-sufficiency, they should not be able to participate in the immoral pleasures awarded to the harder working middle class. It has become the responsibility of shelter staff to instil particular values within residents, and teach the practices of what it takes to become a more successful liberal subject.

One method for attempting to get people back on track is something called "life skills counselling" or some variation of this program that focuses on teaching residents methods for managing aspects of their lives that are deemed to interfere with their ability to sustain a stable lifestyle. These practices encompass moral regulation by staff in their entirety. Life skills can include anything from learning how to cook and clean, to budgeting and creating an atmosphere of self sufficiency and responsibility. At the men's shelter as well as at Shelters A and B, the rooms are closed during the day from morning to evening, which encourages residents to become mobile and actively seek out services or act upon goals they have set with caseworkers. The only way a resident is allowed to stay in is with a doctor's note that requires them to rest.

When asked what staff encourage residents to do while in shelter, responses included: helping people to get into detox or abstaining from the use of substances; creating life goals; using money management skills; applying for Ontario Works; applying for proper government identification such as health cards; job and apartment searching; getting back into school; living by values such as respect and responsibility as outlined by shelter guidelines; using community services including the YMCA or drop-in

centres; and seeking medical attention they may have otherwise avoided. These themes fall within the scope of life skills training, and the hope for staff was that the "ideal" resident would take these lessons with them when they left the shelter setting. These activities not only reflect moral regulation, but also the middle class values that influence the decision to undertake these projects of 'proper' conduct.

Discipline and Punish?

Aside from encouragement of life skills and self-responsibility there are some basic systems in place that help to enforce moral regulation within shelters, as well as highlight the 'governance of others' by staff and particularly the 'governance of self' by residents. These include the implementation of certain rules surrounding curfews, bedtimes, basic daily schedules and routines, chores, visitors, and prescription medications; these also include expected behaviours surrounding dress codes and possession of pornographic material. All of the systems, elaborated below, are in place to contribute to the overall shelter functioning and management and at times to encourage the values and practices they attempt to instil in residents.

All the shelters with the exception of Shelter A have a curfew in place, requiring that residents return to shelter around midnight. Violation of this curfew is noted in memos and brought up by caseworkers to discuss when meeting with their assigned residents. Exceptions are made for people who go to the hospital; and occasionally when arranged with staff ahead of time if there is a reason that staff deem appropriate. A case where this might be applicable is if a resident was asked to baby-sit for a friend, etc. where they could earn some extra money. The curfews are claimed to be in place so that

residents rest, as they are required to retire to their dorms at bedtime, and this allows for people to be up early and out of the dorms at the required time.

Aside from apartment searching and accessing community supports, residents at the family shelter and Shelter A are required to do daily chores they sign up for shortly after registration. Non-compliance is cause for meetings with caseworkers to discuss potential consequences, and chronic nonconformity sometimes leads to suspension from shelter. At Shelter A, two missed chores can result in a twenty four hour suspension. At this shelter, chores include preparation of meals, clean-up after meals, dishes and other chores around the shelter. The idea is that of a community household where everyone must do their part. At the family shelter, chores include dishes, assisting the cooks with mealtime set-up, sweeping halls, common area clean up, and cleaning bathrooms. Those who undertake more than one chore are rewarded with prizes from a 'prize box' in the front line office. These tactics support Dean's discussion of the "authoritarian policy" adopted by state programmes, whereby authoritarian strategies are necessary to enforce the common obligations of citizenship such as the enforcement of work, no matter how routine and mundane, and irrespective of one's other responsibilities such as child rearing (2002: 39). Obediently doing chores can invoke more than a tangible reward for residents. It became evident through discussion with staff that those residents who were more willing to comply with house rules and co-operation with chores were often more highly regarded and favoured by staff. When discussing the ability to mesh well with residents, one staff member at Shelter A noted:

> *Certain people when they come in here are so grateful for the service, 'cause they'll extend themselves – "Oh, I want to help you to do this and I want to do extra chores and I want..." – and they are just personable. You can see they are really eager, so you tend to...some [staff] tend to be little bit more open*

> *towards those people. I am not saying that they are, but they are easier to talk to and they will do things, and their motivation is there so it is easy to communicate better (Shelter A, Front Line 1).*

This type of relationship was more likely to lead to rule leniency, and more exceptions made for 'personable' residents. This again demonstrates the wide discretion available to staff when enforcing the rules, and also that what matters are assumptions about the type of resident being dealt with, rather than the rules, which become secondary. It is easy to see how if there was friction between a resident and staff member that enforcement of the rules can depend a bit more on personality than policy alone.

In the family shelter, visitors are only allowed at certain times, while other shelters do not allow non-residents to access the shelter or to come in and "hang out". A front line staff member at Shelter B noted:

> *We have to make sure people aren't sneaking in. Sometimes people who aren't living here anymore...come in because they want to see their friend or they owe somebody money or something like that. Even if they want to have lunch because they have nowhere to eat you have to monitor people coming and going. Sometimes it's kind of tricky (Shelter B, Front Line).*

Residents at this shelter are required to schedule visits off property, and the rule sheet at Shelter B suggests this is due to the "nature of the facility." At the family shelter, visitors are typically allowed in before dinner time, for a couple of hours a day. This allows residents time to be out for the day completing tasks created with caseworkers. This demonstrates the authority that staff have over resident's daily activities, and how subtle regulation such as the guidelines on visitors influence a broader idea of moral regulation while attempting to instil particular values in liberal subjects.

Medications are also monitored by staff, and residents are required to hand in all prescription medication to the front line office. Front line staff or VON nurses (if

available) dispense medication according to the prescription, and all are kept in a medication cabinet. Upon dispensation, staff record the medication taken by each resident according to dosage and time. This is to avoid the circulation of prescription drugs within shelter, as well as to monitor residents' health. In addition, it allows staff to monitor those residents not following doctor's orders and to bring this up with those residents who may be in need of treatment. More specifically this is used for residents with more severe forms of mental illness to ensure they are getting proper care and are, for example, emotionally, psychologically, and behaviourally stable while in shelter.

Although these guidelines are in place to maintain safety within a community living environment, they are about moral regulation. Prescription medications are lawfully permitted to be held by the person for whom they are prescribed. Regulating associations with visitors gears residents towards particular daytime actions and practices the staff sees as appropriate – conducting apartment and job searches, and so on. These rules demonstrate the regulation of conduct that would not otherwise be required if not for the fact the individual is in a shelter. Though these practices might "make sense"; they are also decidedly moral in nature.

Aside from the previously mentioned management guidelines, all shelters have certain expectations for general behaviour in house. Residents are expected to comply with a particular dress code. For example, pyjamas are not allowed to be worn in the family shelter past 10:00AM, and residents are expected to maintain general personal hygiene while in shelter. All shelters state that clothes with 'offensive' slogans are not allowed. Though not specifically stated, from personal experience working in a shelter clothing with racial or derogatory comments or explicit words, or clothing with

drug/alcohol slogans or themes were not allowed. Some shelters also suggest that shirts must be buttoned up at all times. In general, one guideline sums up this idea by stating that people should "dress appropriately for community living". In addition, some of the shelters require residents shower as part of their registration process. If showering and clothing changes are not done regularly, this is cause for meeting with a caseworker. This is outlined in the rules handed out to residents upon registration.

These expected behaviours plainly demonstrate the influence of what are typically considered "middle class ideals" of the appropriateness of conduct. Also they emphasize practices that would not be regulated should the individual be residing in their own private residence. In this way, middle class values can be used to measure residents, specifically according to those behaviours considered vices (sex, drugs, alcohol, laziness, etc.) thereby dividing those who are willing to work on them, and those who defy the liberal ideal. Though this can be seen as a means of dichotomizing people according to deserving and undeserving categories, there are levels of willingness on behalf of the residents in regard to which rules and behaviours they follow, or how many "vices" they subscribe to. As is taken up in a later section, this can ultimately relate to their treatment by staff and how their progress is measured, and subsequently the level of service they receive overall. In addition, the government reinforces these norms such that those who do not subscribe to liberal ideals can be reprimanded by the network of social services such as appropriate funding through welfare, or insufficient substance abuse treatment facilities, and are then forced to confront moralizing agents to meet their basic "needs" of food and shelter. By requiring a particular appropriateness of conduct through "proper" clothing, encouraging the pursuit of education, abstinence from alcohol, drugs, and sexual

(mis)conduct, the management of vices not only attempts to manage residents while in shelter, but also their lifestyles later on.

Moral regulation occurs in shelters through the delineation of improper conduct that is "remedied" through the administration of life skills training and rehabilitation of vices, as well as through the disciplinary regime that residents are required to follow in exchange for the services offered. The degree to which this is measured, and the level of assistance offered is based on how much a resident is willing or eager to adhere to this regime, and is translated by staff into the degree of progress achieved by the resident. Before progress can be measured, however, an understanding of the degree and methods of surveillance in shelters is relevant to understanding how knowledge is produced about residents, and how this knowledge is used to assist shelters in liaising with external institutions such as the police, CAS, or Ontario Works.

Hunt states that "moral regulation should be understood as ongoing contestations that involve a continuous, and more or less coercive, suppression of some identities and forms of life and the encouragement and enhancement of preferred forms" (1999:15). This is evident in how the shelter's moralizing agents encourage, guide, and reward shelter residents. The following section attempts to delineate how these actions are linked to data collection on individual residents and the significance of surveillance methods used within shelter settings to aid moral regulation.

Surveillance and Moral Regulation

An area not explored by Hunt is the relevance of surveillance in moral regulation, and its particular role in connecting his claim that "moral regulation movements form an interconnected web of discourses, symbols, and practices exhibiting persistent

continuities that stretch across time and place" (1999:9). Through my examination of moral regulation within various shelters, surveillance is found to be inextricably linked to the administration of regulating practices both within shelters and in relation to the knowledge produced for external social institutions.

A basic method of surveillance in shelters is the monitoring and documentation of resident behaviour while in-house. In each of the shelters, surveillance starts from the initial phone call to seek shelter. Staff check databases to pull up a resident's history, and they are checked for restrictions or flags that would prohibit them from residing at a particular location. Upon an individual's arrival in the family or men's shelter, staff conduct an intake where the majority of information is collected about a resident, and an intake memo is completed that discusses the person's story. As one interviewee noted:

> *Intake is a gathering information process. You are asking basic background questions without putting a lot of pressure on them...But usually on an intake...you can get a lot of information out of them, because they are just so desperate for a place to stay (Family Shelter, Front Line 2).*

This excerpt clearly demonstrates how an individual's need can be exploited for the purposes of surveillance. Intake becomes situated as a "confessional" place, and the resident is put in a position of giving up information in exchange for having their desperation resolved. Staff record memos on residents either on computers or in a log throughout daytime and evening shifts. The intake memo allows a caseworker to review what was discussed with front line staff, and to prepare for meetings with the resident and to understand their circumstances. The daily memos monitor activities of the residents, register conflicts or problems, and generally report on their time spent in shelter. This information assists caseworkers in keeping track of their clients, and to monitor behaviour that occurs after caseworkers have left in the evening. These memos are for the

use of shelter staff only, and can be retained anytime after a resident has moved out of shelter. These notes are only circulated among immediate staff, however, and are generally not shared directly with external institutions due in part to the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

Surveillance and External Social Institutions

There is, however, other types of information that circulates more freely outside shelters. Upon registration, residents are asked to sign forms for the release of information across certain agencies, and are informed that any information they share is accessible to staff, or any agency the resident agrees to. This can, however, lead back to the excerpt suggesting a resident's desperation for a place to stay, and plays on their need for shelter and thus their willingness to co-operate with staff. To a degree there is a sense of coercion that residents face in providing information, as they are likely in a state of crisis upon arrival and will co-operate in order to ensure their safety for the night.

External agencies can include CAS, who requires data collection from the family shelter and Shelter B who house youths. CAS can be responsible for funding residents who are under their supervision, and often are involved with monitoring parents residing at the family shelter by being in contact with shelter caseworkers. They also help to enforce legal restrictions for parents or certain adults from being in contact with children, and can inform shelter staff of these conditions. Other external agencies include Ontario Works, and local public schools. Information collected by all shelters involves the completion of an Ontario Works 1A form, which collects basic information such as health card number, birth certificate information, driver's license number, and social insurance number; marital status; number of dependent children; last/present employment;

other persons living in their household (including relatives or boarders); monthly living expenses; income and assets[5]; and finally the applicant's reasons why assistance is required. Residents are required to sign this form as a condition to reside in shelter. By submitting this form, the shelters receive funding from the provincial government through the Ontario Disability Support Program (ODSP) for the bed used by each resident. If residents refuse to sign this form, they cannot be registered to stay.

Other information collected from individuals upon intake is extensive. It includes: legal status; emergency information; health concerns; physical appearance; allergies; former addresses (which can at times include ten to fifteen different locations); income and assets; involvement in abusive relationships (in the case that a resident may have a home, Ontario Works wants to know why a person does not live in it); the source of referral to the shelter; mental health or medical conditions; whether the person has CAS involvement; whether the person has legal issues such as probation or conditions to reside in shelter as ordered by a judge, and pending criminal charges; work history; and personal goals upon arrival.

When asked why such extensive information is collected on residents, one interviewee stated that in the event that a resident goes missing or if police are looking for someone, the shelter is able to provide adequate information to assist them. She stated there was a lot of police contact, and therefore the information generated is in part for use by police and other agencies (Family Shelter, Front Line 1). In regard to residents with CAS involvement, the same person noted that the information on file was required to

[5] The Application for Assistance by Ontario Works form instructs staff to "list all income and assets of the applicant, and all dependents living in the household, such as social assistance of any kind, wages, full or part time earnings, rentals, contribution of payments from any source, annuities, chequing accounts, savings accounts, bonds, stocks, money in trust, insurance policies, real estate, etc."

protect the shelter from liability with children in the case of a violation of CAS requirements for parents. Liability becomes directly linked to knowing residents' legal status, and by surveilling residents shelters protect themselves.

An entire project could be undertaken on the intensity of surveillance and its relevance to moral regulation and influence upon the administration of services to individual shelter seekers. The purpose of the next section, however, is to examine how the collection of such information assists in categorizing the homeless beyond traditional dichotomies of deserving and undeserving to reveal how their treatment is also moralized and legitimized through the administration of services, both within and external to shelters.

A surprising statement was made by a front line staff member at Shelter B about the information database regarding the clients registered at their shelter. She stated:

> *I think there's like 7,000... people [listed in the database]. I can tell you the exact amount who have stayed here. All the people who ever stayed here even for one day, and the people who maybe stayed at the old building in the 1950's... I think we started using [the computer] maybe in 2002 – 2003 something like that. [But] before that they just used paper forms and that's likely filed in the basement or something. But there's quite a few files (Shelter B, Front Line).*

Surveillance to this extent makes one question the necessity or relevance of retaining this type of information on people seeking temporary residence in a shelter, since the information does not directly influence the administration of aid via food and shelter – essentially the basic needs to be covered for the homeless. More generally, many of the interviewees stated that the information collected is for funding purposes from the provincial government, and the rest is to assist in the security and administration of services to the individual resident and the shelter community. One interviewee also

suggested that the collection of information assisted in getting a broader picture of what was going on with each resident, including the ability to manage people's stories for consistency from one stay to the next (Family Shelter, Front Line 1). This allowed the staff members to follow the reasons that brought people into shelter, and recognize potential patterns of events that led to their homelessness and to attempt to resolve particular issues. Thus, surveillance contributes not only knowledge for external social institutions, but also to the creation of the idea of "progress" and the fundamentally liberal notion of what constitutes "good" progress.

Progress

The notion of progress can have a variety of meanings for an individual experiencing homelessness, as well as to staff. This involves assessing individuals on a case by case basis, and determining conditions the individual seeks to improve upon. Though this was generally acknowledged by interviewees, an underlying theme of progress emerged through discussion on different topics of managing residents, "success stories", and subsequent reprimands for a lack of progress according to set definitions.

The idea of assumed benefits for residents can be based on aspects of their personality, and an interesting theme that arose during interviews was the length of stay for residents. Residence with no source of income may stay for free in shelters for a period up to forty-two days, but are re-evaluated after thirty. Those with income, including those on Ontario Works (welfare), ODSP, CPP and WSIB, are required to pay to stay as of the 1st day of the following month of their registration. This means residents are allowed up to a thirty day funded stay in shelter as allowed by the city, and up to forty-two days if granted an extension by a caseworker. This results in a process whereby

individuals on Ontario Works are encouraged to come into shelter closer to the start of the month, since they are required to begin paying room and board upon the arrival of a new month. For example, if an individual needs shelter on the November 27th, they will be required to pay starting December 1st. This is because government cheques such as ODSP, CPP, and WSIB come out at the end of the month, so on the first day of the following month, individuals are required to pay for their shelter stay. If an individual enters at the start of a month, then they can stay the entire month for free, and for that month can access a caseworker to try to set them up with housing and other needs before that month is up.

The interesting part of this condition is that caseworkers can advocate for residents to extend their stay up to forty-two days based on the perceived levels of progress the individual is making towards getting housing, education, addictions treatment, etc. This is up to the discretion of Ontario Works to decide whether to grant an extension, and the caseworkers submit and advocate on the residents' behalf. In the event a resident is not in school, seeking employment or addictions treatment, it is unlikely that individual will be granted a forty-two day extension, though it is up to the caseworker to advocate for this. Residents can be asked to leave the shelter, often leading them to another shelter in the city to repeat the process, known as the "revolving door effect" among shelter workers.

To return to the role of surveillance, when being granted an extension a caseworker must advocate on a person's behalf for Ontario Works to approve an extension. This process relies heavily on surveillance to determine the types of progress an individual is making. This information allows the shelter to retain the resident, in a

manner of speaking, such that they can continue to implement techniques of moralization. In relation to understanding the contributing factors of homelessness and linking people with appropriate services, one interviewee noted:

> *So that is our kind of our biggest goal, because we see shelter as being short-term and we have a small window of opportunity, some are less than two months, maybe about a month together and a month is our average length of stay (Family Shelter, Director).*

Surveillance can be advantageous in assisting with projects of moral regulation within this "window of opportunity", in that it speeds up the process for individuals who return to shelter, and can help identify "problem" behaviours and issues leading to homelessness.

Overall, when asked what was considered "good progress", interviewees typically indicated developments such as completing detox programs or "staying clean" while in shelter; getting along with others and being respectful; and exhibiting non-violent behaviour. This in turn was reflected in the services offered to residents. The most obvious demonstration of this was in Shelter A in the administration of staged housing. To recall, the shelter uses different stages of residential assistance including crashbeds (overflow beds), emergency beds, dormitory housing, and transitional housing. To reside at this shelter, individuals must first access crashbeds or emergency beds for thirty days and then can apply to be waitlisted for the dorms. Getting on the waitlist can be conditional, however, on "progress". Provided the individual is following the thirty day routine of progress listed above, they can be considered for the dorms.

The conditions do not end here. Provided a resident in dormitory housing stays on track with the guidelines for another forty-two days, they apply for the waitlist to transitional housing. Residents "have to prove" (Shelter A, Front Line 1) progress with

addictions and so on, in order to get into transitional housing for up to one year while they sort out the details of their living situation with the support of staff.

When considering progress as a factor in measuring a person's deservedness, it is evident that the traditional dichotomy of the deserving and undeserving poor is too simplistic in its assumptions about the distribution of social assistance. Progress is undoubtedly a part of the measurement process when assisting the homeless, and it is a more dynamic concept requiring attention in contemporary moral regulation studies. The term is also flexible in its application, as that which constitutes progress can change according to moral opinion or middle class values. Finally, it is evident that the concept of progress does not neatly fit into the categories of deserving and undeserving, and warrants further examination of the gradients of deservedness and the concepts that play a role in constituting it.

Summary

Each of the aforementioned conditions represent a key theme of moral regulation. The regulation of activities, surveillance, and granting privileges, all demonstrate key aspects of moral regulation, beyond how moral regulation has been traditionally discussed in the literature. Hunt comes the closest to addressing these issues, as he does not argue the process of moral regulation is solely reliant upon the governing practices imposed on the moralized object, but rather that projects of moral regulation and ethical self formation are often interlinked with not only the process of governing others, but also of governing the self. He acknowledges that moral regulation projects are directed at governing others while at the same time these practices result in self-governing effects (1999:16). This can clearly be demonstrated by the stages of housing offered by Shelter A,

whereby monitoring a person's "progress" and offering privileges and recognition for attaining achievements considered favourable to the administration, can result in self-governing behaviour to change "bad" patterns in one's life. What is lacking in previous research are the stages of practices or modes of regulation that lead to the construction of the subject beyond the deserving/undeserving dichotomy to create a more complex deserving/undeserving liberal subject.

Considering these stages, it is relevant to acknowledge moral regulation as being accomplished in part through practices of surveillance, as well as perceptions of liberalized notions of progress. This is linked to the influence of middle class values which have a propensity to advocate values that are assumed to help society progress, and therefore must also help the homeless to progress as well. This ideology within a shelter is linked to the inextricable role of moral regulation, and the need for eventual governance of the self *through* the governance of others by staff as moralizing agents.

The methods of surveillance used – i.e., for the approval of extensions – demonstrate the broad spectrum of information that contributes to the categorization and legitimization of the treatment of the homeless through the moralized lens of both shelter staff and external social agencies. To more debilitating effect, Gilliom discusses the potential repercussions of surveilling the poor in regard to welfare administration and execution of state policy that unavoidably simplifies this population. This can result in a depersonalizing effect on those who are accessing social services, and also reinforce the ability of the state and the public to exclude individuals based on their "poor" status. Gilliom notes that as the historical terms, practices and priorities of welfare surveillance shifted within social and political changes over the last century, it is evident that there is

an extent to which the state's vision of the poor is always a product of particular prejudices, assumptions, values, and technical capacities (2001:19). This is often reflected further among the public, including those who work with excluded groups. By identifying the linkages between these prejudices and values, understanding stages of the creation of the liberal subject can play a key role in understanding the projects of moral regulation undertaken within shelter settings.

It became evident that shelters did not rely heavily on the texts gathered for this project to manage and sort individuals. For the most part, the "sorting out" phase took place as a result of narrative processes whereby staff deemed residents as unsuitable due to their rule-breaking behaviour, or because a thirty day limit had been reached. Thus, the sorting system relied more heavily on personal relationships built with staff members rather than on textual sorting. In this manner, shelter texts differed from social work texts (See Margolin, 1997:151-8). Shelter texts that were relevant to this project consisted of the pamphlets outlining rules and guidelines that exemplified the moral nature of social service policy. The information recorded by staff on residents was found to be subjective based on the narratives and the particular knowledge created about a person that may eventually lead to their relocation to another shelter.

Overall, the analysis undertaken for this project reveals that moral regulation neglects surveillance as an integral part of the regulation process. Surveillance in shelters acts as an instrument used to highlight the intermediary stages that contribute to the re-making or construction of the liberal subject in a process that is ultimately more complex than a simple designation as deserving or undeserving. The role of external institutions and their influence on constituting the homeless subject remains open, but it is

undoubtedly a factor in administering aid and services to the homeless, based on knowledge received and produced from shelters through a moralized lens. This is particularly true for Ontario Works and the administration of funds and extensions, as well as for agencies such as CAS who may rely partly on information produced in shelters to help determine the course of action for parents involved with them. Finally, the institution of the police and their involvement with shelters and the need to manage particular residents requires that shelters "keep watch". There are clearly avenues for surveillance to be explored further within shelters, particularly through the lens of moral regulation and its role in (re)constructing individuals.

CHAPTER SIX

CONCLUSIONS

Moral regulation research examines how the conduct of individuals is directed. A moral regulation framework examines how identities become forces that can ultimately help determine the course of welfare and other state policies. This can result from the distinction created within and beyond the categorization of people as deserving or undeserving. This project initially asked how scrutiny by governing agents and agencies significantly impacted the lives of shelter seekers; how these individuals are constituted beyond the division of the 'deserving' and 'undeserving' poor; and how their treatment is moralized, categorized, and legitimized within a shelter setting.

This study undertook a series of interviews with various levels of staff as well as an examination of texts from four different shelter locations in a mid-sized Canadian city. By interviewing and analyzing shelter texts and documentation procedures, my aim was to examine the narratives and practices of homeless shelters as they sort shelter seeking individuals through moral regulation. By examining the deserving/undeserving dichotomy within a smaller urban context it became possible to clarify how this distinction is created within and among shelters. Current research tends to neglect agents who are directly involved with providing assistance to homeless individuals, the role they play as moralizing agents, and how their actions are specifically linked to moral regulation.

Upon conducting interviews, it became evident that the sorting process had less to do with the concept of those considered 'deserving' and 'undeserving'. Rather, the sorting process in a smaller urban context relies upon basic demographic criteria outlined

by both the city council and the shelters to serve their collective homeless population at the point of need. The categorization process has transitioned into a period where services cannot be doubled, and therefore demographics and statistics dictate the factors pertaining to the administration of aid and funding. Homelessness and its ability to obtain funding as a pertinent issue, has become a problem of visibility. This is what prevents the mid-sized city from the ability to categorize and sort individuals based on criteria external to demographics, and requires it instead to manage shelter seeking individuals as a population according to what is available courtesy of municipal and federal funding.

What became of interest to this project was the processes involved with *sorting out* the residents, and how this occurred according to staff's moralizing practices and guidelines outlined by shelter policy. This revealed different stages of 'sorting the poor', with the initial sort primarily based on a person's eligibility to be served by a shelter based on their objective characteristics, and subsequently, the secondary sorting out that occurred for specific reasons (such as the violation of a rule, the expiration of funded days, etc). This part of the sorting process also highlights the complexities in administering services to people beyond the traditional view of deserving and undeserving to reconstitute individuals according to degrees of progress and successes as a reconstructed liberal subject. Sorting does not end with admitting an individual into shelter, but emerges into a process that relies on a relationship among residents, staff, and rules. These are all inextricably linked to practices of moral regulation that occur after the formal decision to admit a resident has been made, as sorting can occur post-registration should residents and/or staff decide that an individual is not suitable for taking up residence in a particular place.

Moral regulation within shelters is undoubtedly occurring in how residents are sorted, by the methods used to regulate their behaviours, through the reconstruction of identities into more 'appropriate' middle class subjects, and through the notion of progress. All of these aspects lead to the expansion of the dichotomy of the deserving/undeserving poor, in that there are a variety of moralizing projects and practices occurring. The practice that individuals in shelter deserve the services offered is only part of the project. There is an element of choice involved, whereby the individuals must choose to accept assistance and adhere to plans created with the staff, or else face reprimand. In some cases, those unwilling to accept assistance offered in addition to shelter resulted in their being asked to leave if progress was non-existent or minimal. Thus the dichotomy of the deserving and undeserving poor is too simplistic to encompass the minute details within moral regulation, as notions of what constitutes progress are unstructured within shelter settings.

The treatment of the homeless is legitimized most often by the "success stories" that interviewees recalled. These stories most often involved individuals overcoming neglect by family and friends or substance abuse to seeking out employment and education. It is also legitimized through the middle class ideals that not only continue to support work in shelters, but are reinforced by the ideals held by staff members as to what delineates a legitimate lifestyle.

The significance of the scrutiny by these moralizing agents and agencies on shelter residents can be seen through the practice of moral regulation within a shelter setting, and the impact this regulation may have on the population they serve. Liberalized ideals of self-sufficiency through employment, education, and independence are

undoubtedly imposed on those who stray from the norm. Dean (2002) states that welfare reform or poor relief are different instances of the modelling of liberal government on the values and expectations held to exist, ideally, within civil society (44). In regarding the state as secondary and as derivative of a civil society outside its legitimate scope, liberal government is able to derive the substantive content of freedom and a society based on it and transform that content into a set of norms, enforceable, if necessary, by sovereign means (46). Subsequently, the government reinforces these norms in regards to shelters such that those residents who do not subscribe to liberal ideologies can be reprimanded by the network of social services such as appropriate funding through welfare, or insufficient substance abuse treatment facilities, and are then forced to confront moralizing agents to have their basic "needs" – food and shelter – met.

It is not that moralizing agents have a hidden agenda when it comes to the residents they care for. Rather, this study demonstrates that moral regulation occurs in a variety of ways and according to different factors, including the measurement of progress. The practice of moralizing the homeless comes from the deep seated belief that if given the right tools, people can become self-governing, self-responsibilizing agents, and this notion has been retained with a steadfast presence throughout history. From Valverde's (1998) discussion on 19th century discourses on alcoholism, or the practices of early social work as described by Mary Richmond, to a great degree, many practices have not strayed from the mission statements of social service agencies and salvation through righteousness. If anything, such views continue to be upheld as traditional and acceptable means of assisting those 'less fortunate'.

Overall, literature on moral regulation tends to ignore key components in the actual practice of regulation by the moralizing agent of the moralized subject. Simply stating that a connection exists is not sufficient to understand the complexities involved with the actual creation of the moralized subject. There are a variety of factors that contribute to this process, and this project does not lay claim to addressing them all. However, from the processes uncovered within the shelters observed for this project, themes such as measurement of progress, the role of surveillance as a tool for calculating this progress, and the knowledge produced for external social institutions, all played a key role in how the homeless are constituted within social services.

Chunn and Gavigan (2004) accurately point out the need to view sites and forms of regulation and control as requiring different forms of analysis, but in fears of moral regulation becoming too vague and repeating the theoretical error of over-inclusivity, they attempt to situate moral regulation within the concept of state action and inaction (223). Considering my project as a contemporary study of the moral regulation of the homeless, the influence of the state exists in the form of external social institutions (police, CAS, Ontario Works), which all act within guidelines of the state, and it is these segments of state control that become of importance to moral regulation studies. Chunn and Gavigan fail to address this component in their broad discussion of "the state" and its role in regulation and control, even when the state is "benched, ignored by some, or out manoeuvred by others" (223). I argue that agents acting on behalf of the state maintain its subtle influence, and agree that the state, law, and social policy should be situated within moral regulation literature. However, Chunn and Gavigan's concept of the state is not helpful, as they succumb to the same theoretical error they claim for historical studies of

moral regulation: over-inclusivity. It is too simplistic to suggest that the state is involved. They fail to argue why the state *matters* and in what form. The state is more than Ontario Works and/or welfare fraud. It is also more than the police[6]. There are other state institutions such as CAS involved in the regulation process and it is these branches that also contribute to the demand for knowledge from social service agencies. The reason why shelters conduct such extensive surveillance and data collection on residents is to assist with external social agencies and to maintain relations with these institutions.

The intensity of surveillance opens many doors that could benefit from exploration to contribute to current surveillance and governance literature. From panoptic regimes to privacy issues, homeless shelters offer an incredible resource into the methods undertaken to "regulate the poor". In addition to surveillance, external social institutions and the role they have in creating the guidelines for moral regulation based on the knowledge received and produced by shelters also calls for investigation. Their influence on constituting homeless identities is apparent, as is their contribution to the administration of services to the homeless, but the degree to which this is done remains unstudied. Trends in moral regulation literature, as well as literature on surveillance should refocus attention on the shared processes that contribute to the existence of these two practices, rather than treating them as mutually exclusive. What is evident from this research is that there is a greater complexity than the basic binary distinction of deserving and undeserving homeless populations that warrants examination. By using a moral regulation perspective, the practices involved in characterizing population categories can

[6] There are undoubtedly other external institutions that exist that have not been exhausted by this project, and are beyond the scope of this research. There are also more complexities to 'the state' than are currently recognized within literature, and moral regulation offers an effective tool for examining these complexities in a more localized context.

begin to reveal the finer details of the administration of social assistance, but the complexities of the stages of regulation need to be uncovered in order to reveal new ways of how contemporary processes of constituting the homeless occurs.

References

Berg, Bruce, L. 2001. *Qualitative Research Methods: For the Social Sciences.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Canadian Journal of Sociology / Cahiers canadiens de sociologie, Vol. 19, No. 2, Special Issue on Moral Regulation (Spring, 1994), doi:10.2307/3341342.

Chunn, Dorothy E. & Shelley A. M. Gavigan. 2004. Welfare Law, Welfare Fraud, and the Moral Regulation of the 'Never Deserving' Poor. *Social and Legal Studies* 13, no. 2:219-243.

Curtis, Bruce. 1997. Reworking Moral Regulation: Metaphorical Capital and the Field of Disinterest. *Canadian Journal of Sociology* Vol. 22, No. 3. (Summer, 1997), pp. 303-318.

Dean, Mitchell. 2002. Liberal Government and Authoritarianism. *Economy and Society* 31(1): 37-61.

Foucault, Michel. 1989b. *The Concern for Truth.* In: S. Lotringer (Ed.) Foucault Live (Interviews, 196(84), trans. J. Johnston (Columbia University, NY, Semiotext(e)). pp. 293–308.

Gilliom, John. 2001. *Overseers of the Poor: Surveillance, Resistance, and the Limits of Privacy.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Herd, Dean, Andrew Mitchell, & Ernie Lightman. 2005. Rituals of Degradation: Administration as Policy in the Ontario Works Programme. *Social Policy and Administration* 39, no. 1:65-79.

Hunt, Alan. 1999. *Governing Morals: A Social History of Moral Regulation.* United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Hunt, Alan. 1997. 'Moral Regulation and the Making up of the New Person: Putting Gramsci to Work.' *Theoretical Criminology.* 1/3: 273-301.

Hunt, Alan & Gary Wickham. 1994. *Foucault and Law: Towards a Sociology of Law as Governance.* London: Pluto Press.

Little, Margaret Hillyard. 1994. 'Manhunts and bingo blabs': The moral regulation of Ontario single mothers. *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 19, no. 2: 233-247.

Longmate, Norman. 1974. *The Workhouse.* London: Temple Smith.

Margolin, Leslie. 1997. *Under the Cover of Kindness: The Invention of Social Work.* USA: University Press of Virginia.

Mason, Robin. 2003. Listening to Lone Mothers: Paid Work, Family Life, and Childcare in Canada. *Journal of Children & Poverty* 9, no. 1:41-54.

Men's Shelter. 2007. Pamphlet.

McKeen, Wendy. 2004. The Shifting Discourses of the Progressive Social Policy/Child Poverty Advocacy Community: Whither Social Justice? *Canadian Review of Social Policy* 53:88-107.

Parr, Joy. 1978. The British Child Migration Movement. *Canada's Visual History* Vol.32. National Film Board of Canada.

Piven, Frances Fox & Richard Cloward. 1971. *Regulating the Poor: The Functions of Public Welfare.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Richmond, Mary. 1899. *Friendly Visiting Among the Poor: A Handbook for Charity Workers.* London: Macmillan & Co. Ltd.

Richmond, Mary. 1922. *What is Social Case Work? An Introductory Description.* New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Rose, Nikolas. 1993a. Government, Authority and Expertise in Advanced Liberalism. *Economy and Society* 22(3): 283–99.

Ruonavaara, Hannu. 1997. Moral Regulation: A Reformulation. *Sociological Theory* 15, no. 3: 277-293.

Smith, Dorothy. 1993. The Standard North American Family. *Journal of Family Issues* 14, no. 1: 50-65.

Valverde, Mariana. 1991. *The Age of Light, Soap, and Water: Moral Reform in English Canada, 1885-1925.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Inc.

Valverde, Mariana. 1998. *Diseases of the Will: Alcohol and the Dilemmas of Freedom.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Weber, Max. 1930. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism.* New York: Scribner/Simon & Schuster.

APPENDIX A: ETHICS APPLICATION

REB #_____

UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR
APPLICATION TO INVOLVE HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH
FOR STUDENT RESEARCHERS

Please complete, print, and submit **five (5) copies (original plus four (4) copies)** of this form to the **Research Ethics Coordinator, Assumption, Room 303**

CHECKLIST

Title of Project: A Study of the Management and Categorization of the Homeless in a mid-sizec Canadian City

Student Investigator: **Anita Desai**

Faculty Supervisor: **Dr. Randy Lippert**

Please attach the following items, if applicable, in the following order at the back of the Application.

☐		Decisions Needed From Other REB Boards
☒	B.3.c.i.	Questionnaires and Test Instruments
☐	B.3.d.	Deception (If deception is going to be used, your application will go to Full Review)
☐	B.3.e.	Debriefing Letter - Needed only if deception is used in the study. If submitted, application will go the Full Review.
☒	B.6.b.	Letters of Permission Allowing Research to Take Place on Site
☐	B.6.d.	Recruitment Materials: Advertisements, Posters, Letters, etc.
☒	E.1.	Consent Form
☒	E.2.	Letter of Information
☐	E.4.	Parental/Guardian Information and Consent Form
☐	E.5.	Assent Form
☒	F.2.	Consent for Audio/Visual Taping Form
☒		Certificate of completion of on-line ethics tutorial (MUST BE COMPLETED BY **ALL** STUDENTS)

** Please make sure that all necessary signatures have been provided and that you are using the most recent version of this form (see www.uwindsor.ca/reb).

REB #_____

UNIVERSITY OF WINDSOR
APPLICATION TO INVOLVE HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH FOR STUDENT RESEARCHERS

Please complete, print, and submit the **original plus four (4) copies** of this form to the **Ethics and Grants Coordinator, Assumption, Room 303**

Date: October 2007

Title of Research Project: A Study of the Categorization of the Homeless in a mid-sized Canadian City

Projected start date of the project: November 1, 2007 **Projected completion date:** May 30, 2008

	Name	Dept./Address	Phone/Ext.	E-mail
Student Investigator[1]	Anita Desai	Sociology & Anthropology		
Co-Investigator(s)	N/A			
Faculty Supervisor[2]	Dr. Randy Lippert	Sociology & Anthropology		

Researchers from another institution who are a part of a research team, irrespective of their role, must seek clarification from their institutional REB as to the requirement for review and clearance. For each researcher, please indicate if REB clearance is required or briefly provide the rationale for why it is not required:

REVIEW FROM ANOTHER INSTITUTION

1. Has this application been submitted to another university REB or a hospital REB? ☐ Yes ☒ No

2. Has this application been reviewed, or will this application be reviewed, by another person or a committee for human research ethics in another organization, such as a school board? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If **YES to either 1 or 2 above**,

a. provide the name of the board:

b. provide the date of submission:

c. provide the decision and attach a copy of the approval document: ☐ Approved ☐ Approved Pending

☐ Univ. of Windsor clearance ☐ Other/In Process

[1] STUDENT INVESTIGATOR ASSURANCE

I certify that the information provided in this application is complete and correct.

I understand that as Student Investigator, I have responsibility for the conduct of the study, the ethics performance of the project and the protection of the rights and welfare of human participants.

I agree to comply with the Tri-Council Policy Statement and all University of Windsor policies and procedures, governing the protection of human subjects in research.

Signature of Student Investigator: _____ Date: _____

[2] FACULTY SUPERVISOR ASSURANCE

Title of Research Project: **A Study of the Management and Categorization of the Homeless in a mid-sized Canadian City**

Student Investigator: Anita Desai

I certify that the information provided in this application is complete and correct.

I understand that as principal Faculty Supervisor, I have ultimate responsibility for the conduct of the study, the ethical performance of the project and the protection of the rights and welfare of human participants.

I agree to comply with the Tri-Council Policy Statement and all University of Windsor policies and procedures, governing the protection of human subjects in research, including, but not limited to, the following:

- performing the project by qualified and appropriately trained personnel in accordance with REB protocol;
- implementing no changes to the REB approved protocol or consent form/statement without notification to the REB of the proposed changes and their subsequent approval of the REB;
- reporting promptly significant adverse effects to the REB within five (5) working days of occurrence; and
- submitting, at minimum, a progress report annually or in accordance with the terms of certification.

Signature of Faculty Supervisor: _____ Date: _____

A. PROJECT DETAILS

A.1. Level of Project

☐ Ph.D. ☒ Masters ☐ Undergraduate ☐ Post Doctoral

☐ Other (specify):

Is this research project related to a graduate course? ☐ Yes
☒ No

or to your thesis/dissertation? ☒ Yes
☐ No

If yes, please indicate the course number:

Please explain how this research project is related to your graduate course.

A.2. Funding Status

Is this project currently funded? ☐ Yes
☒ No

If **NO**, is funding to be sought? ☐ Yes
☒ No

A.3. Details of Funding (Funded or Applied for)

Agency:

☐ NSERC ORS Application Number:

☐ SSHRC ORS Application Number:

☐ Other (specify):

ORS Application Number:

Period of funding: From: To:

Type of funding:

☐ Grant ☐ Contract ☐ Research Agreement

B. SUMMARY OF PROPOSED RESEARCH

B.1. Describe the purpose and background rationale for the proposed project.

The purpose of this project will be to examine the management of the homeless by studying the practices used across four homeless shelters in [redacted], and how these institutions sort and manage shelter seekers across organizations. In addition, how each shelter manages their designated population will be examined. The background rationale is to observe the practice of sorting the homeless as belonging to an 'undeserving' or 'deserving' category as has been traditionally explored, and to possibly uncover levels of deservedness beyond this binary through the examination of institutional texts and language used by shelter staff.

B.2. Describe the hypothesis(es)/research questions to be examined.

The research question to be examined is: through what means are shelter seeking persons categorized beyond the division between the 'deserving' and 'undeserving' poor, and how is their treatment is moralized, categorized, and legitimized within the shelter system?

B.3. Methodology/Procedures

B.3.a. Do any of the procedures involve invasion of the body (e.g. touching, contact, attachment to instruments, withdrawal of specimens)? ☐ Yes ☒ No

B.3.b. Does the study involve the administration of prescribed or proscribed drugs? ☐ Yes ☒ No

B.3.c.i. Specify in a step-by-step outline exactly what the subject(s) will be asked to do. Attach a copy of any questionnaires or test instruments.

The subjects will be engaged in an open focused interview to explore their experiences, taking place in a neutral environment. In addition, the subject will be notified that the name of the shelters and the city itself will be masked in this project.

B.3.c.ii. What is the rationale for the use of this methodology? Please discuss briefly.

The open focused interview provides flexibility to probe beyond initial responses and allows the interview to proceed in a conversation-like manner, which becomes crucial for capturing experiences of the interviewee. Also, the subject should feel more comfortable to discuss their experiences as social service workers given the confidentiality of the project.

B.3.d. Will deception be used in this study? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If **YES**, please describe and justify the need for deception.

N/A

B.3.e. Explain the debriefing procedures to be used and attach a copy of the written debriefing

N/A

B.4. Cite your experience with this kind of research. Use no more than 300 words for each research.

I have previously conducted personal interviews during my undergradute and graduate (M.A.) degree, both for the Qualitative Methods class at the University of Windsor.

B.5. Subjects Involved in the Study

Describe in detail the sample to be recruited including:

B.5.a. the number of subjects

Approx. 15

B.5.b. age range

Above 21 years of age

B.5.c. any special characteristics

No

B.5.d. institutional affiliation or where located

[redacted]

B.6. Recruitment Process

B.6.a. Describe how and from what sources the subjects will be recruited.

I will personally contact the directors/workers that I know. It should be noted that I am not in a position of authority over these individuals. The directors/managers for the shelters will be contacted via email/phone calls. They will be informed of the study and asked if they would like to volunteer to assist with the research by providing interviews and blank forms used for collecting data on residents. In addition, snowball sampling will be used to obtain further subjects within the shelters.

B.6.b. Indicate where the study will take place. If applicable, attach letter(s) of permission from organizations where research is to take place.

The interview will take place in a mutually negotiated place, in a room provided by the staff where there will be minimal interruptions.

B.6.c. Describe any possible relationship between investigator(s) and subjects(s) (e.g. instructor - student; manager - employee).

Informal referral; in a few cases ex-co-workers.

B.6.d. Copies of any poster(s), advertisement(s) or letter(s) to be used for recruitment are attached. ☐ Yes ☒ N

B.7. Compensation of Subjects

B.7.a. Will subjects receive compensation for participation? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If **YES**, please provide details.

N/A

B.7.b. If subjects (s) choose to withdraw, how will you deal with compensation?

N/A

B.8. Feedback to Subjects

Whenever possible, upon completion of the study, subjects should be informed of the results. Describe below the arrangements for provision of this feedback. (Please note that the REB has web space available for publishing the results at www.uwindsor.ca/reb. You can enter your study results under Study Results on the website. Please provide the date when your results will be available)

Feedback will be provided by request, and will also be available via a link to the REB website where a summary of the findings will be available. An email address will also be provided to subject at start should they wish to contact the researcher.

C. POTENTIAL BENEFITS FROM THE STUDY

C.1. Discuss any potential direct benefits to subjects from their involvement in the project.

There is potential for the subject to increase awareness about the work done in shelters, and may allow the subjects to discuss their experiences or concerns about their work in a neutral context.

C.2. Comment on the (potential) benefits to (the scientific community)/society that would justify involvement of subjects in this study.

This project can increase the understanding of the categorization of the homeless within the scientific community, beyond the traditional binary of the 'deserving' and 'undeserving' poor. In addition, it offers a uniquely Canadian perspective of the operation of moral regulation projects from the perspective of shelter staff, rather than the more common studies from the perspectives of shelter seeking/low income individuals.

D. POTENTIAL RISKS OF THE STUDY

D.1. Are there any psychological risks/harm?
(Might a subject feel demeaned, embarrassed, worried or upset?) ☐ Yes ☒ No

D.2. Are there any physical risks/harm? ☐ Yes ☒ No

D.3. Are there any social risks/harm? (Possible loss of status, privacy, and/or reputation?) ☐ Yes ☒ No

D.4. Describe the known and anticipated risks of the proposed research, specifying the particular risk(s)/harm associated with each procedure or task. Consider physical, psychological, emotional, and social risks/harm.

None.

D.5. Describe how the potential risks to the subjects will be minimized.

The subject will be free to choose whether or not they would like to discuss any such issues.

E. INFORMATION AND CONSENT PROCESS

If different groups of subjects are going to be asked to do different things during the course of the research, more than one consent may be necessary (i.e. if the research can be seen as having Phase I and Phase II).

E.1. Is a copy of a **separate Consent Form** attached to this application? ☒ Yes ☐ No

E.2. Is a copy of a **separate Letter of Information** attached to this application? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If written consent WILL NOT/CANNOT be obtained or is considered inadvisable, justify this and outline the process to be used to otherwise fully inform participants.

N/A

E.3. Are subjects competent to consent? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If not, describe the process to be used to obtain permission of parent or guardian.

N/A

E.4. Is a **Parental/Guardian Information and Consent Form** attached? ☐ Yes ☒ No

E.5. Is an **Assent Form** attached? ☐ Yes ☒ No

E.6. Withdrawal from Study

E.6.a. Do subjects have the right to withdraw at any time during and after the research project? ☒ Yes ☐ No

E.6.b. Are subjects to be informed of this right? ☒ Yes ☐ No

E.6.c. Describe the process to be used to inform subjects of their withdrawal right.

The subject will have written guidelines outlining the interview process, including the right to withdraw. These guidelines will be addressed verbally so that there is clarification of the process.

F. CONFIDENTIALITY

Definitions: **Anonymity** - when the subject cannot be identified, even by the researcher.
Confidentiality - must be provided when the subject can be identified, even if only by the researcher.

F.1. Describe the procedures to be used to ensure anonymity of subjects and confidentiality of data. Explain how written records, video/audio tapes and questionnaires will be secured, and provide details of their final disposal.

The interview will provide confidentiality to the subject, their place of employment, and the city that the research is being conducted in. If the subject does not wish to be identified, they will be able to provide a pseudonym. The interview will be tape recorded and erased shortly after they are transcribed. The transcribed data will be destroyed six months after the thesis is successfully defended.

F.2. Is a **Consent for Audio/Video Taping Form** attached? ☒ Yes ☐ No

F.3. Specify if an assurance of anonymity or confidentiality is being given during:

F.3.a. Conduct of research ☒ Yes ☐ No

F.3.b. Release of findings ☒ Yes ☐ No

F.3.c. Details of final disposal ☒ Yes ☐ No

G. REB REVIEW OF ONGOING RESEARCH

G.1. Are there any specific characteristics of this research which requires additional review by the REB when the research is ongoing? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If **YES**, please explain.

G.2. Will the results of this research be used in a way to create financial gain for the researcher? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If **YES**, please explain.

G.3. Is there an actual or potential conflict of interest? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If **YES**, please explain for researchers who are involved.

G.4. Please propose a continuing review process (beyond the annual **Progress Report**) you deem to be appropriate for this research project/program.

N/A

Please note that a **Progress Report** must be submitted to the Research Ethics Coordinator if your research extends beyond one year from the clearance date. A **Final Report** must be submitted when the project is completed. Forms are available at www.uwindsor.ca/reb.

H. SUBSEQUENT USE OF DATA

Generally, but not always, the possibility should be kept open for re-using the data obtained from research subjects.
Will, or might, the data obtained from the subjects of this research project be used in subsequent research studies? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If **YES**, please indicate on the Consent Form that the data may be used in other research studies.

I. CONSENT FORM

If a Consent Form is required for your research, please use the following sample **Consent Form** template. If you wish to deviate from this format, please provide the rationale. Print out the **Consent Form** with the University of Windsor logo. The information in the Consent Form **must** be written/presented in language that is clear and understandable for the intended target audience.

J. LETTER OF INFORMATION

If a Letter of Information is required for your research, please use the following sample **Letter of Information** template. If you wish to deviate from this format, please provide the rationale. Print out the **Letter of Information** with the University of Windsor logo. The Letter of Information **must** be written/presented in language that is clear and understandable for the intended target audience.

APPENDIX B: LETTER OF INFORMATION

UNIVERSITY OF
WINDSOR

LETTER OF INFORMATION FOR CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Title of Study: **A Study of the Management and Categorization of the Homeless in a mid-sized Canadian City**

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by **Anita Desai,** under the supervision of **Dr. Randy Lippert**, from the **Department of Sociology and Anthropology** at the University of Windsor. The date will be contributed, with your permission, towards the completion of Ms. Desai's Master's thesis. **There are no sponsoring agencies/organizations.**

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel to contact:
Anita Desai –

Dr. Randy Lippert –

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this project will be to examine the categorization of the homeless by studying the practices used across four homeless shelters in [redacted], and how these institutions sort and manage shelter seekers across organizations. In addition, how each shelter manages their designated population will be examined.

PROCEDURES

If you volunteer to participate in this study, we would ask you to do the following things:

- Participate in one interview, at a mutually decided time and place.
- Answer questions regarding your experiences as a social service worker, who deals with assisting the homeless.
- Each interview will be approximately one hour in length.
- You are free to request feedback about the study at anytime, as well as withdraw at any time.
- The interview will be taped.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

None.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO SUBJECTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

You will not be directly benefiting from this study. However, there is potential for you to increase awareness of the work done in your centre, and for promoting community support.

This project can increase the understanding of the social situation of homeless citizens in the community, and how to better meet their needs and address community concerns.

PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

There is no payment for participating in this study.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission.
The information gathered will be released only to Dr. Randy Lippert, the supervisor for this Masters Thesis project.
You have the right to review/edit the tapes, and when they should be erased.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. You may also refuse to answer any questions you don't want to answer and still remain in the study. The investigator may withdraw you from this research if circumstances arise which warrant doing so. You have the option of removing the data from this study.

FEEDBACK OF THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY TO THE SUBJECTS

Research findings will be available by request, by contacting the researchers at the above mentioned phone numbers or via email.

Web address: _____www.uwindsor.ca/reb_____
Date when results are available: _____May 30, 2008_____

SUBSEQUENT USE OF DATA

This data will not be used in subsequent studies.

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH SUBJECTS

You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact: Research Ethics Coordinator, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario N9B 3P4; Telephone: 519-253-3000, ext. 3948; e-mail: ethics@uwindsor.ca

SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR

These are the terms under which I will conduct research.

_____ _____
Signature of Investigator Date

APPENDIX C: CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

UNIVERSITY OF
WINDSOR

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH

Title of Study: **A Study of the Management and Categorization of the Homeless in a mid-sized**

Canadian City

You are asked to participate in a research study conducted by **Anita Desai,** under the supervision of **Dr. Randy Lippert**, from the **Department of Sociology and Anthropology** at the University of Windsor. The data will be contributed, with your permission, towards the completion of Ms. Desai's Master's thesis. **There are no sponsoring agencies/organizations.**

If you have any questions or concerns about the research, please feel to contact:
Anita Desai –

Dr. Randy Lippert –

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this project will be to examine the categorization of the homeless by studying the practices used across four homeless shelters in [redacted], and how these institutions sort and manage shelter seekers across organizations. In addition, how each shelter manages their designated population will be examined.

PROCEDURES

If you volunteer to participate in this study, we would ask you to do the following things:

- Participate in one interview, at a mutually decided time and place.
- Answer questions regarding your experiences as a social service worker, who deals with assisting the homeless.
- Each interview will be approximately one hour in length.
- You are free to request feedback about the study at anytime, as well as withdraw at any time.
- The interview will be taped.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS

None.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO SUBJECTS AND/OR TO SOCIETY

You will not be directly benefiting from this study. However, there is potential for you to increase awareness of the work done in your centre, and for promoting community support.

This project can increase the understanding of the social situation of homeless citizens in the community, and how to better meet their needs and address community concerns.

PAYMENT FOR PARTICIPATION

There is no payment for participating in this study.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Any information that is obtained in connection with this study and that can be identified with you will remain confidential and will be disclosed only with your permission.
The information gathered will be released only to Dr. Randy Lippert, the supervisor for this Masters Thesis project.
You have the right to review/edit the tapes, and when they should be erased.

PARTICIPATION AND WITHDRAWAL

You can choose whether to be in this study or not. If you volunteer to be in this study, you may withdraw at any time without consequences of any kind. You may also refuse to answer any questions you don't want to answer and still remain in the study. The investigator may withdraw you from this research if circumstances arise which warrant doing so. You have the option of removing the data from this study.

FEEDBACK OF THE RESULTS OF THIS STUDY TO THE SUBJECTS

Research findings will be available by request, by contacting the researchers at the above mentioned phone numbers or via email.

Web address: www.uwindsor.ca/reb
Date when results are available: May 30, 2008

SUBSEQUENT USE OF DATA

This data will not be used in subsequent studies.

Do you give consent for the subsequent use of the data from this study? ☐ Yes ☐ No

RIGHTS OF RESEARCH SUBJECTS

You may withdraw your consent at any time and discontinue participation without penalty. If you have questions regarding your rights as a research subject, contact: Research Ethics Coordinator, University of Windsor, Windsor, Ontario, N9B 3P4; Telephone: 519-253-3000, ext. 3948; e-mail: ethics@uwindsor.ca

SIGNATURE OF RESEARCH SUBJECT/LEGAL REPRESENTATIVE

I understand the information provided for the study **A Study of the Management and Categorization of the Homeless in a mid-sized Canadian City** as described herein. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form.

_____
Name of Subject

_____ _____
Signature of Subject Date

SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR

These are the terms under which I will conduct research.

_____ _____
Signature of Investigator Date

APPENDIX D: CONSENT FOR AUDIO TAPING

CONSENT FOR AUDIO TAPING

Research Subject Name:

Title of the Project: **A Study of the Management and Categorization of the Homeless in a mid-sized Canadian City**

I consent to the audio-taping of the interview.

I understand this is a voluntary procedure and that I am free to withdraw at any time by requesting that the taping be stopped. I also understand that my name will not be revealed to anyone and that taping will be kept confidential. Tapes are filed by number only and store in a locked cabinet.

I understand that confidentiality will be respected and materials will be for professional use only.

_____ _____

(Research Subject) (Date)

APPENDIX E: ETHICS APPROVAL LETTER

UNIVERSITY OF
WINDSOR
OFFICE OF THE
RESEARCH ETHICS BOARD

Today's Date:	November 30, 2007
Principal Investigator:	Ms. Anita Desai
Department/School:	Sociology & Anthropology
REB Number:	07-211
Research Project Title:	A Study of the Categorization of the Homeless in a mid-sized Canadian City
Clearance Date:	November 28, 2007
Project End Date:	May 30, 2008
Progress Report Due:	
Final Report Due:	May 30, 2008

This is to inform you that the University of Windsor Research Ethics Board (REB), which is organized and operated according to the *Tri-Council Policy Statement* and the University of Windsor *Guidelines for Research Involving Human Subjects*, has granted approval to your research project on the date noted above. This approval is valid only until the Project End Date.

A Progress Report or Final Report is due by the date noted above. The REB may ask for monitoring information at some time during the project's approval period.

During the course of the research, no deviations from, or changes to, the protocol or consent form may be initiated without prior written approval from the REB. Minor change(s) in ongoing studies will be considered when submitted on the Request to Revise form.

Investigators must also report promptly to the REB:
a) changes increasing the risk to the participant(s) and/or affecting significantly the conduct of the study;
b) all adverse and unexpected experiences or events that are both serious and unexpected;
c) new information that may adversely affect the safety of the subjects or the conduct of the study.

Forms for submissions, notifications, or changes are available on the REB website: www.uwindsor.ca/reb. If your data is going to be used for another project, it is necessary to submit another application to the REB.

We wish you every success in your research.

Maureen Muldoon, Ph.D.
Chair, Research Ethics Board

cc: Dr. Randy Lippert, Sociology & Anthropology
Mark Curran, Research Ethics Coordinator

This is an official document. Please retain the original in your files.

401 SUNSET · WINDSOR ONTARIO · CANADA N9B 3P4
TELEPHONE 519/253-3000 (3948) · WEB www.uwindsor.ca/reb

APPENDIX F: INTERVIEW GUIDE

Interview Guide

The following is a list of themes to be addressed during the interview:

1. The subject's background in the field
2. The subject's roles and responsibilities as a social service worker
3. The subject's perceptions of homelessness, distribution of the homeless, and division of
   labour across shelters in the city of [redacted]
4. The types of people admitted or excluded and the types referred to other shelters
5. The subject's experiences and challenges as a social service worker working with residents in the shelter

QUESTIONS

1. Background

1. How long have you worked here?

2. Why did you choose to work here?

3. Did you have any specific experiences that led to your decision to work in this field?
   -Probe: Can you tell me more about that?

4. What kind of educational background did you need to be employed here?

5. What other types of social service work have you done?
   -Probe: Can you tell me more about that?

2. Roles and Responsibilities

6. Can you describe your job title?

7. What are your roles/responsibilities?

8. Can you describe the admission process? Take me through a general intake.
   -What is the computer system like?

3. Homelessness in This City

9. Can you tell me about the homelessness situation in this city?

10. Do certain types of people tend to serviced by particular shelters in the city?

11. Do you think there is a division of labour among the shelters when it comes to the homeless?

-As in the division of labour or tasks when it comes to homelessness?

12. How familiar would you say you are with the different services provided in the city?

4. Types of People Admitted, Excluded, and Referred

13. What types of people seek assistance at this shelter?
-Do you get a variety that need to be referred elsewhere?
-How does that process work?

14. What types of people are admitted to this shelter as residents?

-What types of people are only *sometimes* admitted to this shelter?

-What types of people are *never* admitted?

15. What do you do for people who cannot be helped by services you offer here?

16. Do you ever refer people to other shelters in the city?

17. What kinds of services do residents need once admitted to this shelter?

5. Experiences and Challenges

18. Do you have to manage residents in the shelter in certain ways?
-Probe: Can you tell me more about that?
-following rules, organizing people according to different needs/characteristics
-what do you think is the most important rule?

19. What particular challenges do you face from people seeking shelter or from shelter residents?

20. Can you describe an occasion where there was a conflict between residents or between residents and staff that you tried to resolve?
-Probe: Can you tell me more about that?

21. What factors do you think hold people back from getting housing?
-Do you think certain types of homeless people or groups get more attention/access to services than others?

22. Can you describe your best experience with a resident during your work here?

23. Can you describe your worst experience with a resident during your work here?

24. What do you see yourself contributing to the residents during your work here?

VITA AUCTORIS

Anita Desai was born in 1983 in Woodstock, Ontario. She graduated from A.B. Lucas Secondary School in June 2001. She began her post-secondary education in September 2001 at the University of Windsor where she completed a Bachelor of Arts, Honours in Criminology in 2005. She is currently a graduate candidate for the Master's Degree in Sociology at the University of Windsor and hopes to graduate in June 2008.