

An Ethnographic Exploration of the Substance Use of Young People Living in Temporary Homeless Accommodation

A Dissertation Submitted in Fulfilment of the Degree of:

**Doctor of Philosophy in
Applied Social Science**

By

Jennifer Elizabeth Hoolachan

**School of Applied Social Science
University of Stirling
Scotland**

December 2015

Declaration

I declare that none of the work contained within this thesis has been submitted for any other Degree at any other university. The contents found within this thesis have been composed by the candidate: Jennifer Elizabeth Hoolachan.

Abstract

The subjects of ‘youth’, ‘substance use’ and ‘homelessness’ are interconnected, but only a relatively small number of studies have examined the relationships between all three components. Literature highlights how homeless substance users are constructed as ‘vulnerable’ – yet ‘deviant’. Furthermore, academics have examined how people manage the ascribed identities of ‘substance user’ and ‘homeless’ as well as that of ‘youth’. According to sociologists, people’s self-identities and actions develop as a consequence of interactions with their socio-spatial worlds. Therefore, it is useful to contextualise the act of substance use within these complex interactions.

This thesis explores the meanings and contexts of young, homeless people’s substance use. Data were obtained through an ethnographic study conducted in a homeless hostel over a seven month period in 2013 in which twenty-two young people (aged 16-21) and twenty-seven staff members participated. The majority of data were derived from participant-observation encompassing 200-250 informal interactions with the young people and 100-120 interactions with staff along with observations of people’s actions and descriptions of events and appearances. The field-notes were supplemented by four semi-structured interviews and a focus group, involving a total of eleven young people.

Drawing on theories underpinned by symbolic interactionist and phenomenological philosophies, three overarching dimensions of the young people’s experiences were identified as important to their substance use and wider lives. First, the young people engaged in ‘place-making’ actions (including substance use) to personalise spaces within the tightly controlled environment of the hostel. Secondly, substance use was interwoven with the relationships that the young people held with their families, friends and the staff. The ‘pro-drug’ voices of their friends and relatives were arguably stronger than the ‘anti-drug’ voices of the staff. Thirdly, the categories of ‘youth’ and ‘substance user’ were recognised by the participants as pertaining to them, whereas the ‘homeless’ label was relatively meaningless. The thesis concludes that to understand people’s substance use experiences, it is important to consider the socio-spatial contexts within which they are located, particularly when these are temporary.

Acknowledgements

Completing a PhD is not a solo affair. Over the last four years I have had the privilege of encountering an enormous number of people who have given me assistance and support. Although I can only acknowledge a few people here, I am grateful to you all.

My biggest thanks go to the young people and staff at Kelldale. Words cannot describe how blown away I was with the warmth I received. You were inspirational and I have learned more than I could possibly have imagined. I have many fond memories, particularly of the young people parodying pop songs – ‘We Found Love in a Homeless Place’ being my favourite! I hope that you feel my representation of your time in Kelldale is a recognisable reflection of your own experiences.

Thank you to my supervisors – Professor Isobel Anderson and Doctor Ruth Emond – who have gone above and beyond their professional responsibilities to keep me on track and excited about my work. Your expertise and support have been invaluable. It has been a pleasure working with you and I hope my work does justice to the amount of time and effort you have invested in me.

Mum, Dad, Sheona and Wee Granny – what can I say? Thank you for your unwavering support, love and encouragement. Twelve years at university and I am astounded that you are still asking the question ‘so how’s the studying going?’ with genuine interest. Sheona and Chris, thank you for your motivational thumbs-up selfies! Eddie – thank you for bringing me chocolate, facilitating my Netflix ‘addiction’ and for your constant love and hugs. To my amazing ‘sensible’ friends, thank you for patiently waiting for me to have something to talk about other than my PhD (a.k.a. the ‘turtle’ or ‘PhC’). And to my equally amazing ‘insane’ PhD friends, thank you for sharing my ‘bubble’. You have all been a lifeline in what could have otherwise been a very lonely process.

Finally, thank you to the Economic and Social Research Council, the ‘Bank of Mum and Dad’, and everyone who gave me teaching and research contracts to fund this adventure. Special thanks must also go to Rowdy Yates, Linda Campbell, Kim McKee, Joe Crawford and John Thomson.

Table of Contents

Declaration.....	1
Abstract.....	2
Acknowledgements	3
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	8
The Interconnections between Youth, Substance Use and Homelessness	8
Personal and Professional Interests	11
Thesis Objectives	13
Signposting the Thesis.....	14
A Note on the Literature Search and Language	16
Chapter 2: The Socio-Spatial Contexts of (Youth) Substance Use and Homelessness .	18
Introduction.....	18
The Multi-Faceted Nature of Substance Use	20
How to Characterise ‘Substance Use’?.....	20
A Brief Historical Overview of ‘Addiction’	22
The Importance of ‘Setting’.....	24
The ‘Setting’ of Homelessness.....	26
(Youth) Homelessness in a Scottish Context	26
Temporary Accommodation and Housing First.....	30
The Interwoven Nature of Homelessness and Substance Use	33
Multiple Exclusion Homelessness and Policy Frameworks	34
Homeless Spaces and Social Networks	37
Interactions with the Material World: Space, Place and Home	41
Conclusion	46
Chapter 3: Marginalised Self-Identities: The Internalisation of Social Interactions.....	49
Introduction.....	49
Theorising the Self	51
Internalising the Social	52
The Self as a Performance	55
Youth and Self-Identity	58
Youth as a Transitional Period	59
Youth (Sub) Cultures	61
Substance Use, Homelessness and ‘Deviant’ Identities	64

Self, Belonging and Social Change	68
Conclusion	71
Chapter 4: The Ethnographic Process	74
Introduction.....	74
Kelldale: A Case Study.....	75
Using Ethnography in Kelldale.....	77
Introduction to Participant-Observation and Ethnography.....	77
The Research Participants.....	79
Reliability, Validity and Generalisability	83
The Fieldwork Process	84
The Position of the Researcher.....	85
Introductions and Frequency of Visits.....	85
Participant-observation	88
Interviews and Focus Groups.....	91
Engaging with the Staff	95
Leaving the Field.....	96
Keeping Everybody Safe: Ethics and Risk.....	97
The Original Residents	98
Newer Residents and Those who did Not Consent	99
Anonymity, Confidentiality and Disclosure of Illegal Activities	100
‘Vulnerability’	101
The Kelldale Staff.....	102
Protecting Myself from Harm	103
Analysing and Presenting the Data	105
Analysis.....	105
Presentation	107
Conclusion	108
Chapter 5: Creating Place in Kelldale	110
Introduction.....	110
Setting the Scene: Monitored Spaces	112
The Conditionality of Entering Kelldale	115
Voluntary Exit, Conditional Return.....	115
Involuntary Exit, Conditional Return	121
Permitted Place-Making	124
The Lounge: A Young Person’s Place?	124

Bedsits: The Prime Sites of Place-Making	130
Breaking the Rules as Acts of Place-Making and Belonging	137
Drug and Alcohol Use in Kelldale	138
Vandalism	142
‘Out of Place’ Routines.....	144
Conclusion	148
Chapter 6: Social Relationships, Belonging and Substance Use	152
Introduction.....	152
Family Belonging in the Face of Family Breakdown	154
Before Kelldale.....	154
Family Belonging Despite Turbulent Relationships	157
Substance Use: Damaging or Enhancing Family Relationships?	160
Friendships and Romances	162
Learning the Rules of the Game.....	162
Relational and Cultural Belonging Online.....	166
Reciprocity, Drug Use and Degrees of Belonging	170
The Staff	176
The Staff as Rule-Enforcers	177
Being Cared For	181
“‘You Don’t Care!’”	184
Conclusion	187
Chapter 7: Self-Identities and Society.....	192
Introduction.....	192
Education/Employment Transitions or Life on Hold?	194
The Young Self	200
The Racial Other	208
“‘Fucked Up’ Mothers and ‘Uninvolved’ Fathers	212
The Gendered Body.....	214
The ‘Drug User’ Self and the ‘Junkie’ Other.....	219
Temporarily Homeless or Temporarily at Home?	226
Conclusion	234
Chapter 8: Discussion – Youth Substance Use and Temporary Living	238
Introduction.....	238
Socio-Spatial-Self Relations in a Temporary Context	238
Reflections on Taking an Ethnographic Approach	247

Implications and Future Enquiries	251
Appendix 1: Participant Information Sheet	255
Appendix 2: Interview Schedule – Substance Use	256
Appendix 3: Interview Schedule – Housing and Homelessness.....	257
Appendix 4: Interview Schedule – Life in Kelldale.....	258
Appendix 5: Interview Schedule – Relationships	259
Appendix 6: Young People’s Consent Form	261
Appendix 7: Staff Members’ Consent Form.....	262
Bibliography	264
Legislative Acts.....	285

Chapter 1: Introduction

The Interconnections between Youth, Substance Use and Homelessness

The purpose of this thesis is to investigate the meanings and contexts within which drug and alcohol use (collectively referred to as ‘substance use’) occur among young people living in temporary homeless accommodation. The subjects of youth, substance use and homelessness have been the focus of extensive bodies of research in their own right; with some studies examining pairs of these components (e.g. Neale and Stevenson, 2014) and a smaller number considering the full triad (e.g. Heerde and Hemphill, 2015). When substance use is included, it is often constructed as indicative of someone’s involvement in ‘negative’ cultural behaviours (Barker, 2013) or as a disease which requires abstinence or harm reduction measures from which to recover (Allen, 2008). This thesis does not attempt to downplay the devastating consequences that alcohol and/or drug use can have for some individuals and their families. Equally, it does not try to portray substance use as wholly pleasurable and risk-free. Instead, it is viewed as a holistic phenomenon which can be an important feature in some people’s lives. In order to take such a perspective and to understand how young substance users perceive and ‘do’ substance use, an ethnographic approach has been taken in this study. The substance users in this case are young people (aged 16-21) who lived in a temporary accommodation hostel in Central Scotland in 2013.

The association between youth and substance use has an extensive history and remains strong in contemporary society (Measham and Shiner, 2009). Situated within the life-course, the period of ‘youth’ has been explored within two streams of sociological literature: transitions and (sub)cultures. Transitioning from childhood to adulthood is often characterised in relation to moving from education to employment, the parental home to one’s own home and from being single to forming a family (Molga, 2007). Youth researchers have long been interested in how substance use intersects with these journeys and some have highlighted transitional changes in leisure preferences (MacDonald and Marsh, 2005). In particular, when a young person reaches the age of 18 in the United Kingdom (UK), he is able to legally access the pub and nightclub cultures

with their associated features of alcohol and illicit drug consumption. This is a significant milestone which can structure a young person's journey to adulthood (Northcote, 2006).

This branch of transitional literature overlaps with (sub)cultural theories that are highly associated with being young. In the second half of the 20th century, subcultural groups such as mods, rockers and ravers were known to use certain types of drugs which, in turn, became status symbols (Yates, 2002). Since the 1990s, subcultural theorists have come under criticism by postmodernists who emphasised individuality and the disappearance of historic structures (Kehily, 2007). This is supported by the 'normalisation thesis' which argues that substance use has become so widespread within youth culture that it is now integrated into young people's social norms (Parker, Aldridge and Measham, 1998). Common to these debates is the continual connection between substance use and youth culture, regardless of the shape that these cultures take. The emergence of 'legal highs' in the UK is the most recent manifestation of young people's desire for intoxication as these new drugs have been deliberately promoted to the younger generation (Winstock, 2011).

Youth substance use has been explored within many different contexts such as nightclubs (Demant, 2013), on the streets (Werb et al., 2010) and in parks (Robinson, 2009). Socio-spatial contexts, such as these, are viewed as intersecting with a person or group's substance use behaviours and intoxication experiences. In other words, the combination of a person's physical and social environments can be interwoven with her decisions, actions, understandings and experiences of drug and alcohol use. It is argued in this thesis that homelessness represents a further type of socio-spatial context. In Scotland, various forms of homelessness are legally recognised in the *Homelessness etc. (Scotland) Act 2003*, but for the purposes of this study, one form – those living in a temporary accommodation hostel – is examined. Despite the fact that many of the actions and characteristics of young homeless people are no different from their housed peers (Robinson, 2008), their homelessness changes the way society perceives and interacts with them. Theories of 'multiple exclusion homelessness' (Fitzpatrick, Johnsen and White, 2011) and 'revanchism' (Smith, 1996) have demonstrated how homeless substance users are constructed as 'vulnerable' yet are treated as socially undesirable in that they are subjected to many forms of social control in an effort to remove them and their 'unacceptable' behaviours from prime spaces. Homelessness itself is a source of

disadvantage and stigma; when it is combined with substance use, these effects are even greater (Fitzpatrick, Johnsen and White, 2011).

While substance use is connected to both young people and homelessness, the final link in this triad is also worth noting: the link between youth and homelessness. The causes of youth homelessness are distinctive from those of older adults because young people are more susceptible to the risks of family breakdown and the decisions of their parents (Johnsen and Quilgars, 2009). There are disproportionately high numbers of young people in homelessness statistics (Shelter Scotland, 2015a) and these individuals are often perceived as more vulnerable in comparison to homeless adults¹. Therefore, youth homelessness is distinguishable from homelessness among other age groups, making it a distinctive type of experience to explore.

Although the varied and complex relationships between youth, substance use and homelessness have often been examined in pairs, little research has considered all three components and their interconnections. Where such studies have been conducted, they have largely focused on the activities of ‘street’ youth: young people who are rough sleepers or who spend considerable periods of time socialising on the streets (Werb et al., 2008; Gibson, 2011). Research concerning homeless hostels is less prevalent and existing studies often evaluate the condition of hostels and/or they focus on people’s experiences of living in this type of accommodation (Cloke, May and Johnsen, 2010). In other words, these studies take hostel living in general as their focus, rather than being young or using substances. This thesis therefore, addresses these gaps in knowledge. Not only does it give substantial attention to each component (youth, substance use and homelessness) and their interconnections, it takes substance use as its central focus. Consequently, most of the data analysis is weighted towards the hostel residents’ drug and alcohol use and how this interacts with their day-to-day lives. However, because of the holistic and inductive nature of ethnography, data concerning other aspects of hostel life and the young people have also been included.

¹ This was reflected in the ‘priority need’ categories in homelessness legislation prior to 2013. See Scottish Executive (2005)

Personal and Professional Interests

In the spirit of exercising reflexivity, which is a key aspect of ethnographic work (Mauthner and Doucet, 2003), it is important to offer a short background as to how, and why, this thesis came about. Transparency can assist in revealing potential biases that have arisen through the researcher's interactions with the social world under investigation (LeCompte and Goetz, 1982). As will be seen, the symbolic interactionist works of Mead (1934), Blumer (1969) and Goffman (1959) were influential in examining the data. These theorists posit that the ways in which people perceive and experience the world are derived from the complex webs of interactions they have with the social environment. While this lens proved to be useful in analysing the data, it is also important to present myself – the researcher – as a social agent whose views of the world have been shaped by others.

With this in mind, several overlapping sources of personal and professional interest were significant in the thesis' inception. Having undertaken a Degree in Psychology which was heavily weighted towards quantitative analysis, I was left feeling despondent as to the ways in which people were reduced to a series of numbers and biological mechanisms. In short, quantitative approaches felt inadequate for fully capturing what it means to be a social being involved with others. This feeling was reinforced when I began volunteering for ChildLine – a UK-wide charitable counselling service for children and young people – in my final undergraduate year. ChildLine advocates a person-centred approach to counselling whereby the counsellor's role is to garner information to build a holistic picture of the young person's life in order to listen, empathise and offer advice.

ChildLine provided the opportunity to speak to young people of varying ages, from a wide spectrum of backgrounds, about a range of personal problems. Through this, I learned the importance of seeing someone as a whole person whose current life and ways of understanding the world have been shaped by his social biography and intersecting experiences. I became accustomed to advocating on young people's behalf which, over time, transferred into other areas of my life. Therefore, when designing the methodology for this thesis, I realised that my views of the world aligned with the philosophies underpinning ethnographic research. This quote by Herbert Gans in a conversation with 'Chicago School' theorists resonated with this:

And I think ethnography is particularly useful here because we come closest to the people who are being studied...Ethnography has always studied the underdog...we can communicate for the underdogs, for the victims to – and in opposition to – the perpetrators as I think of them. (Becker et al., 2004: 265)

This person-centred, advocacy manner of looking at the world was felt to be a more beneficial, valuable and effective way of approaching social change and its associated research.

My choice of Masters Degree in Alcohol and Drug Studies further influenced the topic of this thesis. This course took an inter-disciplinary approach to substance use which has been carried over into this thesis as it draws on literature from a multitude of disciplines, most notably sociology, human geography, social work and social policy. Through examining an issue from different perspectives, its numerous dimensions and contradictions become apparent. In contrast to quantitative analysis, this interdisciplinary, qualitative manner is more able to capture the nuances of a person's life.

The additional interest in homelessness came about from my experiences at ChildLine. It was not uncommon for a young person to contact this service if she had been kicked out of the family home by her parents and had nowhere to spend the night. If the young person was under the age of 16 or had prior engagement with a social worker, then it was relatively straightforward to refer her to social services who had a legal duty to find her accommodation. However, if a young person was aged 16-18 and had no prior social services contact, then attempting to find her emergency accommodation, especially late at night, proved to be incredibly difficult and dependent on the services available in her local area. These experiences converged with my postgraduate education and interest in young people's lives to form the proposal for this thesis.

Thesis Objectives

This thesis aims to provide a nuanced understanding of the substance use experiences of young homeless people. Three broad objectives were used to guide the thesis and provide research parameters:

- To understand how life in temporary accommodation is perceived and experienced by young homeless people.
- To explore what substance use means to the young people living in these situations.
- To explore how the socio-spatial contexts of young people's lives in temporary accommodation are interwoven with their substance use.

The first objective was created to capture data pertaining to the day-to-day lived experiences of young homeless people: a goal that has been echoed elsewhere (Hall, 2003; Cloke, May and Johnsen, 2010). By keeping this objective broad, data about substance use were documented but so were data concerning a variety of other experiences that were insightful in understanding the young people's lives. Exploring this broader context helped to situate the young people's substance use. Furthermore, this objective enabled an exploration of how different aspects of living in a homeless hostel became internalised into their self-identities and actions.

To provide a narrower focus for the study, the second objective designated substance use as the central feature of interest. Existing literature tends to prioritise homelessness over substance use, although some notable exceptions (Neale, 2001; Stevenson and Neale, 2012) highlight the insights that can be gained by giving prominence to the latter. Not only was substance use an anchor for the study, it was also the part of the thesis which resonated the most with the young participants because it was a significant and identifiable feature of their lives.

The final objective was derived from observations that existing literature often places significance on the social relationships and physical environments of substance use and/or homelessness. Relationships with friends, family and service providers have been found to provide valuable support and company for substance users and/or homeless

people, or they have been found to exacerbate their problems and perceived marginality (Barker, 2013; 2014). Furthermore, the physical environments within which people are located can strongly influence how they experience substance use and/or homelessness (Zinberg, 1984; Cloke, May and Johnsen, 2010). Social relationships have been of a larger concern within current literature in comparison to the physical environment, although the latter has received more attention in relation to homelessness than it has with substance use². Given the apparent significance of socio-spatial contexts, including this as a primary objective enabled an exploration of these issues within the setting of a temporary accommodation hostel.

In addressing these objectives, this thesis draws on multiple interconnected theories but it does not set out to ‘test’ any of them. Rather, the theories used should be viewed as influential in the methodological approach of ethnography and providing analytical insights. While the primary goal of ethnography is to produce ‘thick description’ of the data so as to bring the reader ‘close’ to the subjects and reduce the sense of social distance, it also then needs to move beyond description, otherwise the reader may be left thinking ‘interesting, but so what?’ (Snow, Morrill and Anderson, 2003: 183). In addition, a common criticism of ethnography is that it stops short at description and does not interpret the data in relation to theory (Snow, Morrill and Anderson, 2003). Ignoring theory can lead to explanations of ‘how’ a phenomenon occurs but not ‘why’ (Katz, 2002). Theory, with regards to this thesis, should therefore be viewed as a lens through which to view the data.

Signposting the Thesis

The remainder of the thesis is structured as follows. Chapters 2 and 3 present different aspects of the literature review carried out to inform, and set the context for, the research objectives, and to highlight gaps in knowledge. Chapter 2 explores the socio-spatiality of substance use and homelessness respectively. After examining some of the ways in which these two phenomena are constructed in the literature, their interconnectedness is highlighted through considering theories that characterise homeless substance users as marginalised victims but also socially undesirable ‘deviants’. The chapter ends by

² For example see Smith (1996)

considering the concept of 'home' which provides alternative insights into the implications of being without a home for a person's emotional wellbeing and identity development. Chapter 3 asserts that the socio-spatial aspects of a person's world become internalised into his sense of self, which, in turn, influences his actions. After setting out this argument by drawing on the works of Mead (1934), Blumer, (1969) and Goffman (1959), the chapter unpacks the concept of 'youth' and then revisits substance use and homelessness to review the literature pertaining to these identities. The penultimate section of the literature review considers May's (2011; 2013) work which theorises that the connections between self and society can be understood through the concept of 'belonging'. Chapter 3 ends by drawing together the arguments made in the literature review as a means of providing a rationale for the current study's research objectives.

Chapter 4 documents the methodological journey of this thesis, beginning by recounting the decision-making processes that led to accessing the hostel. The methodological approach of ethnography is then discussed and the study's participants are introduced. The fieldwork process is then documented which considers some of the challenges that occurred in building relationships with the young people in the study. Issues pertaining to ethical procedures and personal safety are outlined and the chapter ends by documenting how the data were analysed and presented in the subsequent analysis chapters.

Chapters 5, 6 and 7 constitute the analysis which contains a combination of data excerpts and discussion of how they connect to existing literature and theory. These have not been structured in accordance with the research objectives highlighted above, but rather they have been structured thematically and each chapter lends insights for each objective. Chapter 5 focuses on the spatial aspects of living in the hostel, although the social and spatial are tightly interwoven. It details the rules and restrictions of the hostel and how the young people acted in ways to personalise their spaces within a tightly controlled setting. Chapter 6 explores the relationships that were prominent in the young people's lives including those of family, friends and the hostel's staff members. Chapter 7 unpacks the young people's performed self-identities which provide insights into how they internalised (or not) their current experiences, as well as their knowledge of how they were viewed by wider society.

Connections to literature and theory are made throughout the three analysis chapters and the concluding chapter (Chapter 8) summarises these by drawing out the main contributions that this thesis makes to existing knowledge. It also points to its limitations which are counteracted by highlighting the benefits of conducting ethnographic research with disadvantaged groups. The thesis ends by pointing to areas to which this research could be directed.

A Note on the Literature Search and Language

The literature discussed in this thesis represents the culmination of a four-year endeavour to capture the existing knowledge base pertaining to the subjects of youth, substance use and homelessness, as well as wider theoretical frameworks and methodological approaches. The *Web of Science* database was predominantly used to conduct literature searches using combinations of keywords, including ‘youth’, ‘transition’, ‘subculture’, ‘drugs’, ‘alcohol’, ‘intoxication’, ‘addiction’, ‘homeless’, ‘housing’, ‘belonging’ and ‘identity’. In addition, key sociological theorists (Mead, Blumer, Goffman, Zinberg, May), prominent writers (Anderson, Arnett, Barker, Emond, Johnsen, Neale) and philosophical frameworks (symbolic interactionism and phenomenology) were researched for the relevant topics. With regard to methodology, searches were conducted using keywords such as ‘ethnography’, ‘participant-observation’, ‘qualitative’ and ‘reflexivity’. Latterly, particular journals were searched as these were identified as producing the most relevant results. These included the *Journal of Youth Studies*; *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy*; *International Journal of Drug Policy*; *European Journal of Homelessness*; *Housing Studies*; *Health and Place*; *Sociology*; and *Ethnography*.

Literature was recorded and examined by implementing a thematic coding practice whereby articles were sorted into online folders according to their main themes. Books and reports on the relevant topics were also consulted by following up sources cited in online journals. Online sources were subjected to the same recording process as journal articles while notes from hard copies were typed up so that these could also be incorporated into the coding process. As the thesis progressed and the focus narrowed,

many articles that were initially included were filtered out as they no longer became relevant.

Finally, it is pertinent to make three notes on language in the subsequent chapters. First, feminine and masculine pronouns (such as she/he, her/his) are alternated when making references to a non-specific gender. Where possible, the gender is switched on each page but only where this makes grammatical sense. Secondly, sections of the thesis (as already seen in this chapter) have used first-person language pertaining to the researcher's views. Such language is prominent in Chapter 4 which sets out the methodology and in Chapter 8 when reflecting on the use of ethnography. First-person language is also used sparingly in Chapters 5, 6 and 7. Since ethnographers engage in a reflexive research process, it is common to use first-person language when using this methodology as this fits with, what Van Maanen (1988 in Hammersely and Atkinson, 2007) has described as, a 'confessional' writing style. In contrast to realist accounts which appear impersonal and authoritative, confessional styles of writing are used to convey transparency in a manner which indicates 'how I did it' (Van Maanen, 1988 in Hammersely and Atkinson, 2007). Thirdly, when representing the participant's own words in Chapters 5, 6 and 7, direct quotes have retained the participant's dialect with footnotes to explain specific slang terminology.

Chapter 2: The Socio-Spatial Contexts of (Youth) Substance Use and Homelessness

Introduction

Substance use and homelessness are complexly interwoven in that substance use has been found to predate, or contribute to, a person's homelessness as well as being a consequence of homelessness (Neale, 2001; McVicar, Moschion and Ours, 2015). Researchers have attempted to unpack this multi-faceted relationship in order to highlight policy and practical implications of what Neale (2001: 353) has referred to as a 'double jeopardy'. This chapter reviews the literature pertaining to this 'double jeopardy' by examining how substance use and homelessness are socially and spatially conceived. As will be seen, much of this work focuses on preventing or reducing behaviours deemed to be 'problematic' through various interventions, and often the people at the centre of such interventions are treated as objects who need to be 'fixed'. Attempts at understanding different aspects of substance use and homelessness (including social and spatial dimensions) are therefore typically undertaken with the agenda of educating policymakers and practitioners in relation to 'improving' their respective policies and interventions. While this work certainly has value, it can serve to simplify a highly complex and contextually-specific set of issues. Consequently, what is often overlooked are the experiences, feelings and interpretations of the people at the centre of such discussions.

The ways in which the subjective self and its relationship to society can be incorporated into such discussions is the focus of Chapter 3 and, indeed, the thesis' empirical chapters, but first it is necessary to review existing literature concerning the 'double jeopardy' of substance use and homelessness in order to demonstrate how discourses of 'fixing' and 'improving', via social control, are constructed. As such, this chapter begins with a discussion of the phrase 'substance use' to establish boundaries regarding its definition whilst highlighting the importance of language in framing perceptions of drug and alcohol use. It is argued that the majority of substance use literature presents this behaviour as being inherently problematic, although a smaller body of work has focused on the pleasurable effects of intoxication. This emphasis on the problematic is continued

through a review of the main theoretical lenses of substance use to demonstrate how the complex entanglement of moral, medical, psychological and social portrayals have led to varying responses and the presentation of ‘addicts’ as being victims, deviants or both. Given that this thesis locates substance use within a social lens, a closer examination of Zinberg’s (1984) theory of ‘drug, set and setting’ is undertaken which emphasises the influence of socio-cultural environments in mediating substance use behaviours.

Considering Zinberg’s (1984) position, it is argued that homelessness is a form of socio-cultural environment within which substance use occurs. However, homelessness does not act as a passive backdrop but actively intersects so that homelessness and substance use, for some people, are mutually reinforcing and complexly entangled (Neale, 2001). The homelessness section begins with an overview of how the term is defined and responded to within Scottish legislation and policy. This is coupled with a brief review of youth homelessness and its causes. Since this thesis focuses on young people living in temporary accommodation, an examination of this form of homelessness is presented along with the ‘Housing First’ model which offers an alternative housing solution for homeless people with substance use and mental health problems.

Whereas the first two parts of the chapter focus on substance use and homelessness as separate components, the third section reviews literature that draws out some of their common ideas. Recent work on the notion of ‘multiple exclusion homelessness’ is examined which argues that people who experience both homelessness and substance use problems are even more socially excluded than those who fall into only one of these categories (Fitzpatrick, Johnsen and White, 2011). This is followed by a review of the literature which documents how homeless people are subjected to a battery of measures to control their movements in space. Such control is interwoven with the political will to eliminate the consumption of alcohol in certain spaces and all use of illicit drugs. In addition, the importance of social networks for supporting people or adding to their perceived marginality is examined. Together, the concerns raised in this section (and in the chapter as a whole) illustrate the argument that people who are substance users and/or homeless are deemed to be ‘problematic’ and in need of social control. Moreover, they highlight that people’s subjective selves, as they relate to these issues, are often absent from such discussions.

The connection between the social and spatial is the focus of the final part of this chapter. Drawing on studies of human geography, the concepts of ‘place’ and ‘home’ are considered. Homelessness literature typically focuses on policy responses, whereas incorporating the dimension of ‘home’ emphasises what homeless people may be lacking in terms of ontological security and a sense of control, as well as the influence that being with or without a home can have on someone’s self-identity. This final section also highlights how physical spaces are divided up with certain spaces being associated with specific meanings. This is underpinned by processes of power which determine who has access to particular spaces and which behaviours are permitted and prohibited there.

The Multi-Faceted Nature of Substance Use

How to Characterise ‘Substance Use’?

The term ‘substance use’ is used by academics, policymakers and practitioners to describe the ingesting of a range of chemicals for recreational purposes or as a consequence of an ‘addiction’ (Marel et al., 2015; Martin et al., 2015). In most cases the term includes the consumption of alcohol and illicit drugs but it may also involve tobacco (Greene, Ennett and Ringwalt, 1997) or prescription drugs (Chaplin, Gilvarry and Tsakanikos, 2011). The emergence of ‘legal highs’ – new synthetic drugs that mimic the effects of existing illicit drugs but which fall outside of the *Misuse of Drugs Act 1971* (Newcombe, 2009) – further adds to the repertoire of chemicals which are available for intoxication. The popularity of these drugs has grown substantially since the early 2000s, particularly among young people (Winstock, 2011).

In addition to the variety of chemicals involved, the terms substance ‘use’, ‘abuse’ and ‘misuse’ are commonly used as well as ‘recreational’ and ‘problematic’, and ‘dependence’ and ‘addiction’ to depict the consumption of alcohol and drugs to differing degrees. These terms, with the exception of substance ‘use’, attach negative or positive connotations to consumption with the negative terms implying that the harms of ingesting such substances outweigh the benefits (Rødner, 2005). It is well-documented that excessive use of alcohol, tobacco, illicit and legal drugs can be damaging to physical health (Gossop et al., 2007; McKetin et al., 2008), and mental health (Teesson et al.,

2010) and is associated with engagement in risky sexual behaviours (Staton et al., 1999), criminal and anti-social behaviours (Miller et al., 2006) and unemployment (Henkel, 2011). Furthermore, the existence of treatment services, coupled with the expansion of educational, preventative and punitive measures (Scottish Government, 2008; 2009), suggest that people do experience problems or, at the very least, are believed to need help to reduce their consumption. However, as discussed further below, common understandings of ‘addiction’ have a moralistic and political history leading some to argue that addiction is socially constructed for the purposes of controlling people’s behaviours to meet political and economic ends (Davies, 1997).

Whereas the majority of substance use research focuses on its problematic causes and consequences as well as the ‘success’ of various interventions in creating behaviour change³, a smaller number of studies have revealed the positive effects of intoxication which is often termed ‘recreational use’. In a longitudinal study of young people’s use of alcohol, tobacco and illicit drugs, Parker, Aldridge and Measham (1998) described the following self-reported, pleasurable feelings of intoxication; *energetic, excited, friendly, carefree, confident, loving, sexy, strong, happy, in control, outgoing, being part of a group and having fun*. Furthermore, a study which examined the motives of young people in beginning to inject heroin found that they did so in order to gain pleasant feelings of drowsiness, numbness, intoxication, relaxation and being ‘out of it’ (Witteveen, Ameijden and Schippers, 2006). Such literature goes some way to counterbalancing negatively framed accounts of substance use, and is helpful for highlighting the subjective experiences of users, yet it still tends to problematise these positive effects without considering wider social contexts which may intersect. Furthermore, the illegality of drug use means that most users remain ‘hidden’ from research and statistics (Miller and S nderlund, 2010). With the exception of studies such as those above, illicit drug use usually only becomes visible to practitioners and policymakers when someone accesses a support organisation or becomes involved in the criminal justice system (McPhee, 2013). This explains why research and public perceptions are skewed towards problematic consequences, whereas it is likely that a sizeable percentage of the

³ See Keurhorst et al. (2015) for a recent example

population has engaged in illicit drug use in a non-problematic, enjoyable manner (McPhee, 2013).

A Brief Historical Overview of 'Addiction'

To understand current perceptions of substance use, it is necessary to examine how this behaviour has been historically characterised and this can be done by considering four theoretical shifts over the 19th, 20th and 21st centuries (Berridge, 1999; Yates, 2015). These theories are termed: moral, medical, behavioural and socio-cultural. Beginning in the 19th century, the moral model was rooted in religion as proponents argued that people who consume substances were sinful and in breach of the established social norms. Berridge (1999) traced the historical processes of how opiates and other drugs became prohibited and consumption became viewed as 'negative'. She detailed how a complex combination of class-based and racist prejudices, coupled with the rise of the medical profession and the Temperance Movement, led to the perception that alcohol and drug use was an immoral and sinful act that opposed God's will. From this perspective, the source of problematic substance use was believed to be the weak will and deviant nature of the individual's character (Berridge, 1999).

As the foundations of modern medicine grew alongside the positivist nature of science in the latter half of the 19th century, the concept of addiction became viewed as a disease and fell within the remit of health professionals (Heather and Robertson, 1997; Berridge, 1999). Focus shifted from viewing the source of problematic substance use as being contained within the individual to being contained within the drug itself. Therefore, addicts were viewed as having no control over their consumption and being pitiful victims of the 'demonic substance' (Heather and Robertson, 1997). This 'disease' discourse was prominent in the first half of the 20th century but was challenged when, in the 1970s, psychological models emerged (Yates, 2015). In particular, behaviourism attributed substance use to the principles of reinforcement: people learn to associate consumption with positive or negative feelings and consequences, and these associations result in neurological changes leading to compulsive behaviour (West, 2006). Although such models assert that biological changes are the mechanisms of substance use, they diverge from medical models in relation to recovery. Whereas medical models assert that

addiction is irreversible and can only be managed through complete abstinence (West, 2006), numerous treatment interventions have been developed⁴ as the behavioural model posits that reinforced associations can be altered.

Alongside psychological models, the 1970s also saw the emergence of socio-cultural theories that emphasised the historical, environmental and structural influences on substance use patterns and understandings (Room, 2003). Anthropologists have demonstrated how the effects of substances are dependent upon the cultures and environments in which they are consumed (MacAndrew and Edgerton, 2003). The effect of environment was innovatively highlighted in Alexander's (1978) seminal 'rat park' studies. After force-feeding morphine to rats over a period of time, they were placed in a large cage containing plenty of space, toys and food which aimed to provide them with a nurturing environment. They were provided with both morphine solution and plain water to drink. Moral, medical and behavioural theories would have predicted the rats' uncontrollable consumption of the morphine but instead they opted to drink the water. Crucially, rats in the control group that were housed in smaller, sparse cages consumed significantly greater levels of morphine compared to the experimental group. This led Alexander (1978) to conclude that physical and social environments play a critical role in determining substance use behaviours.

The significance of socio-cultural factors have subsequently been demonstrated within the human population. The influence of economics was highlighted by Wilkinson and Pickett (2009) who found that mental illness (including problematic alcohol and drug use) is greater in more financially unequal countries. In addition, Batty et al. (2012) found that socially disadvantaged men are more likely to consume excessive quantities of alcohol. With regards to the physical environment, Duff (2009) argued that the condensing of pubs and nightclubs into a few city streets creates an atmosphere of busyness and excitement which attracts young people to congregate and engage in shared intoxication. As well as influencing the experience of the drug 'high', it is also important to consider how and why some spaces are deemed to be more appropriate for substance use than others (Duff, 2007). In a study which mapped out the sites of injecting drug use, Dovey, Fitzgerald and Choi (2001) argued that the prohibition and stigma of heroin use

⁴ See Prochaska, Norcross and DiClemente (1994) for example

meant that users had to find spaces to inject that were hidden from the public gaze. In doing so, their sample turned to public toilets, alleyways, alcoves and carparks to inject, which provided privacy but not safety, since being secluded reduced their chances of being discovered if they overdosed. Taken together, these studies highlighted that some spaces, such as pubs and nightclubs, are ‘designated’ substance use spaces (Duff, 2007). However, when substance use is denigrated either because of the particular drug involved or because of the space in which it is taken, people are forced to conceal their use in order to avoid punitive consequences and this, in turn, can increase health risks (Dovey, Fitzgerald and Choi, 2001).

Despite such evidence which demonstrates the interconnectedness between socio-spatial environments, substance use engagement, experiences and consequences (Alexander, 1978; Zinberg, 1984; Room 2003), political and public portrayals still emphasise tones of moral, medical and behavioural positions (Yates, 2015). Instead of viewing substance use problems as a consequence of inequality or prohibition, for example, legislation prioritises prevention, recovery and law enforcement (Barton, 2003). Drug users are perceived as both criminals and victims, highlighting the political will to monitor and shape people’s behaviours (Barton, 2003). Thus, drug users are morally condemned for deviating from prescribed social norms and society’s role is constructed as helping them to conform through treatment or criminal sanctions (Barton, 2003). Moreover, moral, medical, psychological and, in many cases, socio-cultural understandings of substance use tend to frame substance users as objects whose behaviours are, or should be, controlled. In doing so, people’s abilities to exercise agency, to interpret their social worlds and to experience a range of feelings and opinions concerning their actions are neglected. This is pertinent for the current study which, as will be seen in later chapters, offers an alternative way of understanding substance use when people’s subjectivities are foregrounded.

The Importance of ‘Setting’

Following the psychological and socio-cultural developments in substance use research, in 1984 psychiatrist Norman Zinberg proposed his theory of ‘drug, set and setting’ in which he outlined what is now known as the bio-psychosocial model. This theory posits

that the combined influence of individual biology (drug), psychology (set) and the socio-spatial environment (setting) differentially affects the ways in which people use drugs and the effects and behaviours experienced while under their influence. Therefore, the development of an ‘addiction’ is not solely the result of the substance, the characteristics of the individual or the structural and cultural context but a complex interaction of all three variables. Yet, despite this interaction, Zinberg (1984) asserts that the socio-spatial ‘setting’ bears the greatest influence on a person’s substance use. Thus Zinberg’s biopsychosocial model conceived of substance use as being predominantly located in the social, which is the position adopted throughout the empirical chapters in this thesis.

Within the dimension of ‘setting’, Zinberg (1984) highlighted two mechanisms of control: social sanctions and rituals. Social sanctions refer to formal and informal values and rules of conduct associated with substance use including legislation and restrictions. Social rituals are the informal behavioural patterns associated with substance use. Examples of rituals include waiting until everyone has arrived before heroin injecting begins or ensuring a new user consumes psychedelics in the company of an experienced user. Research conducted with young drug users led Zinberg to identify four functions of social sanctions and rituals:

1. They define moderate use and condemn compulsive use;
2. They limit use to physical and social settings that are conducive to a positive or ‘safe’ drug experience;
3. They identify potentially untoward drug effects and take the relevant precautions;
and
4. They support individuals’ non-drug using obligations and relationships

Thus sanctions and rituals denote the multilevel ways in which society shapes a person’s actions (in this case substance use) and also how people interact to devise their own norms and rules. This reciprocal self-society interaction is unpacked further in Chapter 3 and forms the conceptual framework for exploring the empirical data in the subsequent findings chapters.

According to Zinberg (1984), the practices of sanctions and rituals add socialisation elements to substance use and, more importantly, they ensure that people remain in

control of their consumption and the consequences as much as possible. While Zinberg provided substantial detail about the criteria by which someone was deemed a controlled or a compulsive user (based on frequency and patterns of use), there were discrepancies between how the researchers in his study perceived their participant's drug use and how the participants themselves viewed their use. Participants appeared to self-define their use on the basis of frequency, honesty and the prioritisation of other responsibilities – including money and other socially constructed benchmarks – which in themselves constitute social sanctions. Thus, while Zinberg claimed that his theory focused specifically on controlled (as opposed to compulsive) substance use, there is no clear dividing line to indicate when someone's use has become problematic. Rather, from the substance users' perspectives, this dividing line appears to be dependent on the sanctions and norms of peer-groups and subcultures, and is therefore socially constructed.

The 'Setting' of Homelessness

(Youth) Homelessness in a Scottish Context

Based on Zinberg's (1984) argument that to understand people's substance use it is pertinent to contextualise it within its socio-spatial environments (the 'setting'), this section conceives of homelessness as a type of setting. However, not only do the characteristics of this setting differ for each individual or group, they also depend on the form that homelessness takes as there are legally recognised 'types'. In the UK, local authorities have had a legal obligation (referred to as 'duty') to house homeless people since the introduction of the *Housing (Homeless Persons) Act 1977* (Himsworth, 1994). In Scotland, these duties were reiterated in the *Housing (Scotland) Act 1984* (Himsworth, 1994). At the time these were only discretionary powers but with the formation of the Scottish Parliament in 1999, housing and homelessness became fully devolved powers, meaning that related legislation has diversified across the UK (Anderson, 2009). Post-1999 amendments to the 1984 Act were made in the *Housing (Scotland) Act 2001* and *Homelessness etc. (Scotland) Act 2003*, and the subsequent Code of Guidance (Scottish Executive, 2005) is therefore based on these two amended Acts. According to this Scottish Code of Guidance, being 'homeless' is legally defined as:

- Someone who has no accommodation in the UK in which she has a legal right to occupy;
- Someone who has accommodation but it is unreasonable for her to continue to live in it because of, for example, intolerable standards;
- Someone who cannot secure entry into accommodation that she is legally entitled to occupy;
- Someone who is at risk of violence if she continues to live in her current accommodation;
- Someone who has a temporary mobile home, caravan, houseboat or other moveable structure but has no place where she is entitled or permitted to put it and live in it;
- Someone living in overcrowded accommodation which may endanger her health;
or
- Someone living in temporary accommodation (such as bed and breakfast or hostel accommodation)

Under the legislation, housing authorities are obligated to have a strategy for preventing homelessness and ensuring that accommodation and support are available to anyone in their area who is homeless or at risk of homelessness (Scottish Executive, 2005). Homelessness, therefore, is not seen as an issue only affecting those without a roof over their heads and is not only tackled in a responsive manner. Indeed, the key way in which the issue is currently addressed is through the Housing Options approach. The Housing Options policy is UK-wide but differs across local authorities (Fitzpatrick, Quilgars and Pleace, 2009). The policy is prevention-focused and under this scheme, anyone who approaches their local authority for housing advice is given an interview to explore the full range of available options, including services such as family mediation or rent deposit guarantee provisions (Fitzpatrick, Quilgars and Pleace, 2009).

Whereas Housing Options is a UK-wide policy, the most significant aspect of homelessness legislation in Scotland, which sets it apart from the rest of the UK, is what was known as the ‘2012 commitment’ initiated in the *Homelessness etc. (Scotland) Act 2003*. Prior to the end of 2012, someone approaching his local authority to receive assistance for homelessness had to be assessed against four criteria: (1) he had to meet

the legal definition of homelessness as outlined above, (2) he had to be unintentionally homeless (3) he had to have a local connection to the area, and (4) he had to be in ‘priority need’. Only once these criteria were fulfilled did the government have a legal duty to house the individual. However, at the end of 2012 the criterion of being in ‘priority need’ was legally abolished (Scottish Government, 2012). Previous priority need categories included pregnant women; those with dependent children; those deemed to be vulnerable⁵; 16-17 year olds; care leavers under the age of 21; those whose homelessness was the result of an emergency (such as fire or flooding); ‘high risk’ 18-20 year olds⁶; victims of domestic abuse; and victims of racist, homophobic or religious harassment (Scottish Executive, 2005). Thus, young people, especially those whose housing situation put them at substantial risk of becoming involved in substance use, were prioritised under this old system; reinforcing the contention that substance use is inherently problematic and in need of prevention or ‘fixing’. However, the decision to abolish ‘priority need’ was based on the argument that it was a throwback to ideologies concerning the ‘deserving’ and ‘undeserving’ poor with the belief that many people deserve to be homeless and only those in the priority categories do not (Shelter Scotland, 2005). Furthermore, Anderson (2009) described how the decision to abolish the criterion emerged from the growing recognition that it discriminated against single homeless people (predominantly men) and those with support needs that were not recognised by local housing authorities.

Together, the Housing Options approach and the 2012 commitment have had notable effects on homeless statistics in Scotland (Mackie and Thomas, 2014). It should be noted that statistics only provide a partial picture in that they only include those who have approached their local authority for assistance and therefore they do not account for sofa surfers and other hidden forms of homelessness (Shelter Scotland, 2015a). With this in mind, a recent document by Shelter Scotland (2015a), which drew on official government statistics, reported a 34% decrease in the number of applications made to local authorities in order to receive the main homelessness duty (i.e. to be provided with accommodation) in the period 2009-2014. However, when divided by sub-group, the report found that

⁵ ‘Vulnerable’ included elderly people, those with mental or physical health problems, care leavers over the age of 21, ex-servicemen, those who had just left custody or detention and those fleeing violence.

⁶ ‘High risk’ included being at risk of sexual abuse, financial exploitation, or involvement in serious substance ‘misuse’

homelessness among certain populations (i.e. those living in the private rented sector and those deemed ‘intentionally homeless’) had increased. It also reported that 55% of homeless applications in 2013-14 were made by males, although more females than males were aged under 25. Significantly for this thesis, 29% of all homeless applications in 2013-14 were made by under-25s. Although youth homelessness has been decreasing as a proportional share of all age groups since 2009-10, they are still an over-represented group:

(T)he rate of youth homelessness in Scotland is 13.7 per 1000 of the population, compared to the rate of homelessness for over 25s which is 5.5. (Shelter Scotland, 2015a: 14).

Not only do young people comprise a substantial proportion of the homeless population, the causes for their homelessness are distinctive compared to older age groups, particularly since young people are often reliant on the actions of their parents (Mallett et al., 2010). In a summary of the literature, Johnsen and Quilgars (2009) identified the following common causes of youth homelessness: family disruption (as a result of parental divorce); conflict with (step-)parents; witnessing or experiencing violence within the family home; living in a family with financial problems; running away from home; having spent time in care; having been involved in crime or anti-social behaviour; and having been suspended or excluded from school. While not all young people use drugs and alcohol, and while substance use is not necessarily a significant factor in youth homelessness, there is evidence that substance use can play a part (Neale, 2001; Pleace, 2008) and therefore this behaviour may intersect with these other known causes. This picture suggests that young people presenting to local authorities as homeless are likely to have biographies characterised by turbulent family lives and/or psycho-social difficulties. Furthermore, homelessness for many is episodic meaning that people move between homelessness, independent living and/or living with their parents (May, 2000). Not only do young homeless people have challenging pre-homeless biographies, their homelessness/housing journeys can be fraught with difficulties pertaining to poverty, health, conflict and anti-social behaviour (Hall, 2003; Barker, 2013). Consequently, their lives are often referred to as ‘chaotic’ as they face multiple barriers in obtaining security and stability (Clapham et al., 2014).

Temporary Accommodation and Housing First

As will be seen, the data drawn on in this thesis were collected from a group of young people living in a temporary accommodation hostel which constitutes one particular form of homelessness. Thus, it is useful to outline here what such accommodation involves and, particularly, its drawbacks as an interim solution to homelessness, as these issues contextualise, to some extent, the conditions in which the young participants were living. These drawbacks have been highlighted in academic literature but they are perhaps more starkly shown through comparison with an alternative homelessness solution: the 'Housing First' approach. Therefore, this section firstly considers what temporary accommodation is and why it can be problematic, before juxtaposing it with the Housing First approach.

When someone makes a homeless application with her local authority, one option is to place her in temporary accommodation while her application is reviewed and a longer-term solution is found (Stevenson, 2014). Because of the removal of the 'priority need' criterion, Scottish local authorities have had to find additional housing to accommodate those who would previously have not received the main homelessness duty (Robertson and Serpa, 2014). In order to do so, councils designated a greater proportion of their social housing stock as temporary accommodation and in the period 2001-2011, the use of hostel and Bed and Breakfast (B&B) accommodation tripled, meaning that a greater proportion of social housing is used for short-term and insecure lets (Robertson and Serpa, 2014).

Temporary accommodation exists in various forms including flats, houses, bedsits, hostels, and B&B hotels, although, in Scotland, the latter is viewed as a last resort (Shelter Scotland, 2015b). Edgar and Meert (2005) proposed that homeless accommodation consists of three common aspects: shared living with little or no private space; staff supervision of the premises; and a temporary living agreement in which the individual can be evicted without the need for court action. The degree to which each of these criteria applies differs according to the service and wider housing context. For example, although such accommodation is usually provided on a short-term basis, many end up living there for much longer than originally intended (Edgar et al., 2007). This could be

because of a national housing shortage or because individuals have been excluded from regular housing (Busch-Geertsema and Sahlin, 2007).

In their review of the role of hostels in contemporary society, Busch-Geertsema and Sahlin (2007) detailed the different purposes that temporary accommodation serves. First, it provides physical shelter where no alternatives are available. Secondly, the time spent living in a hostel is often used as a way of engaging homeless people in activities designed to tackle identified support needs; these include substance use. Thirdly, hostels act as a form of institution in which homeless people can be simultaneously controlled and protected in relation to wider society. Fourthly, if one accepts the premise that some people are intentionally homeless, hostels may act as a deterrent from future homelessness if they are in poor condition. Finally, they provide a form of community through shared living which can help to combat feelings of loneliness and alienation (Busch-Geertsema and Sahlin, 2007).

Despite these perceived benefits, Busch-Geertsema and Sahlin were highly critical of hostels and, indeed, temporary accommodation has become problematized in recent years, particularly where substance use is concerned (Stevenson, 2014). Some hostels require residents to commit to substance use reduction programmes as part of their accommodation agreement⁷. However, many people do not feel ready to tackle their substance use problems or do not feel they need to (Neale, 2001). Therefore, people can end up living in a shared space with other substance users and there is the risk that this could introduce or exacerbate problems connected to drugs and/or alcohol (McKeown, 2006). Furthermore, living in the same space as other injecting drug users can increase exposure to blood-borne viruses (Neale and Stevenson, 2012). Additional problems can arise in hostels if they are poorly resourced, inadequately managed and do not offer a great deal of privacy or security (Stevenson, 2014). A lack of privacy and a high level of noise can negatively impact on sleep quality which has ‘knock-on’ effects for other health issues (Nettleton, Neale and Stevenson, 2012). Some hostels are not equipped to adequately accommodate couples meaning that important relationships are compromised and some may choose to sleep rough in order to remain together (Stevenson and Neale, 2012). Finally, while the initial cause of homelessness may have been as a result of an

⁷ See for example Phoenix Futures <http://www.phoenix-futures.org.uk/>

individualised problem, difficulties in getting out of homelessness are more likely to be connected to structural factors such as the housing market. Therefore, even if hostel-dwellers receive a package of intensive support, it may not be enough to help them to move back into a home of their own (Busch-Geertsema and Sahlin, 2007).

As mentioned, one response to these issues is what is known as the Housing First model introduced in the United States of America (USA) during the early 1990s. As the name suggests, this approach seeks to move homeless people with complex needs (primarily co-morbid mental health and ‘addiction’ issues) into permanent housing as quickly as possible and then subsequently they are offered a long-term package of outreach support (Tsemberis, 2010). Housing is viewed as a basic human right and it challenges the current dominant response to homeless substance users of providing treatment first and attempting to help someone to become ‘housing ready’ before facilitating the move into permanent housing (Busch-Geertsema, 2014). Tenancies are relatively secure and tenants have a large degree of choice in that they can choose their own furnishings and level of engagement with support services (Atherton and McNaughton, 2008). The Housing First model has been adapted and rolled out across a large number of countries and there is evidence of its success with regards to demonstrating that homeless individuals with complex needs can sustain a tenancy (Padgett, Gulcur and Tsemberis, 2006; Davidson et al., 2014). However, evidence of reduced substance use and mental health problems is more mixed (Busch-Geertsema, 2014) while some have argued that more research is needed concerning non-housing outcomes to fully evaluate the model’s success (McNaughton and Atherton, 2011; Johnsen and Teixeira, 2012).

In the UK, Johnsen and Teixeira (2012) demonstrated that the Housing First model has been met with less enthusiasm compared to other countries because of a belief that many housing services already offer the help that the model recommends. Therefore, this model is not regarded as a radical alternative to what is currently in place. However, the authors pointed to three key ways in which these services differ in relation to the USA model. First, the services are only offered to homeless people deemed to be ‘low risk’ rather than those with complex needs. Secondly, the support packages offered are time-limited – usually only for six months – in contrast to the indefinite support advocated by the model. Finally, eligibility is determined by an individual’s willingness to engage with the support package, whereas the USA model firmly argued for this to be optional and

for housing to be provided regardless. This reiterates the arguments made in this chapter that there is an emphasis in the UK on controlling and ‘fixing’ substance use through prevention and intervention. In this instance, housing is conditional on the person allowing service providers to intervene in his substance use.

Johnsen and Teixeira (2012) subsequently highlighted several ways in which service provision for homeless people with complex needs could be changed in the UK to deliver a more holistic approach. It would, however, require a substantial increase in the supply of affordable housing, along with a well-resourced support system, which is currently lacking in Scotland (Commission on Housing and Wellbeing, 2015). Nonetheless, the Housing First model represents a significant alternative to the ‘treatment first’ approach of temporary accommodation (Padgett, Gulcur and Tsemberis, 2006).

The Interwoven Nature of Homelessness and Substance Use

Given that homelessness is generally viewed as the consequence of factors that have led to the loss of a stable and secure home, theorising homelessness differs from theorising the bio-psychosocial underpinnings of substance use. Similar to substance use though, are narratives about homelessness as being determined by structural or agentic causes (Ratcliffe, 2004). For example, Cloke, May and Johnsen (2010) documented some of the structural causes (decimation of the manufacturing industries, decline in social housing stock and welfare ‘reform’) underpinning the increase in homelessness during the 1979-1990 Thatcher and 1990-1997 Major Governments, but also the growing political demonisation of rough sleepers who ‘refused’ to change their ‘lifestyle’. In addition, there has been much interest in the ways in which homeless people are socially and physically controlled with regards to their movements through space and their conduct (for example, Smith’s (1996) theory of ‘revanchism’ which is discussed later). These theories typically overlap with the domain of substance use. Those who demonise homeless people often draw upon their substance use as indicative of moral failure (Cloke, May and Johnsen, 2010), whereas those who construct homeless people as ‘vulnerable’ likewise highlight their substance use as adding to their social disadvantage (Fitzpatrick, Johnsen and White, 2011).

Not only do the following sections demonstrate some of the ways in which substance use and homelessness interact, they show how these interactions are typically viewed from a top-down, objective perspective. Such perspectives are crucial as they portray substance users and homeless people as both ‘vulnerable’ and ‘deviant’. In the next chapter, it is argued that these top-down portrayals filter into the consciousness and everyday lives of the general public, which reinforces the perceived need to control and intervene in the lives of those who are substance users and/or homeless. Yet, this top-down perspective represents only one aspect of everyday life and it fails to account for the subjective experiences of those on the receiving end of such portrayals and consequent interventions.

Multiple Exclusion Homelessness and Policy Frameworks

Similar to Cloke, May and Johnsen’s (2010) discussions cited above, Pleace (2011) documented the ways in which the political zeitgeist influences how homelessness is constructed on a structural-individual spectrum. In the 1970s, he contended, structural constraints were understood as contributing to homelessness as increasing numbers of families found themselves in this position following their inability to meet housing costs. This was followed by a return to individualistic accounts with the arrival of the Thatcher era and a narrow policy response that concentrated on street homelessness (Smith, 1999; Anderson, 2007). By ending the building of new social housing and selling off a large share of the higher quality housing stock, the Thatcher Government ensured that the state was not equipped to accommodate a significant proportion of homeless people and consequently the number of people sleeping rough increased (Pleace, 2011). When New Labour took power in 1997, they viewed homelessness and other social problems from the lens of social exclusion (Pleace, 2011) which they defined as ‘...what can happen when people or areas suffer from a combination of linked problems such as unemployment, poor skills, low incomes, poor housing, high crime, poor health and family breakdown’ (Social Exclusion Unit, 2004). Some have argued that social exclusion is a broader concept than income poverty or structured inequality since it captures the failure of the state to include marginalised groups into society, politics and the ‘moral order’ (MacDonald and Marsh, 2005).

Despite a return to Conservative Party politics in 2010⁸, it would appear that the theme of social exclusion with regards to homelessness has been retained, at least within academia. In 2009, four research projects were commissioned in the UK under the theme of ‘multiple exclusion homelessness’ (MEH), with the initial findings published in 2011. This research rested on the premise that homelessness often occurs in conjunction with other social problems meaning that some people’s social exclusion lies within multiple domains (Dwyer and Somerville, 2011). Within this research programme, one study quantitatively investigated the nature of MEH and detailed the prevalence and patterns of social problems experienced by their sample of 1,286 individuals who had accessed ‘low-threshold’ services for homelessness, institutional care, substance ‘misuse’ or street culture activities (Fitzpatrick, Johnsen and White, 2011). Of the sample, 98% had experienced homelessness, 70% had experienced substance ‘misuse’, 67% street culture activities (such as begging, shoplifting and street drinking) and 62% institutional care. Crucially, 47% of the sample had experienced all four domains of social exclusion and of the 70% who had experienced substance use, less than 1% had not experienced homelessness. Such high levels of overlap clearly demonstrate the association between homelessness and substance use and, in the context of social exclusion, Fitzpatrick, Johnsen and White (2011: 510) argued that these individuals had experienced ‘an even more extreme concentration of trauma and vulnerability than has hitherto been assumed’.

As this quote demonstrates, the term ‘vulnerability’ is often used interchangeably with concepts such as social exclusion and marginalisation, but attention is seldom given to the meaning of this term and to the criteria by which an individual or group is deemed to be vulnerable. Larkin (2009) claimed that the precise definition of ‘vulnerable’ is vague since everyone feels vulnerable at some point in their lives. She also argued that it has a variety of meanings that are context-specific and that differ depending on whether it is viewed as a product of an innate quality or structural determinants.

Despite these complexities, numerous Government policies have been developed which target ‘vulnerable’ groups in order to achieve a political goal, to improve people’s

⁸ In 2010-2015, the UK was governed by a Coalition Government comprised of the Conservative and Liberal Democrat Parties. In the May 2015 General Election, this Coalition Government was superseded by an outright Conservative Party victory.

wellbeing and to benefit wider society. Larkin argued that political definitions of vulnerability rest within their conceptualisations of marginalisation and social exclusion:

[Political criteria for vulnerability] are based on the ways in which [vulnerable groups] are marginalized, socially excluded, have limited opportunities and income, and suffer abuse (physical, sexual, psychological and financial), hardship, prejudice and discrimination. (Larkin, 2009: 3)

Young homeless substance users are also represented as vulnerable in government policies that claim to provide some form of protection. This was reflected in the old homelessness 'priority need' categories which provided a safety net specifically for 16-17 year olds; over-18s who had been looked after and/or had a mental illness (including problematic substance use); and those aged 18-20 whose living circumstances put them at risk of problematic substance use (Scottish Executive, 2005). In addition, legislation such as the *Children (Scotland) Act 1995* ensured the protection from harm of young people under the age of 18 and those who had been looked-after up to the age of 21. More recently, the *Children and Young Person's (Scotland) Act 2014* extended this local authority provision for young people up to the age of 25. In addition, it enables looked-after young people, who are not ready to leave home, to remain living with their kinship or foster carers up to the age of 21 (McCormack, 2014). This legislation takes the perspective that young care leavers' perceived vulnerabilities can be exacerbated if they are forced to move out of their care placements before they feel ready to.

Legislation concerning alcohol and drug use applies across the UK but specific policies are devolved. The Scottish alcohol strategy (Scottish Government, 2009) is less youth-focused than that of England and Wales (HM Government, 2012) which views those aged below 25 as being particularly problematic regarding their high likelihood for drunkenness. However, the Scottish Government's strategy included a debate over whether or not to increase the minimum age for purchasing alcohol to 21 on the basis that it will curb anti-social behaviour at the weekends purportedly caused by 18-20 year olds. Likewise, young people are targeted for drug prevention and treatment responses in both the Scottish (Scottish Government, 2008) and English/Welsh (HM Government, 2010) drug strategies, with both strategies arguing that youth recreational drug use can later become problematic and so must be prevented from an early age.

Discussions of MEH and policies concerning young people, substance users and homeless people therefore frame these groups as vulnerable and/or deviant. This framing serves to protect certain groups in society while simultaneously functioning as a means of social control. In terms of substance use, its associated stigma is underpinned by moralistic and individualised rhetoric that places the blame for social problems on substance use (Room, 2005). Room (2005) extended this argument by asserting that it is not substance use *per se* that is viewed as problematic, but intoxication. Consuming an amount that causes someone to have reduced self-control may have consequences which undermine the ability of the individual to conform to socially prescribed norms. Therefore, policies and legislation are designed to coerce people to retain self-control so that they do not act in ways which transgress morally charged standards. Thus, Room (2005) contended, while drug and alcohol strategies purport to protect vulnerable groups, they likewise seek to control people's behaviours. This further serves to legitimise the work of professional bodies, such as medical personnel and police officers, who reproduce their own authority by informing the construction of policies (Room, 2005). As will be argued in Chapter 3, such discourses not only reproduce authority, they also penetrate the consciousness of the general public (including substance users and homeless people themselves) who, in turn, govern their own behaviours based on their perceptions of what others may think of them. Where their behaviours do not fully align with dominant discourses and norms, they may experience stigma or they may align themselves to an alternative set of social rules.

Homeless Spaces and Social Networks

The interactions between substance use and homelessness can also be observed in the context of homeless people's use of spaces and their social networks. The social control and underpinning disapproval of such groups are highly salient when considering the divisions and policing of public and private spaces. Prescribing the spaces within which homeless people are permitted to be can determine the people they come into contact with and their actions within these spaces (Johnsen and Fitzpatrick, 2010). These two themes – the spatial and social – are significant for the remainder of the thesis because, as will

be seen, they structured the everyday lives of the young people who participated in the research.

As discussed, Zinberg's (1984) 'setting' refers to the influence of the physical and social environment on the effects, consequences and behaviours relating to substance use. Regarding the physical environment, the divisions and control of public versus private space have a significant impact on homeless people. For example, Shannon et al. (2010) found that, in Canada, the prohibition of soliciting in public spaces forced homeless sex workers to solicit in more isolated spaces far away from health services and needle exchange programmes, thus increasing personal risk. Similar regulatory, surveillance and controlling measures are prevalent in the UK including by-laws that restrict homeless people's access to prime space; business improvement districts; Controlled Drinking Zones; and Anti-Social Behaviour Orders (Cloke, May and Johnsen, 2010). More recent examples of such controls in the UK (and specifically London) were the highly publicised 'anti-homeless spikes' – metal studs covering patches of ground or doorways connected to luxury flats or businesses – that were designed to prevent rough sleepers or beggars from sitting or lying down for fear of compromising the 'feel' or appearance of the area (Andreou, 2014). According to Smith's (1996) theory of the 'revanchist city', such measures have been designed to regulate the 'unacceptable' behaviours of homeless people as the wealthy and middle-class members of society have been attempting to reclaim city space from the marginalised 'others' through processes of urban regeneration and gentrification. Extending Smith's theory, Mitchell (1997) argued that the ultimate political goal of urban revanchism is to do away with homelessness by removing homeless people themselves through pushing them out to the margins of society until there is no space left for them to exist in.

This literature suggests that such control measures have two connected purposes: to remove homeless people from prime space and/or to pressure them to change their 'unacceptable' behaviours such as substance use (Smith, 1996; Cloke, May and Johnsen, 2010). Given that levels of substance use are far greater in the homeless population compared to the general population (Neale, 2001), it could be suggested that these measures have been, at least partially, unsuccessful. In her study of homeless drug users in Scotland, Neale (2001; 367) stated that '...addressing a drug problem whilst one is roofless is virtually impossible'. This was based on self-reports of heroin users who

claimed that despite intoxication increasing their vulnerability and risk of abuse, the drug played a substantial role in alleviating some of the physical and emotional pain associated with being homeless. For many, giving up the drug and its cushioning effects while homeless was not always viewed as possible or desirable. Rather than reducing people's drug and alcohol use, policies such as Controlled Drinking Zones and Anti-Social Behaviour Orders serve to either criminally punish people for their behaviours or to force them to move to areas that are not so heavily policed (Cloke, May and Johnsen, 2010).

Cloke, May and Johnsen (2010) argued that discussions of urban homelessness and revanchism have neglected to account for the spaces that homeless people frequently access, as well as the agency of homeless people and those who provide services for them. To address this imbalance, the authors drew attention to hostels, night shelters, day centres and soup runs, and the positive relationships and experiences that can occur in these places, as well as the regulation, containment and control measures that are adopted. They argued that although the negotiation of space by homeless people is an important aspect of their lives, this is secondary to the associated emotions such as care, generosity, boredom, depression and anger that accompany this negotiation. Within temporary accommodation hostels, Stevenson (2014) has likewise highlighted the importance of the staff-resident relationships, citing instances of both negative and positive actions by the staff towards the resident(s). According to Stevenson, positive relationships can enhance feelings of inclusion and 'social capital' which can assist in recovery from substance use problems. Focusing on emotions complements Neale's (2001) findings that homeless drug users have high rates of deliberate overdose as a result of feeling depressed, distressed and hopeless. Staff who provide services for this population, therefore, have the potential to boost wellbeing and mitigate some of these negative emotions (Stevenson, 2014).

Neale's (2001) findings, cited above, were based on comparing people who were currently homeless with those who had been homeless previously but were currently housed. While she defined homelessness as sleeping rough, living in emergency accommodation or sofa surfing, she did not differentiate her findings according to place of residence. However, within the homeless population, place of residence has been found to intersect with substance use. In an American study, Greene, Ennett and Ringwalt (1997) found differences in substance use between young people living on the

streets, homeless shelters and at home. Specifically, illicit drug use (excluding cannabis) was most prevalent among street-youth, followed by shelter-youth and then household-youth, whereas the reverse trend was found for alcohol. Shelter-youth had the highest prevalence of tobacco use and both shelter- and street-youth had the same prevalence of cannabis use, which was higher than household-youth. The authors concluded that substance use amongst homeless youth should be viewed within the contexts of different living circumstances and homeless youth should not be treated as a single population.

As well as the physical environment, a person's social network has an impact on substance use. In an investigation of such networks among homeless youth, Ennett, Bailey and Federman (1999) found that they tended to be small, albeit intimate, and were likely to consist of friends rather than relatives or sexual partners. Importantly, one quarter of their sample reported that they did not have anyone in their social network and these people were significantly more likely to engage in risky sex, trade in survival sex and engage in illicit drug use. This latter finding has been replicated in relation to young people's 'social capital', defined by Ennett, Bailey and Federman (1999) as involving networks of relationships that facilitate actions within social structures and that provide people with feelings of trust and mutual aid (Bantchevska et al., 2008). High social capital among homeless youth has been associated with general wellbeing (Bassani, 2007) whereas low social capital has been connected to higher levels of substance use and days spent living on the streets – among other issues (Bantchevska et al., 2008).

Bassani (2007) highlighted the need for further research regarding peer groups and youth-centred groups as the majority of youth social capital research has focused on the family and school groups of which young people do not normally choose to be members. Indeed, if homeless youth are more likely to have friends than relatives in their social networks, and since family breakdown is a major cause of youth homelessness (e.g. Johnsen and Quilgars, 2009), any positives to be gained from social groups are likely to be generated from peers and other non-family relationships. Yet being homeless does not necessarily mean that contact will be lost or negative relationships will develop with family members (Barker, 2012). In a longitudinal study of homeless drug users, Kemp, Neale and Robertson (2006) found that those who maintained positive relationships with family members were more likely to be 'protected' from engaging in substance use. Furthermore, they found that only one factor was associated with exiting homelessness

among their sample: not having family problems. This finding led the researchers to conclude that family relationships and social capital seem to be valuable in preventing and buffering the effects of homelessness.

Interactions with the Material World: Space, Place and Home

The spatial aspects of homelessness discussed so far have concerned the ways in which homeless people in public spaces are controlled and marginalised. Neale's (2001) findings that homeless people use drugs as a means of coping with their rooflessness goes some way to understanding the feelings underpinning the behaviour. The pain that her participants felt may have been caused by historical turmoil connected to the reasons for their homelessness, yet this does not capture or explain the emotional experiences of actually being homeless in the present moment. Indeed, focusing on the subjective experiences of living in temporary accommodation, which includes emotionality, is one of the aims of this thesis. May's (2011; 2013) concept of 'sensory belonging' can cast a new dimension on this issue. In discussing the idea that people have a need to feel connected to the external world, May distinguished between cultural, relational and sensory belonging. Her theory will be outlined in greater detail in Chapter 3, but sensory belonging is pertinent for this discussion as it refers to feeling an affinity with the material environment through the use of our senses. The sights, sounds, smells, tastes and the overall 'feel' of a place enable people to engage with and give meaning to their environments. To unpack this, it is useful to turn to human geography which distinguishes between space, place and home.

Casey (2001: 404, original emphasis) argued that space and place are 'two different *orders* of reality' meaning that neither takes primacy over the other. He defined space with regards to its 'locatory capacity' meaning that space can be thought of as a geographical container which can exist in absolute or relative form (Casey, 2001). When differentiating between the two, Gieryn (2000: 465) stated that 'space is what place becomes when the unique gathering of things, meanings and values are sucked out'. Taken together, space can be likened to an empty vessel that is devoid of meaning whereas places involve infusing spaces with physical, social and abstract objects that combine to give an overall meaning. People come to understand a place as being

geographically bounded, consisting of a landscape of objects which are interpreted through social interactions (Easthope, 2004).

Although the meanings of places are nuanced and personal, many spaces are designed for particular purposes and/or take on commonly held meanings. This is what has been referred to as ‘representations of space’ (Lefebvre, 1991). Jeyasingham (2014) provided examples from social work studies including ideas about particular neighbourhoods being associated with certain minority ethnic groups and therefore conceived of as different, poor and violent. This contrasts with people’s lived experiences of place – what Lefebvre (1991) referred to as ‘representational spaces’ – in that places are lived and people can act in ways which defy the commonly held representations of a space. Jeyasingham (2014) illustrated this through the example of street prostitutes who defy notions of the city as being coherent and policed.

This ability to defy or change representations of space can be seen in literature concerning youth, substance use and homelessness. One study explored how young people felt about official representations of spaces including the home (Thompson, Russell and Simmons, 2014). The authors presented case studies including that of a young man named Danny who had traversed the homeless system before being provided with a council flat. In contrast to his mother’s house which he regarded as ‘home’, he did not view his flat as ‘home’ as he did not have the personal resources to create what he perceived as a homely environment. Rather he used the flat to socialise with friends and ‘do business’ (dealing cannabis). His lived experiences of the flat changed after being attacked by a neighbour:

For Danny, it transformed his flat from a place where he did business, partied, slept, ate and ‘got stoned’ into a place he feared and actively avoided. (Thompson, Russell and Simmons, 2014: 71)

The example of Danny illustrates that some places (such as ‘home’) have commonly held representations which may or may not live up to expectation. Furthermore, people can experience a place differently to what its dominant representation suggests and such experiences (and meanings) can change over time or as a consequence of a critical event.

If places are spatial sites filled with physical, social and abstract meanings, a home can be conceived of as a ‘significant type of place’ (Easthope, 2004: 128). Given that the ‘setting’ (Zinberg, 1984) of this thesis is a temporary accommodation hostel for those who are home-less, it is pertinent to unpack dominant representations of home in order to understand what ‘home-less’ people may be lacking. Most contend that ‘home’ is distinctive from ‘house’ since people can feel ‘at home’ in non-house places. For example, a home could refer to a neighbourhood, a city or an entire nation (Blunt and Dowling, 2006; Soaita, 2015). A dwelling, such as a house or flat, can be conceived as a type of spatial container that becomes a home-place when people ascribe those meanings to it. These meanings can be negative as well as positive since, for example, people may experience home as a type of prison if they need to spend a great deal of time there, as in the case of a mother raising a baby (Gurney, 1997). In attempting to understand what a home can potentially offer to people, three interconnected themes have been identified in the literature: ontological security, control and identity development. Each of these will be discussed in turn.

Ontological security refers to the idea that people need to have confidence and trust in their understandings and perceptions of the material and social worlds within which they are located. It is about feeling as though one can rely on the world as it is presented to them and involves feeling grounded in the constancy and continuity of the world as it relates to self-identity (Giddens, 1991). Many believe that a person’s home can provide ontological security which, in turn, provides benefits for wellbeing (Clapham, 2011; Easthope, 2014). This occurs because a home, as it relates to dwelling, is the site of daily routines and practices over which an individual can obtain ‘a sense of mastery and control away from the outside world’s scrutiny’ (Padgett, 2007: 1926).

Control is therefore closely linked to ontological security and can involve determining the activities within a home-place as well as the people who enter it. This is related to privacy and the ability to denote a ‘backstage’ area in which people can drop their performances and which can be controlled with regards to ensuring that ‘audience’ members do not enter (Goffman, 1959)⁹. According to Parsell (2012), control over a space enables people to exercise autonomy over their lives. One way in which people

⁹ Goffman’s theoretical contributions are discussed in more detail in Chapter 3

can exert control is through the concept of ‘home-making’. Based on the work of Klis and Karsten (2009), Soaita (2015) proposed that home-making consists of three components: the manipulation of the physical setting by means of ‘thick’ objects, including the physical structure; the performance of meaningful domestic activities; and the occurrence of social engagement with significant others. With regards to ‘thick’ objects, researchers interested in home-making agree that the placement of physical objects (such as furniture, rugs and mementos) in the home, as well as a home’s layout, décor and structural quality, are significant beyond their immediate appearances (Mallett, 2004; Soaita, 2015). This is because objects are imbued with particular meanings and memories and are therefore reflective of the self (Jacobs and Malpas, 2013).

Given that a home can be conceived of as a type of place, the term ‘home-making’ can be likened to ‘place-making’. In a study of young people affected by parental substance use, Wilson, Houmøller and Bernays (2012) used the concept of ‘place-making’ to refer to efforts by the young people to avoid conflict and unpleasant features of their family life while also acting in ways to create more subjectively pleasant, safe places for themselves within their dwelling. The authors also focused on the young people’s sensory experiences and how these linked with their place-making behaviours. In particular, the visual, physical and auditory senses were apparent as the authors pointed to watching television (TV), dancing and listening to music as methods used by the young people to carve out their own place within the family home and away from their substance using parents. Place-making aligns with the idea that people’s minds engage with the material environment through the use of the sensory body (Casey, 2001). Many groups, including children and young people, often have relatively little influence in shaping and controlling their social and material environment (Matthews and Limb, 1999). In more extreme cases groups, such as prisoners or mental health patients, can be subjected to high levels of surveillance coupled with their movements and behaviours being strictly prescribed (Goffman, 1961; Foucault, 1975). When people experience a loss of control, their reactions may be in the form of resistance in the sense that they act in ways to temporarily free themselves from perceived constraints (Haenfler, 2004). From this perspective, place-making can be thought of as a form of resistance since it involves taking control of a space, even if only for a temporary period, and infusing it with physical, social and sensory objects and activities which have personal significance.

Interwoven with the ontological security and control that can be experienced within a home/place is the connection with the self. The home can be viewed as a reflection of the self, given that people shape the environment just as it shapes them (Marcus, 1995). Jacobs and Malpas (2013) asserted that to understand the ways in which people relate to physical objects (including a dwelling and everything it contains) is to understand the structure of the individual's self. Some have argued that self and place are so inextricably bound, that it is not possible to examine one without the other (Casey, 2001). It follows that the self is developed and expressed in relation to how much ontological security and control over a place one has as well as the meanings given to the place. This was powerfully discussed by Neumark (2013) who claimed that 'house beautification' for formerly-displaced people enabled them to feel a sense of agency and control where these were previously lacking. Actively engaging in processes of cleaning a house, decorating and displaying items can create new feelings of normalcy and routine. In the 'carrying out' of house beautification, people can come to terms with their previous feelings of loss and begin to formulate a renewed sense of self (Neumark, 2013).

Underpinning these discussions are political processes of power. A huge body of literature exists on this topic which considers a range of ways in which places (including the dwelling and wider geographically-bounded spaces) are the sites of inclusion and exclusion. Disempowerment in this sense refers to ways in which ontological security, control and the right to behave in certain ways in certain places are compromised. These issues have been explored in relation to gender (Gurney, 1997), age (Thompson, Russell and Simmons, 2014), class (Wacquant, 2008), ethnicity (Phillips and Harrison, 2010), disability (Imrie, 2004), sexual orientation (Taylor, 2004), 'anti-social' behaviours (Flint, 2002) and homelessness (Cloke, May and Johnsen, 2010). With regards to the latter, although home is not synonymous with house, homeless people often claim that they need to have a dwelling of their own in order to obtain the feelings and benefits associated with home (Parsell, 2012). Home ownership provides the greatest level of ontological security and control (Easthope, 2014) but given the unlikelihood of becoming a home owner, homeless people need to be housed in a dwelling that is fairly managed by a landlord – affordable and in good condition – otherwise their mental health and wellbeing could suffer (Smith, Albanese and Truder, 2014). As Padgett (2007) noted in relation to people with mental health problems, it is ironic that those arguably most in need of ontological security are those least likely to be in housing circumstances that would

provide it. Housing is therefore crucial for enabling feelings of ontological security and control which can be developed through place-making activities. This in turn has a strong influence on a person's sense of self. If having a lack of ontological security, control and an insecure sense of self comprises a person's wellbeing, it follows that this may explain the pain felt by homeless people who use substances to cope (Neale, 2001).

Conclusion

This chapter has reviewed a wealth of literature which unpacks the concepts of 'substance use' and 'homelessness' as well as pointing to their socio-spatial dimensions. It has been argued that the ways in which substance use and homelessness are framed are underpinned by political interests. Substance use – and particularly illicit drug use – is almost always presented as problematic despite its recreational aspects. People who are 'addicted' are viewed simultaneously as sick or deviant; in need of help or punishment. Likewise, those who are homeless are portrayed as being vulnerable but at the same time they are subjected to practices which entail their removal from prime spaces, either directly through the criminal justice system or indirectly through architectural features such as 'anti-homeless spikes'. Substance use, more than homelessness, has strong moralistic assumptions connected to it in that people who drink heavily or use drugs are viewed as the perpetrators of social problems. This is because losing self-control through intoxication may undermine a person's conformity to prescribed social norms and values. When that person also happens to be young, the fears around these issues are enhanced because of concerns that substance use and/or homelessness problems will become entrenched.

Within these narratives, there is evidence that substance use and homelessness are both punctuated by social and spatial dimensions. This socio-spatial environment is what Zinberg (1984) referred to as the 'setting' for drug use and this thesis purports that homelessness (and its varying forms) can be conceived of as a form of setting. As well as discussions about revanchism, the physicality of homelessness may be played out in temporary accommodation. Hostels and similar types of dwelling have historically been problematized on spatial grounds because sharing a living space can give rise to multiple health and wellbeing issues. When juxtaposing a hostel with the materiality, ontological

security, control and identity aspects of 'home', these problems are exposed more fully. However, hostels can also serve as a crucial source of support for homeless people as they can be sites of much-needed care. The Housing First model potentially offers a viable means of overcoming the challenges of hostel living while also retaining the benefits of support provision, but the UK system currently prioritises a 'treatment first' approach which legitimises the continual need for temporary accommodation.

Temporary accommodation staff and other workers involved in providing care for homeless people represent only one source of valuable support. The role of friends and relatives when exploring the topics of substance use and/or homelessness can be crucial for providing social support or for further entrenching marginality. A small body of work has highlighted the emotions associated with these issues and the ability of social networks to buffer the negative feelings connected to substance use and/or homelessness. Negative emotions can also be counteracted through the practice of 'place-making' – engaging the senses to carve out a subjectively pleasant place within an unpleasant, unfamiliar or tightly controlled environment. The social and spatial are, however, closely intertwined, since the meanings that transform physical spaces into places arise and change through social interaction.

Overall, the evidence indicates that the socio-spatial contexts within which people are embedded are of crucial importance for understanding the lived experiences of homeless substance users. Yet, it has been argued in this chapter that the majority of theoretical and policy research concerning the topics of substance use and homelessness are skewed towards a top-down, objectivist perspective, focusing on the social problems that can arise from being intoxicated or having no secure dwelling to call 'home'. Studies which highlight the emotionality connected to these issues offer some insights into the subjective experiences of substance use and/or being homeless and such research indicates that, for example, the political desire to control substance use is not always mirrored by a similar subjective desire. Additional literature which focuses on the topic of identity can also address these issues from a subjective perspective and this is the focus of Chapter 3. Chapter 3 also asserts that the subjective self and objective society exist in a dialectical relationship meaning that it is necessary to examine both in order to gain a more nuanced understanding of people's everyday lives. This position is carried forward

in the remainder of the thesis and used to inform the empirical analyses in Chapters 5, 6 and 7.

Chapter 3: Marginalised Self-Identities: The Internalisation of Social Interactions

Introduction

The previous chapter highlighted that the majority of substance use and homelessness research takes an objective perspective in a way that not only problematises these issues, but that frames them as requiring interventions to prevent the problems or ‘fix’ the individuals experiencing them. While much of this research has merit, constructing people in this way through top-down narratives of them being ‘vulnerable’ and/or ‘deviant’ neglects to account for people’s subjectivities. In other words, it fails to explore how those at the centre of such interventions and narratives *experience* substance use, homelessness and their related public perceptions and social control measures.

One exception is the body of literature concerning the concept of self-identity, which does often attempt to forefront people’s subjective experiences. Self-identity also represents another common thread that connects the topics of youth, substance use and homelessness. Distinctions can be made between ‘ascribed’ identities, which are imposed upon people, and ‘enacted’ identities which refer to the ‘physical embodying or representing a sense of who one is in relation to others’ (Parsell, 2011: 443). Thus, identities are not only imposed on people; they are practised and actively managed (Parsell, 2011). Writing from a feminist perspective, Shields (2008) further asserted that people are not passive recipients of identity categories, but actively situate themselves in relation to culturally-specific identities. Closely related to these ideas is the concept of ‘intersectionality’ which explains that people are multidimensional and fit into more than one category, and each category influences the ways in which people are perceived, as well as their actions (Skeggs, 1997; Shields, 2008). The subject of identity is, however, not without its criticisms. May (2013: 7) argued that the concept of identity is problematic because writers run the risk of entering a ‘circular logic’: ‘if the starting point of a study is the category ‘lone mother’, then ‘lone motherhood’ becomes the lens through which a woman’s life is interpreted.’ Thus, May (2013) argued that it is important not to reduce people to discrete categories but, rather, to socially locate them in relation to their personal biographies and experiences of being ascribed with particular identity

characteristics. In other words, identity theorists attempt to place a person's subjective self at the centre, while acknowledging that top-down objective categorising (such as labelling someone as 'vulnerable' or 'deviant' as explored in Chapter 2) can become internalised into that person's sense of self.

With this in mind, this chapter reviews the literature that situates the categories of 'youth', 'substance use' and 'homelessness' within discussions of self-identity. The term 'self-identity' (as opposed to 'identity') has been used to reflect the influence of psychological understandings of the 'self' in conjunction with sociological notions of 'identity'. As Shields (2008: 301) noted: 'identity in psychological terms relates to awareness of self, self-image, self-reflection and self-esteem'. The construct of the self is firstly addressed in this chapter by considering the symbolic interactionist positions of George Herbert Mead (1934) and his student, Herbert Blumer (1969). Mead is often credited as constructing an effective social psychological lens for understanding the self (May, 2013), and his work argued that the self and its resulting behaviours can be explained through interactions with other people. This discussion is followed by considering the work of Erving Goffman (1959) who examined how people's self-identities are manifest in how they present themselves to others in day-to-day interactions.

The chapter then switches focus to take a deeper look at the concept of 'youth' and what it means to be a young person. In Chapter 2, youth was discussed tangentially in relation to its association with drug and alcohol use, the distinctive nature of youth homelessness and policies which construct young people as vulnerable and/or deviant. However, in this chapter, 'youth' is unpacked in more detail because, unlike substance use and homelessness research, youth researchers have been more attentive to the concept of self-identity. In discussing youth, two bodies of literature are reviewed – transitions and (sub)cultures – which conceptualise young people as being constrained by structural forces, whilst also being active agents whose lives are characterised by fragmentation and individualisation. The development of self-identity is seen as a defining aspect of youth transition (Arnett, 2015) which is interwoven with cultural understandings of youth (Hollingworth, 2015). The chapter then returns to the subjects of homelessness and substance use but this time in relation to self-identities. Research has demonstrated how people sometimes take advantage of being categorised as 'substance user' or 'homeless', but more typically they engage in processes of 'othering' (Rødner, 2005) to distance

themselves from potentially stigmatising (or what Goffman, 1963 referred to as ‘spoiled’) ascribed self-identities. This literature is further connected to Howard Becker’s (1934) theory of labelling which focused on the concept of ‘deviance’.

The chapter continues with an examination of May’s (2011; 2013) concept of belonging. Her notion of sensory belonging has already been described in Chapter 2 but her wider theory, which also addresses cultural and relational belonging, is helpful for shedding light on the debates presented in this chapter. Although other researchers have explored what it means to belong (e.g. Savage, Bagnall and Longhurst, 2005; Biehal, 2014; Bennett, 2015) May’s work ties together the argument that the self connects to society in a dialectical relationship as it views people’s actions as being motivated by a need to belong. This argument forms the main theoretical underpinning of this thesis and the analysis presented in Chapters 5, 6 and 7. The relationship between self and society, mediated by social interactions and a need to belong, allows an escape from the top-down, objectivist positions typically taken in substance use and homelessness research that were outlined in Chapter 2. Rather than viewing people through the lens of ascribed pejorative identities, which results in recommendations for ‘preventing’ and ‘fixing’, taking a dialectical perspective enables an analysis which places the person (in a holistic sense) at the centre. Thus, an interactional approach to exploring the intersections of youth, substance use and homelessness can overcome some of the shortcomings of existing literature.

The chapter concludes by summarising the main arguments raised and then demonstrating the gaps in knowledge to convey the rationale for the current study. In doing so, it reiterates the thesis objectives outlined in Chapter 1. These objectives act as a bridge between the literature reviews presented thus far and the main study which is the topic of the following chapter.

Theorising the Self

To begin unpacking the argument that self-identities are the products of the internalisation of social interactions, this section briefly sets aside the topics of youth, substance use and homelessness in order to outline the theoretical contributions of Mead

(1934), Blumer (1969) and Goffman (1959). The purpose of this section is to lay the groundwork for the remainder of the chapter which concerns the self-identities of those who are young, substance users and/or homeless. Moreover, as mentioned, the ideas of these theorists, along with others, were influential when analysing the data presented in Chapters 5, 6 and 7.

Internalising the Social

In contrast to essentialist and psychological accounts of meanings which respectively locate the meaning of an object within itself or within a person's psyche, Mead (1934) and Blumer (1969) asserted that the meanings of objects are derived from collective action. 'Objects' can fall into one of three classifications, according to Blumer: physical objects (e.g. a chair); social objects (e.g. a person or group); and abstract objects (e.g. philosophical doctrines or ideas of justice). Within the category of 'social objects' lies a person's sense of self. Mead (1934) argued that the development of 'self' occurs as a result of being able to view the self as an object involved in interactions with others. In the same way that a person is able to conceive of other people as 'objects' involved in social interactions, so too does he understand his role as an object in these processes – a skill referred to as *self*-consciousness.

In building his theory of the self, Mead differentiated between the 'I' and 'me'. As a young child, the 'I' develops when the child realises that he is a separate object from his mother. The 'I' can be understood as a type of 'inner self' (May, 2013: 45) which grows as the child comes to learn how he is viewed through the eyes of the significant people in his life (e.g. his parents). This is later followed by the development of the 'me' which involves a process of internalising the views of the 'generalised other': an abstract social group that holds shared attitudes or meanings – a 'universe of discourse' (Mead, 1934). In other words, a person first learns how he is viewed by particular people and, later, how his understandings and behaviours fit with wider social norms. These external responses to the individual become incorporated into the way he conceives of himself as a social object. Thus, social interactions create a person's sense of self.

Mead (1934) regarded the 'I' as unpredictable because it does not fully exist in a person's consciousness until an interaction brings it forth 'in the moment'. To illustrate how the self exists in a mutually reinforcing relationship with the social world, Mead used the example of a baseball game. Not only do the players need to put themselves in the position of specific individuals in order to anticipate their actions; they also need to learn the behaviours associated with the various positions in the game. With practice, these understandings become internalised and only then can each person place her own behaviours within the context of the entire game as an organised system. Thus, when a 'generalised other' is formed in relation to particular social processes, it can exert influence over the behaviours of those involved in the activity through the 'me'. At the same time, when the player needs to act in the game, her 'I' may come through and play a role in determining her response in that precise moment.

Upon setting out his theory of the self, Mead (1934) expanded it to explain the occurrence of society and its various characteristics. The complex web of interactions that every person experiences in day-to-day life means that society is the product of co-operative activity as well as conflict and competition. These processes do not take place passively but rather reflexively because people have the capacity to turn a critical gaze towards their selves and the perceived selves of others (Mead, 1934). This means that people's selves are constantly changing as a result of further interactions with new people-situation combinations. In clarifying Mead's position, Blumer (1969) pointed out that since people coalesce to form shared meanings, it could be argued that when someone embarks on a routinized behaviour involving the usual group of people, she has a firm understanding of how to act and how the others will act. However, Blumer also claimed that such predictability can never be guaranteed since interruptions and new situations frequently arise and those involved need to adjust their behaviours accordingly. Rather than regarding the world as largely static and foreseeable, symbolic interactionists view it as dynamic and continually in motion. Blumer further stated that even in situations where behaviours are repetitive and pre-established, joint action always starts again. Even though those involved carry with them their memories, meanings and historical experiences of similar situations, joint action takes place in the present moment and can never be fully foretold. Therefore, social norms, rules, and values should not be unquestioningly accepted as predictive of behaviour.

Bringing together Mead (1934) and Blumer's (1969) theoretical contributions, the self and society are argued to exist in a mutually reinforcing or dialectical relationship. The self (comprised of the 'I' and 'me') is the product of society as a person comes to learn his role as a social object in interaction with others. In turn, society is the result of the infinite combinations of selves in interaction and in particular situations that occur at any one time. Neither self nor society can exist without the other. The reflexivity of the self is key to understanding social change as people have the capacity to reflect and alter their actions which can have a ripple effect for others. Blumer (1969) summarised this position in terms of three premises: (1) people act towards physical, social (including selves and other people) and abstract objects based on the meanings they have for them, (2) these meanings are derived from social interactions, and (3) such meanings are prone to change through subsequent interactions.

As will be seen, Mead (1934) and Blumer's (1969) ideas influenced May's (2013) conceptualisation of belonging. More broadly, they led to the creation of a sociological branch of thought, which has its own journal (*Symbolic Interaction*) dedicated to extending their ideas and applying them to different areas of social life. For example, symbolic interactionism has been combined with studies in human geography to explore how interactions lead to the development of place attachment (Cross, 2015) and how people emotionally experience migration (Wasielewski, 2015). With regard to the three components at the centre of this thesis – youth, substance use and homelessness – symbolic interactionism has been used to inform youth subcultures (Torkelson, 2015) and how homeless substance users distance their self-identities from their 'troubled' pasts (Meanwell, 2013): both areas are explored later in this chapter. Crucially, the works of Mead and Blumer place the subjective self at the centre of social scientific research. In doing so, a fuller picture can emerge of the processes of social life which can overcome the shortcomings of top-down, objectivist positions that ascribe, for example, 'vulnerable' or 'deviant' identity categories to people without considering how those people experience and perceive their social worlds (Elliott, 2014).

The Self as a Performance

If one takes the position that the self is the result of social interactions which influence people's behaviours (such as substance use behaviours), such behaviours can be revealing about a person's sense of self and the 'generalised other' attitudes. Goffman's (1959) dramaturgical work is useful in this respect as he placed his focus on the manifestations of the self in everyday life. In doing so, he detailed the ways in which humans guide their interactions with others through a range of different motives and he explained that some actions, which begin as performances, become internalised and reproduced in the self. Furthermore, the role of the 'audience' enables, prevents or challenges the actor from conducting herself in particular ways, and therefore the audience are integral to the self. Such dramaturgical work, therefore, adds a further dimension to the process of placing people's subjective selves at the centre of research and fills some of the gaps that are apparent when using a top-down approach.

Goffman (1959) began with the simple observation that when two people meet, they attempt to gain information about each other which helps them to define the social situation. This, in turn, guides their subsequent behaviours within that interaction. In every interaction, each person has an agenda or a motive which exists either consciously or unconsciously (Goffman, 1959). Examples of such motives include deliberately portraying a specific self-impression which may or may not be misleading; expressing particular views that the individual knows are held by the audience; antagonising the audience; or playing a practical joke. Regardless of the motive, Goffman believed that it is always in a person's best interest to assume control of any interaction and this is done by learning as much information about the audience and social situation as possible.

Smith (2005) noted that Goffman's work is widely criticised for portraying people as calculating, manipulative and egoistic. Yet, Smith (2005: 399) contended that such criticisms are unfounded given that Goffman was 'unmistakably aware' of how the structural position of the audience limits the presentations an actor chooses to enact. As Goffman (1959) explained, knowing that the actor(s) in question can have a multitude of motives and the capacity to deceive, audience members may seek out aspects of their behaviours which are ungovernable in order to assess the validity of what is being conveyed. For example, a skilled observer may witness the actor displaying certain facial

expressions that are inconsistent with those aspects of the performance which she controls. The observer can choose to call out this inconsistency or 'play along' and allow the performance to continue. Goffman (1959) placed great significance on this aspect of pretence because if interactions were always interrupted by the audience, social life could not advance. Therefore, all members of an interaction are complicit in the performance as they often temporarily accept it in order to fulfil the social interaction.

These processes occur regardless of whether the actor and audience are meeting for the first time or whether they are well acquainted. In all instances, each person involved in the interaction carries with them knowledge and memories of previous encounters, either with the same people or with people and situations thought to be similar, and consequently they have preconceived notions about what to expect (Goffman, 1959). If there is a disruption to the performance, an actor can engage in 'defensive' or 'protective' practices as a means of 'saving face' (Goffman, 1959; 1967). 'Defensive practices' refer to actions an actor takes to conceal or manage disruptions to his performance, whereas 'protective practices' refer to actions taken by co-actors or the audience to conceal or manage a disruption to someone else's performance (Goffman, 1959). 'Saving face' therefore refers to preserving the actor's personal front and/or the performance when these are disrupted in order to prevent the actor from experiencing emotional pain (Goffman, 1967).

Crucially, the impressions someone conveys of himself can become internalised as the actor starts to believe in their truth. Conversely, what an actor initially believes to be his true self can, over time, come to be perceived by him as fake. It is more likely that an actor moves back and forth between belief and disbelief with regard to the impressions he is portraying (Goffman, 1959). This idea of having a 'true' or 'sincere' self is what Goffman (1959: 32) referred to as 'front': '...the expressive equipment of a standard kind intentionally or unwittingly employed by the actor during his performance'.

Goffman (1959) made a distinction between 'front stage' and 'backstage' behaviours. Front stage refers to the places where performances are given. Such places may involve particular settings and in these settings the actor adopts a specific style of appearance and decorum in accordance with the expectations of the audience and situation. During a front stage performance, an actor may suppress or conceal aspects of himself that would

undermine the performance such as bodily functions, sexual activity, swearing and being playful. He may also attempt to conceal a potentially 'spoiled identity' (Goffman, 1963): a concept which is explored later in the chapter. Therefore 'backstage' refers to those places where the performance can be dropped and suppressed facts can surface. In these places, Goffman (1959: 115) asserted that the actor could relax and 'step out of character', whilst also preparing for future performances. He provided numerous examples for illustration including a businessman retreating to his private office and a school teacher entering the staffroom. Therefore, for Goffman (1959), front stage and backstage are usually distinctive places, separated by physical structures including walls and doors, although what primarily denotes a front- and backstage is how these places are used. As Andersen (2014: 485) noted 'the same physical space may serve as a front stage at one moment and backstage in the next'. Of crucial importance is the actor's ability to have control over who enters backstage places because if there are no clear boundaries, the performance could be undermined if an audience member witnesses the actor being 'out of character' (Goffman, 1959). Goffman (1959: 124) further hinted that the ability to exert this control partially depends on an actor's social status and material wealth:

The line dividing front and back regions is illustrated everywhere in our society. As suggested, the bathroom and bedroom, in all but lower-class homes, are places from which the downstairs audience can be excluded.

Although Goffman did not elaborate on the inequality present in the ability to control who enters backstage areas, literature concerning the lack of control over space by homeless people (Smith, 1996) and children (Matthews and Limb, 1999), discussed in Chapter 2, lends weight to this idea.

With regards to the self, Goffman (1959) argued that the performances that take place in daily life become ascribed to the actors as constituting their selves or character. He agreed with Mead (1934) in rejecting the idea that a person's self is located within her as a psychological trait. Often when a person acts in a particular way, her performance is understood as being a reflection of her 'true' and 'natural' self. However, Goffman (1959) rooted the concept of self within the whole social scene which is interpreted by everyone involved. Everyone relies on other people to 'complete the picture' of self and

in this way Goffman (1967) argued that the self is something that other people temporarily lend to an individual.

Linking back to the main focus of this thesis, the collective works of Mead, Blumer and Goffman demonstrate the value of placing a person's sense of self at the centre of research. Doing so enables an analysis which is dialectical in that a person (along with her sense of self and subsequent actions), in interaction with others, influences the 'generalised other' attitude in a bottom-up manner. In turn, this top-down 'generalised other' or 'society' can influence how that person understands herself and behaves. Social policies which frame substance users as 'deviant', for example, and which insist that such individuals seek treatment for their supposed problems, form one aspect of the 'generalised other' which may or may not become internalised into a person's sense of self. It is argued that only by placing that person at the centre of research, and exploring her subjective views and experiences of being labelled and treated as a 'deviant', is it possible to understand the effects that this societal view has in terms of her self-identity and interconnected actions. This thesis attempts to do just this as will be seen in subsequent chapters.

Youth and Self-Identity

This chapter now considers the concept of 'youth' as the thesis focuses specifically on *young* homeless substance users. As discussed in Chapter 2, the causes of youth homelessness are distinct from those of homeless adults (Johnsen and Quilgars, 2009) and young people are constructed as 'vulnerable' in comparison to adults, evidenced through youth-specific legislation such as the *Children and Young Person's (Scotland) Act 2014*. As will be seen, youth substance use is bound up in discussions of transitions and (sub)cultures. Young people's self-identities are interwoven within the self-society dialectical relationships outlined thus far and, as mentioned, youth researchers have been more attentive to processes of self-identity in comparison to those investigating substance use and homelessness. Therefore, it is necessary to understand how society constructs 'youth' as well as how young people experience this ascribed category.

Youth as a Transitional Period

There has been substantial debate as to what the stage known as ‘youth’ consists of and how it should be defined (Plug, Zeijl and Bois-Reymond, 2003). A distinction is made between ‘youth’ and ‘adolescence’ with the latter being regarded as deterministic and biologically or psychologically situated, and with the former being socially constructed (Kehily, 2007). Furthermore, ‘youth’ often refers to a slightly older age group compared to ‘adolescence’ in that the former are considered to have greater freedom from parental and legal restrictions (Hill et al., 2015). Most commonly, the parameters of youth involve specifying an age range but there is no established consensus over its lower and upper limits, and consequently there is some degree of inconsistency. For example, the Emerging Adulthood (EA) theory (Arnett, 2000; 2015) applies to people aged 18-25 years old, whereas others have included 16-17 year olds (e.g. Frith, 1984) and 25-29 year olds (e.g. Molgat, 2007) in the ‘youth’ category. Defining ‘youth’ on the basis of age has further been regarded as problematic since it fails to account for heterogeneity (Frith, 1984). Therefore, as well as quantifying youth by referring to a specific age group, researchers have explored the identity and transitions of people as they move from childhood to adulthood.

Traditionally, youth transitions referred to the successful achievement of adult milestones in the life-course. Molgat (2007) cited the work of French sociologist Olivier Galland (1984, 1991) who proposed three different types of transition:

1. Professional transitions: moving from education to employment
2. Relationship transitions: moving from having a ‘single’ status to forming a relationship and starting a family, and
3. Residential transitions: moving from the parental home to own home

In contemporary society there are three key differences in the nature of youth transitions compared to past generations. First, transitions from childhood to adulthood are becoming progressively prolonged (Andres and Adamuti-Trache, 2008). Secondly, whereas transitions were traditionally linear, a greater number of individuals are now experiencing non-linearity, de-standardisation and fragmentation in their lives (Furlong

et al., 2003). Thirdly, transitions are no longer regarded as irreversible (Molgat, 2007). These continuing changes to the nature of youth transitions can be attributed to various structural factors. For example, increasing numbers of people are opting to enter Higher Education when they leave school and a substantial proportion are returning to education after periods of employment (Andres and Adamuti-Trache, 2008). Labour market and employment status have a significant impact on self-reported measures of adult status as unemployed young people feel they have not yet reached adulthood because they are not financially independent from their parents (Molgat, 2007). Indeed, although it is conceptually useful to separate professional transitions from other types, in practice, different strands of transition are interlinked. For example, being unemployed may mean that a young person cannot afford to move out of the parental home and greater numbers of women entering Higher Education may result in delayed parenthood (Molgat, 2007; Andres and Adamuti-Trache, 2008).

A fourth type of transition regarding the leisure pursuits of young people was proposed by MacDonald and Marsh (2005) who found that, over time, the young people in their study migrated from spending their free time socialising with their friends on the streets to participating in the commercialised night time economy of pubs and nightclubs. This transition was mediated by age and income, and consequently those who could not financially afford to frequent pubs and clubs continued to socialise on the streets resulting in their extended transitions in this domain. The authors identified a sub-group of these latter individuals which they termed 'disengaged young men'. Over time, these men became more entrenched in street culture as they developed tight-knit networks of like-minded friends. The authors described how a proportion of these men were introduced to drug-taking and involvement in petty crime and, for some, these behaviours became chronic and progressively more severe. MacDonald and Marsh (2005) commented that long-term participation in this type of street culture was both a cause and consequence of social and economic exclusion from mainstream society.

A person's transition from childhood to adulthood is therefore intersected by his socio-economic position and cultural norms. This is a criticism against theories that portray youth as a period of freedom, growth and excitement (Hill et al., 2015). For example, Arnett's (2000; 2015) EA theory conceived of youth as consisting of five dimensions: identity exploration; instability; self-focused; feeling in-between; and possibilities. Even

those dimensions which first appear to be negatively experienced – such as instability and self-focused – were portrayed by Arnett (2015) as offering a type of ‘personal adventure’ in which a young person does not need to worry about anyone other than himself. This privileging of agency downplays evidence of structural constraints including indications that, young people with complex, non-linear transitions are more likely to come from disadvantaged backgrounds, have fewer educational qualifications, live in socially deprived areas and come from a lower social class category (Furlong et al., 2003).

While Arnett may have been criticised for downplaying structure, his theory has shifted attention to subjective experiences of youth, and researchers have begun to explore the interplay between structural positions and self-identity aspects of transitions. For example, when defining self-perceived adulthood, young people of a lower socio-economic status (SES) associate more traditional markers (such as having a job or children) with adulthood, whereas those with a higher SES are more likely to emphasise individual development such as autonomy and responsibility (Plug, Zeijl and Bois-Reymond, 2003). This suggests that Arnett’s (2000; 2015) criteria for ‘youth’ only pertain to a particular socio-economic section of society, with SES intersecting with young people’s self-identities.

Youth (Sub) Cultures

In addition to youth self-identities being framed within transitions literature, the subject has also been examined through embedding youth identity within the historical, largely working-class subcultures that have defined generations such as the teddy boys, mods, rockers and ravers (Widdicombe and Wooffitt, 1995). Although each of these groups acted to symbolise different social values and rituals from one another, they were bound together through their desire for self-expression, political stances and their perceived delinquency (Widdicombe and Wooffitt, 1995). Members of these subcultural groups used symbols to assert their identity including clothes, hairstyles and accessories, and they were each associated with specific genres of music and the use of different types of drugs (Yates, 2002). Since the late 1990s, the concept of subcultures has been challenged by postmodernists on the grounds of increasing globalisation, consumerism and

commercialisation (Kehily, 2007). Redhead (1997) argued for the replacement of 'subculture' with 'clubculture' on the basis that the commercialisation and globalisation of dance music in the early 1990s resulted in a music genre and culture that appealed to young people across the social spectrum. Similarly, Parker, Aldridge and Measham's (1998) normalisation thesis argued that drug use has become a common feature of youth regardless of sub-group and social status. Even those who abstain from drug use are still 'drugwise' in that they have a great deal of knowledge about drugs as a result of their frequent encounters with the substances and their users.

Such arguments imply that the development of identity by young people is no longer embedded in subcultural participation and consequently identities are subject to the pursuit of consumption and hedonism (Muggleton, 2000). The 'risk society' thesis proposed by Beck (1992) posited that global structural changes have resulted in a shift in the nature of risk, with the greatest contemporary risks now being produced by technology rather than wealth distribution. As a consequence of these changes, the traditional structures of social class, gender, family and employment have been uprooted and people have become increasingly individualised. According to this position, individualisation refers to the way in which the de-traditionalism of structures causes people to become more responsible for their choices and actions, including the development of their self-identities:

People with the same income level, or to put it the old-fashioned way, within the same 'class' can or even must choose between different lifestyles, subcultures, social ties and identities. From knowing one's 'class' position one can no longer determine one's personal outlook, relations, family position, social and political ideas or identity. (Beck, 1992: 131)

The concept of individualisation is supported by postmodern subcultural theories which assert that the embedding of identity within the collective conscience of subcultures has been replaced by individual pursuits of pleasure and escapism (Blackman, 2004). Postmodern theories argue that the concept of subculture is too rigid as it does not account for the observation that, in contemporary society, people tend to be a part of multiple groups (Maffesoli, 1996).

More recently, researchers have critiqued Beck's (1992) position and the suggestion that people's lives have become fragmented to the point where they must actively choose an identity. Specifically, critics have emphasised the ways in which structures such as social class, gender and race are still significant concepts for understanding society (Mythen, 2005; Hollingworth, 2015). Similarly, Beck's view of the past as being static and the present as being fluid has now been rejected (May, 2013). It has also been argued that Beck's thesis not only means that social class is still relevant for people's life chances but that it will actually become more significant. This is because the increasing distribution of social 'bads' will result in increasing income inequality, meaning those from wealthy backgrounds will have the means to buffer the risks while those without will suffer the most (Curran, 2013).

Studies of youth culture which emphasise the individualisation of identities fail to account for the continuing influences of structures in contemporary society. As May (2013) contended, structures of the past have not vanished but simply exist in different forms. Social class, as Curran (2013) argued, remains crucially important in a time of increasing wealth inequality. Consequently, researchers have attempted to 'rescue' subcultural theories in recent years by re-integrating contemporary structures into notions of youth culture. For example, Hollingworth (2015) argued that two subcultural groups – 'the Football crowd' and 'the Smokers' – embodied classed, gendered and racial 'capitals' that had differing values attached to them. Hodkinson (2012) has argued that subcultures remain, but the social lives of young people share similarities that cut across groups, which are characterised by hierarchies, ideologies, identities, networks and motivations. Whereas early subcultural theories were premised on class-based inequalities and these positions were later challenged by postmodernist accounts of individualisation, since the late 2000s there has been a return to an emphasis on the ways in which youth experiences are underpinned by structural constraints (Shildrick and MacDonald, 2006).

As can be seen, there are many overlaps between youth transitions and subcultural literature. Objectively, youth identities are framed in relation to young people's positions in education, employment, housing, marital status and leisure pursuits (including substance use), while subjectively there is an emphasis on self-definitions of adulthood,

autonomy and individualism. In both sets of literature (transitions and subcultures) there are proponents who advocate for the need to consider objective structures and subjective experiences together. As will be seen in Chapter 7, the young participants in this study were aware of societal expectations concerning transitional norms and they were equally aware of their own positions in relation to these norms. They were embedded within a set of cultural norms which did not always align with the ‘generalised other’ attitudes; they were all homeless, most were not engaged in education and employment, some were parents of children they did not have access to and most were regular drug users. Exploring how these young people experienced this discord, therefore, enables an analysis which situates individual experiences and identities within wider social contexts.

Substance Use, Homelessness and ‘Deviant’ Identities

One theme underpinning discussions of youth subcultures is the association of young people with ‘deviant’ acts including substance use. As Cohen (2002) noted, young people have historically been denoted as ‘folk devils’ leading to ‘moral panics’ about their behaviours and the consequences for wider society. Substance users and homeless people are likewise often attributed with ‘deviant’ self-identities and behaviours (Radcliffe and Stevens, 2008; Parsell, 2011). This intersectionality between three potentially ascribed ‘deviant’ identities (youth, substance use and homelessness) is likely to have implications for how these individuals feel about themselves and wider society.

In his theory of labelling, Becker (1963) highlighted that different social groups hold different views regarding ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ behaviours; encouraging the former and punishing the latter. Those who break the rules and conduct themselves in ‘wrong’ ways are classified as ‘deviant’ or as an ‘outsider’ and they are portrayed as someone who cannot be trusted. Drug users are particularly susceptible to this labelling:

The drug addict, popularly considered to be a weak-willed individual who cannot forego the indecent pleasures afforded him by opiates, is treated repressively... Since he cannot get drugs legally, he must get them illegally... The behavior [*sic*] is a consequence of the public reaction to the deviance rather than a consequence of the inherent qualities of the deviant act. (Becker, 1963: 35)

Placing the blame for drug ‘addiction’ on the ‘weak-willed’, ‘immoral’ character of the individual enables rule-makers to justify their attempts at prohibiting substance use and controlling the individual, as discussed in Chapter 2. However, Becker (1963) further emphasised the agency of those labelled as ‘deviant’ who, rather than conforming to prescribed social rules, find ways of working around them. This connects to his additional argument that deviance is relative and a group of ‘deviants’ (such as drug users) are likely to disagree with the rules placed on them and their actions. Consequently, they may view others as ‘outsiders’ who simply follow different sets of rules which leads to a ‘them and us’ mentality. Importantly, Becker refuted the idea of people having ‘deviant tendencies’ that suggest a psychological trait. Instead he demonstrated that people typically begin with a vague curiosity about a so-called deviant act but it takes repetitive practice of this act before it becomes internalised to form a part of a person’s self-identity.

Whereas Becker (1963) provided an explanation as to how the ‘deviant’ label emerges and how those labelled as ‘deviant’ respond, Goffman (1963) described how people cope with stigmatising or ‘spoiled identities’ during everyday interactions. He distinguished between people whose differences are physical and visibly displayed (those who are discredited) and those whose differences are social and not immediately apparent (those who are discreditable). Discredited people behave in ways to manage their differences whereas those with discreditable identities are concerned with revealing or concealing their differences. While being different can be contextually positive or negative; stigmatised attributes are those which are viewed as socially negative (Goffman, 1963). One recent study that explored the ‘spoiled identities’ of homeless people found that many covered up their homelessness by maintaining a high level of personal hygiene (through regular showering and shaving) as a means of avoiding being discredited (Rayburn and Guittar, 2013). Lack of personal hygiene as indicative of a ‘spoiled identity’ was also cited by drug users in a study by McIntosh and McKeganey (2001). These two studies indicate that people who are homeless and/or substance users are often aware of how their outward appearances may be perceived and negatively judged by others. As Neale, Nettleton and Pickering (2011) noted, although the term ‘spoiled identity’ was not explicitly defined by Goffman, it is likely that he did not intend for it to denote a person’s entire character:

Instead, aspects of their social identity – that is aspects of the multiplicity of selves they present to the world – can be damaged or discredited at particular moments and in particular situations. (Neale, Nettleton and Pickering, 2011: 5)

People act in ways to minimise or conceal potentially stigmatising attributes with the hope that their selves will not be damaged. However, merging this with Becker's (1963) theory, whether or not an attribute is regarded as stigmatising depends on the views of the people the individual is in interaction with.

The act of distancing oneself from a stigmatising label has been demonstrated in various studies concerning homelessness. Perry (2013) undertook an ethnographic study of a 'hybrid space' – a 24-hour doughnut shop which was open at night as a homeless shelter. The author provided detailed examples of the ways in which the homeless visitors enacted non-homeless identities in the shop during the evenings. Some stated that they had a home but were temporarily 'displaced'; sofa surfers did not classify themselves as homeless; and some bought cups of coffee and doughnuts enabling them to take on a 'patron' identity. Significantly, many separated themselves from a homeless identity through the denigration of other homeless people. This was done through expressing disgust at other people's poor personal hygiene and behaviours, such as eating food that had been tossed in bins. In addition, Parsell (2011) analysed enacted homeless identities among a group of rough sleepers in which he demonstrated the importance of the setting in influencing people's performances. When rough sleepers accessed a charitable outreach service that provided free food, their body language and expressions of gratitude portrayed them as passive and needy. By contrast, when they had some money and made use of a local café, their actions were more assertive as they held the status of 'customer'. The author concluded that the ways in which people act in relation to their identities are fluid, context-specific and that some of his participants appeared to adhere to normative beliefs and stereotypes of street homeless people, while others expressed identities that created distance from their homelessness.

Studies have likewise found that drug users distance themselves from labels such as 'junkie' and drug 'abuser'. In a paper which examined how heroin users distanced themselves from the 'junkie' label, Radcliffe and Stevens (2008) explained the reasons

for this highly stigmatised term as being a result of stereotypical connections between heroin use, criminality and the perception that such people are morally degenerate. Their sample utilised several strategies for rejecting this label including constructing ‘junkies’ as being dirty, smelly and thieving. Significantly, many in the sample felt that attending a drug treatment service symbolised an admission that they were no different from ‘junkies’ and consequently some did not attend for this reason. Those who did attend continued to distance themselves by claiming that they were not ‘heavy users’ or that their use was not serious as they did not use crack cocaine. Finally, the authors reported that female drug users were more likely to express fear and shock at realising they may be subjected to a stigmatising label. This is supported elsewhere in the literature as female drug users often face greater levels of stigma and shaming because drug use is widely regarded as a masculine activity (Malloch, 1999). Not only is being a substance user highly stigmatising, some have argued that these discreditable identities result in people being excluded from participatory and decision-making processes because the strength of these spoiled identities can construct substance users as ‘less than fully human’ (Fricker, 2007: 44).

If someone is ascribed a stigmatising identity, it is possible that this will become internalised and will affect her conduct and how she thinks of herself (McIntosh and McKeganey, 2001). Summarising the effects of stigma on ‘substance use disorders’, Livingston et al., (2012) explained that self, social, and structural forms of stigma have been shown to have adverse effects on mental and physical health, non-completion of substance use treatment, delayed recovery and reintegration, and increased involvement in risky behaviours. Similarly, stigma adversely affects homeless youth by adding to feelings of loneliness, low self-esteem, feeling trapped, and suicidal ideation. This is particularly the case if the young person feels as though she is to blame for her homelessness (Kidd, 2007). Given the stigma associated with homelessness and substance use separately, those who experience both may face an additional level of disadvantage, lending weight to the notion of multiple exclusion homelessness (Fitzpatrick, Johnsen and White, 2011):

Stigmatizing attitudes regarding certain behaviors [*sic*] (e.g. substance use during pregnancy) and groups (e.g. injection drug users) are widely accepted, culturally endorsed and enshrined in policy (e.g. criminal law). (Livingstone et al., 2012: 40)

Therefore, someone with a ‘spoiled identity’ is likely to face stigma at multiple levels including legal, political and institutional structures as well as day-to-day interactions with others. This, in turn, may penetrate her sense of self and actions which has numerous implications for her general wellbeing. In the present study, although it was unusual for the young people to explicitly acknowledge the ‘deviance’ attributed to their positions as young, homeless substance users, the tactics they used to subvert the hostel’s rules regarding substance use (Chapter 5), the tensions that substance use sometimes caused in their personal relationships (Chapter 6) and processes of self-deprecation and ‘othering’ (Chapter 7) suggested that they were aware of their ‘deviant’ social positions.

Self, Belonging and Social Change

Drawing together the notions of self-identity as discussed in this chapter, this penultimate section considers the work of Vanessa May (2011; 2013) who offered the concept of belonging as an alternative lens through which to understand the connections between self and society. Although May (2013) did not write specifically on the topics of youth, substance use or homelessness, her ideas, like those of Mead (1934), Blumer (1969) and Goffman (1959; 1963), lend value for understanding the dialectical self-society relationship as well as incorporating the dimension of emotion. One aspect of her theory – sensory belonging – was addressed in Chapter 2 as it complements ideas relating to home and place.

May’s (2013) analysis of belonging was influenced by her previous work concerning lone motherhood (May, 2008; 2010) and stemmed from her criticisms of dominant sociological understandings that posit the disappearance of social structures which have left people in positions of helplessness or liberation. These are problematic, according to May (2013) because they tend to view the past as fixed and static while the present is seen as fluid and fragmented and they separate ‘social structures’ from the ‘personal’ while emphasising the former over the latter. May cited the works of Simmel (1950) and Elias (1991) to support her own position that traditions have, in fact, not disappeared but have changed their nature and role and that social structures and individuals cannot be understood separately. She argued that equal weight should be given to the study of the

fluidity and interactional relationships between self and society, in addition to examining large social formations. She took this further by following Simmel's argument that what we think of as 'society' is derived from the crystallisation of some (inter)actions that occur between individuals and therefore these (inter)actions provide an important starting point for understanding the social world: 'there thus exists a constant and complex loop between individual (inter)action and social change, both affecting each other' (May, 2011; 367). In addition to focusing on the interactions between people May (2011; 2013) advanced this position by also arguing there is a need to examine the relationships that people hold with the material environment and shared cultural norms. Therefore, she distinguished between relational, sensory and cultural belonging.

Drawing on the sociologies of everyday life (Gardiner, 2000 and Lefebvre, 1947 cited in May, 2013) and personal life (Smart, 2007), it is possible to take the perspective that sociologists should focus on the everyday, ordinary events that take place in people's lives as well as the embeddedness and creativity that characterise the relationships people have with social structures and the imaginary (May, 2013). On the basis of these theoretical arguments, May (2011: 368) introduced the concept of belonging which she defined as 'a sense of ease with oneself and one's surroundings'. She claimed that belonging has four aspects that make it useful for examining the inter-relatedness of the self and social change. These are summarised as:

1. A focus on belonging enables a person-centred approach, meaning the relationships between self and social change can be investigated from the point of view of the person
2. Belonging is useful for examining how people engage with social structures in their everyday lives
3. Belonging can be used to understand relational, cultural and sensory connections
4. Experiences of belonging can change and are dynamic; thus it is a helpful tool for understanding social change

May took a phenomenological approach in that she was interested in understanding how people make sense of their world but there was a recognised connection with symbolic interactionist and Bourdieusian lines of enquiry:

(O)ur sense of self is constructed in a relational process in our interactions with other people as well as in relation to more abstract notions of collectively held social norms, values and customs (May, 2011: 368).

Thus, the focus on how people interact with one another and their wider material and social environments has clear overlaps with the works of Mead (1934), Blumer (1969) and Goffman (1959) as well as the literature on home and place presented in Chapter 2. Furthermore, belonging can be partially achieved through having knowledge of what to do, how, and when to do it in a given situation which relates to Bourdieu's theory of habitus and having a mastery of 'the game' (May, 2013). However, May (2011: 369) clearly stated that belonging is not the same as habitus because belonging is a 'relational concept that necessarily focuses on social interaction and inter-subjectivity, and the emotional content of these'. This emphasis on emotionality is a key component of May's (2013) theory.

While belonging is primarily considered to be a feeling of ease and familiarity with a particular person or context, there are also underlying power struggles that influence the achievement of this feeling. To have a sense of belonging requires a reciprocal process in which others make judgements as to whether someone embodies their shared self-beliefs and values. May (2011; 369) referred to 'hierarchies of belonging' in that there can be a power struggle for people to be fully accepted as belonging to particular cultures, spaces or groups. To not belong or to be 'misrecognised' (Laitinen, 2012) can result in a person feeling as though he has some sort of undesirable personality trait and therefore not belonging can affect his sense of self (May, 2015). However, it can also mean that misrecognition changes the ways he feels about others. In other words, belonging and not belonging influence not only the self but also how someone views those who have facilitated or prevented these feelings.

As mentioned, May (2011; 2013) distinguished between three forms of belonging: sensory, cultural and relational. Sensory belonging, as previously discussed, refers to feeling an affinity with the material environment through the use of the senses. Cultural belonging can occur on multiple levels ranging from nationality, ethnicity and social class to more local-level cultures that involve groups of people who engage in shared traditions or practices (May, 2013; 2015). Most people belong to multiple cultures. Having a

feeling of cultural belonging requires someone to be able to recognise similarities and differences between himself and others and thus to have a sense of where he fits in. Relational belonging relates to a person's social network and his feelings of belonging to people in these networks such as family, friends, strangers and communities (May, 2013). These relationships can overtake other forms of belonging as their significance can lead to upsetting consequences when someone feels as though he does not belong (May, 2015).

As will be seen in the empirical chapters, May's concept of belonging proved to be a useful tool for theorising some of the reasons behind the young people's actions and narratives. A focus on belonging as a mediator between self and society overcomes some of the criticisms laid out thus far in two significant ways. First, it allows for substance use and homelessness to be explored in a more nuanced manner by taking a holistic approach and accounting for people's experiences, emotions and attitudes. This is in contrast to the literature discussed in Chapter 2 which portrays substance use and homelessness as problematic issues that need to be controlled or fixed. Secondly, the concept of belonging is interconnected with societal attitudes, norms and structures meaning that it also avoids the risk of over-emphasising agency which theorists such as Beck (1992) and Arnett (2000; 2015) have been known to do.

Conclusion

Whereas Chapter 2 outlined the socio-spatial dimensions that intersect with substance use and homelessness, this chapter has argued that these external dimensions have the potential to become internalised into a person's self-identity. This, in turn, has consequences for her subsequent behaviours, with implications for the perpetual changes that occur in socio-spatial worlds. Even when a person outwardly rejects an ascribed self-identity, recognition that the 'generalised other' may impose this label upon her often has consequences for her actions. This argument was made by drawing on symbolic interactionist and phenomenological lines of enquiry and particularly the works of Mead (1934), Blumer (1969), Goffman (1959; 1963), Becker (1963) and May (2013). Each of these theorists added unique elements to this argument but they all agreed on the premise that people's selves and societies exist in a dialectical relationship. May's (2013) concept

of belonging additionally focuses on the emotions underlying people's need to feel connected to other people, cultures and sensory worlds.

This chapter also unpacked the concept of 'youth'. Whereas transitions literature has focused on identity as it relates to structural milestones such as employment and leaving the parental home, the structure-agency debates concerning subcultures have centred on the role of peer groups and leisure. Importantly, youth self-identities have been conceived of by postmodernists as individualised, fluid and liberating whereas others have stressed the importance of social structures that constrain and intersect. Specifically, those from lower social class backgrounds are often attributed with less agentic capacity than those from wealthier backgrounds. Regardless of the position taken, subcultural literature shares the commonality of associating youth identity with substance use.

In addition to youth, the concept of self-identity was also considered in relation to those who are substance users and/or homeless. Becker's (1963) labelling theory and Goffman's (1963) concept of 'spoiled identity' were used to highlight the stigma associated with many groups as a result of their perceived deviant actions and selves. However, it was also noted that the stigmatised person or group is likely to view the labellers as 'others' or 'outsiders' who share a different set of social norms and values. In other words, ascribing people with normative labels can create a 'them and us' division. Knowing the consequences of being ascribed a stigmatising label leads people to distance themselves from these identities by engaging in processes of 'othering'. Nonetheless, stigma has significant implications for a person's wellbeing if she internalises her ascribed spoiled identity or if she is subjected to oppressive interactions in her daily life.

Overall, the literature and inter-connected theories reviewed in this chapter, and the previous one, present a rationale for an in-depth exploration of the experiences of young substance users living in temporary accommodation. The ways in which society or the 'generalised other' (encompassing shared norms, meanings and values) view each of these three components – youth, substance use, homelessness – separately and in combination, are multi-faceted and often contradictory. The argument that the 'generalised other' attitude has the potential to become internalised into people's selves

opens up the question of how this is manifest among those who face marginalisation and stigma on multiple levels. Moreover, since self and behaviours are dialectically interwoven, taking substance use as the behaviour of interest enables an exploration of its role in the messiness of people's lives.

As outlined in Chapter 1, the three objectives of this thesis are to (1) understand how life in temporary accommodation is perceived and experienced by young homeless people, (2) explore what substance use means to the young people living in these situations and (3) explore how the socio-spatial contexts of young people's lives are interwoven with their substance use. These objectives have been constructed with the aim of unpacking how the socio-spatial features of a group of young people's lives influence their self-identities and subsequent behaviours, and vice versa, with substance use being the key behaviour under examination.

Chapter 4: The Ethnographic Process

Introduction

As Chapters 2 and 3 have highlighted, the subjects of youth, homelessness and substance use are complexly interwoven and different lenses have been used to examine these areas. Few studies have given prominence to all three components and their interconnections and it is rare for such studies to take a broad view of substance use and to contextualise this within the setting of temporary accommodation. Furthermore, combining ideas of self-identity, place-making and belonging when considering this population is a relatively novel approach for framing how these young people perceive and act within their social worlds. Attention is now given to the methodological process involved in data collection and analysis for the main study.

The emphasis on meanings and contexts, indicated in the research objectives, falls within an interpretivist philosophy which argues that research concerning human social life requires a methodology that accounts for people's social interactions, activities and interpretations. As Prus (1996: 9) stated:

(T)he interpretivists are centrally concerned with the meanings people attach to their situations and the ways in which they go about constructing their activities in conjunction with others.

This philosophy opposes that of positivists who argue that human social life can be studied objectively and that social research should resemble that of the natural sciences (Prus, 1996). Qualitative research methods typically fall within an interpretivist framework as they are able to facilitate the collection of data which are more in-depth and exploratory than quantitative methods (Marsh and Keating, 2006). With this in mind, and considering the research objectives and anticipated nature of the participant group, ethnography was selected as the principles and methods of this approach allow for the capturing of people's narratives, as well as their practices, in an inductive manner (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007).

This chapter details the ethnographic research that took place in a temporary homeless hostel in Scotland, named Kelldale¹⁰, with a particular group of participants. The fieldwork was carried out over a seven-month period between May and November 2013. An overview of Kelldale as a case study site is firstly presented followed by a detailed account of the methodological background of ethnography. The Kelldale participants are introduced and the fieldwork process is documented. In the penultimate section, ethical considerations are outlined as well as how personal risks were managed. The chapter ends with an explanation as to how the data were analysed and how they are presented in the following chapters.

Kelldale: A Case Study

Kelldale – a temporary accommodation hostel – was located on the outskirts of a city centre in the Central Belt of Scotland. The decision to recruit from a homeless service rather than a substance use service was based on the likelihood of a homeless service facilitating access to people with a wider range of substance use experiences. This is in comparison to, for example, a drug and alcohol treatment organisation where service users would likely have been skewed towards the more ‘problematic’ end of substance use. Access to Kelldale resulted from an initial search of the Homeless Link¹¹ website (www.homelessuk.org) which contained a search function for finding homeless services throughout Scotland. This search produced a list of 564 organisations which were filtered on the basis of their suitability and travelling distance. This process produced the following results:

- Accommodation – emergency (sixteen services)
- Accommodation – second stage (nineteen services)
- Accommodation – specialist (seven services)
- Day Centre (thirteen services)

¹⁰ ‘Kelldale’ is a pseudonym to protect the identity of the service, its residents and staff members

¹¹ Homeless Link is a charity which consults with homeless services in England to increase best practice. Despite the charity’s remit as being England-focused, at the time of the search, it contained details of homeless services throughout the entire UK, including Scotland.

In addition, a local homelessness network was contacted to enquire about possible services that might be helpful. The network provided contact details for an additional two organisations bringing the total number of services that could potentially have granted access to fifty-seven.

Contacting these services began with emails to provide a brief explanation of the research and to ask for a meeting with the manager; Kelldale was the second organisation to agree to this request. I met with the managers on three occasions to negotiate access and this process took approximately five months as the project manager had to liaise with her seniors on the matter and a Protecting Vulnerable Groups (PVG) check had to be carried out. It seemed likely that this particular service would facilitate access to a number of young people (aged 16-21) who used drugs and/or alcohol and so the decision was taken to stop the search and fully commit to Kelldale with the view to accessing a second service later if it was needed.

As will become more apparent later in this chapter, and in Chapter 5, Kelldale was a self-contained, purpose-built hostel featuring fourteen bedsits meaning that fourteen young people could live there at any one time. The fieldwork predominantly occurred inside this building meaning that Kelldale functioned as a case study of temporary accommodation. According to Yin (2012: 4), drawing on a case study enables closeness and a deep understanding of a 'real-world behaviour and its meaning' set within a particular context. While case study research can be used to explain a certain phenomenon or to evaluate a service, policy or programme (Yin, 2012), Kelldale represented a case study in the sense that its specific socio-spatial dimensions interacted with the everyday experiences of the young people and staff who occupied the building. This is similar to Somerville et al.'s (2011) case study of young people living in a Young Men's Christian Association (YMCA) hostel in Stoke-on-Trent. The authors were interested in examining multiple exclusion homelessness (see Chapter 2 for more detail of this phenomenon) and so the YMCA was not the central focus of investigation. However, in limiting their sample to those living in this hostel, the authors were able to highlight how the hostel's specific features intersected with the young people's experiences of homelessness and their perceptions of support from YMCA staff. In other words, the YMCA featured in their lives as an active mediator of their current situations.

Similarly, therefore, the focus of the current study is to explore the broad topic of young homeless people's substance use but within the specific context of Kelldale.

Using Ethnography in Kelldale

Hammersley and Gomm (2000) have noted that many social scientists view case study research as strongly overlapping with ethnography. Ethnography encompasses a combination of methods with a particular underpinning philosophy that requires the researcher to examine people in their 'natural' settings (see below for more detail). Thus, in a similar manner to Zinberg's (1984) conceptualisation of 'setting', the case study denotes a bounded setting in which fieldwork takes place (Yin, 2012). This section details the ethnographic approach taken in the case study of Kelldale.

Introduction to Participant-Observation and Ethnography

As mentioned, ethnography is a methodological approach, underpinned by certain philosophical ideas, which employs a variety of methods to collect data (Skeggs, 2001; Ronald, 2011). These methods typically include participant-observation, qualitative interviews, focus groups, document analysis and/or visual methods (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). The approach is rooted in 19th century anthropology whereby researchers travelled to unfamiliar and 'exotic' places to study different cultures and live among the native people in order to gain an in-depth understanding of their ways of life (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). This methodology was premised on using 'participant-observation' to collect data as it was argued that this would provide a more comprehensive picture of those being studied, as opposed to relying on the statements of informants alone (Soloway and Walters, 1977). In their seminal work, Gold (1958) and Junker (1960) conceptualised participant-observation as lying on a spectrum which represents the level of interaction the researcher has with her participants. At one end of the spectrum is the 'complete observer' who has no contact at all, while at the other end is the 'complete participant' whose role as a researcher is totally concealed. In between these two poles lie 'participant-as-observer' and 'observer-as-participant'. In these cases, the role of the researcher is disclosed to the participants and both involve a level of interaction between all parties. The stance of 'observer-as-participant' is more suited to

one-off interview visits while 'participant-as-observer' involves building relationships over time and employing a mixture of formal and informal observation and questioning (Gold, 1958).

While participant-observation forms the core method of ethnography, academics have found it difficult to define the fuller ethnographic philosophy. This is partially as a result of the approach being adapted by sociologists and to suit particular theoretical lenses ranging from Marxism to feminism to symbolic interactionism (Skeggs, 2001; Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). Nonetheless, one attempt at defining ethnography was made by anthropologist Jennifer James (1977: 180):

[Ethnography is] the study of culture from within, the attempt through field observation to record how individuals perceive, construct, and interact within their social and economic environment.

As well as pointing to ethnography's interpretivist position by noting the emphasis on perception, construction and interaction, this definition also indicates that the focus is on the individual and his perspective instead of wider social structures. Rather than ignoring such social structures, however, Siegal (1977) highlighted that these are still considered within ethnography, along with forces such as culture and social control, as this approach provides a way of synthesising such forces with the behaviours and meanings that people attach to social situations.

In addition, James' (1977) definition alludes to ethnography's association with naturalism which argues that the social world should be studied in its 'natural' state rather than artificial conditions created by the researcher (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007; Lambert, Glacken and McCarron, 2011). Ethnographers must go to the places where people are and try to see the social world through the eyes of the participants (Lambert, Glacken and McCarron, 2011). This perspective was also taken by Blumer (1969) who connected the symbolic interactionist approach to ethnography by arguing that the purpose of social scientific investigation is to lift the 'multiple veils' that cover an area of group life in order to 'dig deeper' and to gain a fuller understanding of the complexities involved. Just as Mead (1934) asserted that a person has the ability to put himself in the position of others and then take this knowledge back into the self, researchers must

actively do this with the participants and this is most effectively achieved by going to where the participants are.

Over the last century, the use of ethnography as a research approach gained support, particularly in the USA and UK, largely as a result of the influence of the 'Chicago School' which expanded its sociological research to include studying urban life (Apter et al., 2009). While anthropologists and sociologists continued to study cultures and people in places which were foreign to them, the Chicago School inspired a parallel trend to emerge. This involved ethnographic studies that were conducted 'closer to home' with regards to geographical proximity and familiarity in the sense that both parties may speak the same language and have some shared cultural connections. One of the earliest seminal studies of this kind was Whyte's (1943) *Street Corner Society* which took place in a slum area occupied by Italian immigrants near to Whyte's workplace. Despite their geographical proximity, shared English language and a mutual love of baseball, Whyte documented the ways in which he was an outsider to the lives of his participant group. As he became more accustomed to the culture and more accepted by those he met, he was able to provide detailed accounts about the lives of his participants by describing their physical appearances, backgrounds, behaviours, rules, values, conversations and the places in which these were located. Providing such 'thick' description in order to create a sense of 'you are there' is the goal of many ethnographies (James, 1977) as such data are seen as capable of capturing life as it is happening (Katz, 2002).

The Research Participants

One key feature of ethnography that distinguishes it from other research designs is that it consists of an in-depth study of a relatively small number of people. As Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) explained, the researcher must make a 'trade-off' between breadth and depth of the investigation. Unlike quantitative studies that aim for large numbers and breadth at the cost of less detailed data, ethnographic studies aim for depth at the cost of obtaining data from a smaller sample.

The precise number of participants to be included in an ethnographic study is dependent upon several factors: the number of people who enter the fieldwork site; their eligibility;

their ability and willingness to provide informed consent; the researcher's ability to build rapport and trust; and issues of safety¹². In the current study, most of the residents living in Kelldale were approached and asked to participate (the subject of consent is discussed later in this chapter). Of the thirty-three residents who lived in Kelldale during the seven months of fieldwork, twenty-two agreed to participate. These were six females and sixteen males all aged 16-21 years old (Table 1). All names were changed to protect their identities. Despite Kelldale being promoted as a 'short-stay' hostel with a maximum tenancy of twelve weeks, Table 1 indicates that many of the participating residents had lived there for substantially longer¹³. This was a consequence of the shortage of social housing in the city which meant that many young people were 'stuck' in temporary accommodation for longer periods of time.

Table 2 provides a broad overview of the residents' substance use. For two young people (Grant and Stacy) it was not possible to ascertain if they were involved in substance use and, if so, what the nature of this was. Despite providing consent, there were few opportunities to interact with these two residents and, consequently, data concerning them are minimal. This was a similar situation for Blair, although one conversation with him revealed that he used 'legal highs'. Table 2 indicates that, where known, eighteen residents smoked tobacco, seventeen drank alcohol, sixteen smoked/inhaled cannabis and twelve used 'other drugs'. These 'other drugs' included ecstasy, amphetamine, cocaine, mephedrone, 'legal highs' and Valium and Tramadol, although not everyone in this group had tried all of these drugs. In general, everyone who smoked tobacco did so daily. The frequencies of other forms of substance use were more difficult to assess as these were dependent on the individual, the situation and whether or not the resident(s) had the means to purchase these substances. Other than tobacco, cannabis was the most frequently used substance, with the majority of young people smoking/inhaling cannabis on a much more regular basis than drinking alcohol and using other drugs. Table 2 indicates that eleven young people engaged in all types of substance use. In comparison to the others, these young people were the heaviest substance users as their consumption was more frequent, in addition to involving a wider range of chemicals. Notably, these eleven residents smoked/inhaled cannabis on a near-daily basis.

¹² See Hall (2003) for an example of these processes in action

¹³ Indeed Table 1 only denotes the length of time the residents participated in the study. Several had already been living there for many months prior to my arrival.

Table 1: young people's characteristics

<i>Pseudonym</i>	<i>Age¹⁴</i>	<i>Gender</i>	<i>Time engaged in research</i>	<i>Original resident?¹⁵</i>
Amanda	17	F	Entire duration (28 weeks)	Yes
Danielle	21	F	Entire duration (28 weeks)	Yes
Andy	18	M	27 weeks	Yes
Tom	20	M	27 weeks	Yes
Chloe	21	F	25 weeks	No
Craig	19	M	25 weeks	Yes
Jordan	17	M	24 weeks	No
Ryan	20	M	24 weeks	Yes
Dinesh	21	M	21 weeks	No
Matt	17	M	20 weeks	No
Cara	17	F	15 weeks	Yes
Grant	21	M	14 weeks	No
Nathan	17	M	14 weeks	Yes
Liam	17	M	13 weeks	No
Blair	16	M	10 weeks	No
Callum	16	M	9 weeks	No
Garry	21	M	8 weeks	Yes
Stephanie	17	F	8 weeks	Yes
Jack	20	M	6 weeks	No
Vince	21	M	4 weeks	Yes
Rob	19	M	3 weeks	Yes
Stacy	16	F	3 weeks	Yes

¹⁴ Age at the beginning of fieldwork. Several residents had birthdays during the fieldwork period.

¹⁵ Was the resident living in Kelldale when the fieldwork period began?

Table 2: overview of young people's substance use

<i>Resident</i>	<i>Tobacco</i>	<i>Alcohol</i>	<i>Cannabis</i>	<i>Other Drugs</i>
Amanda	✓	✓	✓	
Danielle	✓	✓	✓	✓
Andy	✓	✓	✓	
Tom	✓	✓	✓	✓
Chloe	✓	✓	✓	✓
Craig	✓	✓	✓	✓
Jordan	✓	✓	✓	✓
Ryan	✓	✓	✓	✓
Dinesh				
Matt	✓	✓	✓	✓
Cara	✓	✓		
Grant	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Nathan	✓	✓	✓	
Liam	✓	✓	✓	✓
Blair	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	✓
Callum	✓	✓	✓	✓
Garry	✓	✓	✓	✓
Stephanie	✓	✓	✓	✓
Jack	✓	✓	✓	
Vince	✓	✓	✓	
Rob	✓			
Stacy	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown

Identifying which staff members to include in the study was not as straightforward as recruiting the young people. In total, I met thirty-nine members of staff throughout the fieldwork. It was not possible to obtain a signed consent form from all of these people as some introductions were brief and there were no follow-up opportunities to fully discuss the consent process. While all staff members were aware of the study and no-one refused to participate, only those who provided written or clear verbal consent and who featured in the observed interactions with the young people were included. This process

resulted in twenty-seven members of staff participating in the study alongside the twenty-two young people. The names of the staff have also been changed in the subsequent chapters to protect their identities.

Reliability, Validity and Generalisability

One consequence of choosing depth over breadth, and of doing a qualitative study more generally, is that it is vulnerable to criticisms concerning reliability, validity and generalisability. Briefly, reliability relates to the ability to replicate research findings while validity is concerned with accuracy (LeCompte and Goetz, 1982). Generalisability, on the other hand, refers to the applicability of findings from the sample in a study to a wider population (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). Such canons have traditionally been used in positivist research to measure the credibility of the findings produced (LeCompte and Goetz, 1982) and it has been argued that they are not compatible with qualitative research because of ontological differences (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). However, a growing effort has emerged to adapt and apply these standards to qualitative research and some argue that failure to do this can damage the credibility of a qualitative study.

In an article explaining how to apply standards of reliability and validity to ethnography, LeCompte and Goetz (1982) pointed to transparency and reflexivity as being key to ensuring that an ethnographic project is credible. Such transparency can be achieved through explaining the role of the researcher and her status within the participant group; indicating who provided the data and why certain individuals were involved while others were not; through describing the circumstances in which the data were collected; and being explicit about how the data were collected and analysed. My role as the researcher is reflected upon in the following section and the remaining criteria are interspersed throughout the findings chapters. Data extracts are always presented along with details about who was involved and when and where they occurred. Moreover, different fonts are used to denote my own words from those of the young people and staff.

Beyond the need for transparency and reflexivity, and contrary to positivist claims, Mason (2002) has argued that it is possible to make generalisations from qualitative

research because the nuance of such research allows an analysis of how a phenomenon has developed, how it works or is constituted, how it compares to other social phenomena, and even arguments about causation and prediction which are more often associated with quantitative methods. Rather than making empirical generalisations which, as mentioned above, involve generalising from a small sample to a wider population, Mason (2002) asserted that qualitative research is more adept at making theoretical generalisations. She offered several ways in which this can occur and explained that the strength of a generalisation lies within the rigour of a study's sampling strategy, methodology and analysis. In order to identify areas of generalisation, Mason (2002: 198, original emphasis) encouraged the researcher to pose the question: 'what kind of generalizations do my *research questions* imply?' In the current study, the research objectives imply that generalisations might be made about the experiences and substance use of young people living in temporary accommodation other than Kelldale. As will be seen in the empirical chapters, and particularly in Chapter 8, it was possible to offer generalising statements in the form of '*lessons for other settings*' (Mason, 2002: 196, original emphasis). Specifically, Chapter 8 discusses how this study's empirical findings has implications for both the temporary accommodation model and its counterpart, the Housing First model (see Chapter 2 for more detail). These implications primarily arose through an in-depth ethnographic methodology and a robust analysis which focused on the processes of everyday life in Kelldale and 'negative instances'¹⁶ which highlight diversity of experience as well as similarity.

The Fieldwork Process

This section outlines the data collection process and maps out the decisions that were made during my time in Kelldale. Predominantly, this relates to the young people as they were the central focus of the study. However, a separate section on staff has been included as their voices have been represented to a lesser extent in the subsequent analysis chapters. Before detailing the fieldwork process, this section discusses the importance of being reflexive in ethnographic work.

¹⁶ 'Negative instances' are examples and cases which run counter to the developing explanation (Mason, 2002)

The Position of the Researcher

By implementing a range of methods, ethnographers seek to understand cultures from within, while simultaneously maintaining a level of distance. Such a goal has been termed the insider/outsider challenge (Allen, 2004; Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). The insider perspective refers to that of those being studied while the outsider perspective is that of the observer (Harris, 1990). In relation to exploring the meanings that people attach to their behaviours, the insider perspective refers to what people think about their behaviours and why they act in certain ways. The outsider perspective involves the assumptions made by the researcher as to specific meanings and behaviours, along with how these relate to wider literature and theory (Harris, 1990). The challenge for the ethnographer lies in not making assumptions about why people may be acting in particular ways as this would produce a purely outsider and distorted account (Harris, 1990).

One way of handling this insider/outsider tension is through the process of reflexivity (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). Reflexivity is based on the recognition that although ethnographers are initially outsiders, their presence and actions do not exist in a vacuum but rather they influence the researcher-participant interactions and, ultimately, the data analysis (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). Power differentials and emotions as well as the ethnographer's gender, age, ethnicity and compoment can all affect the research process (Lumsden, 2009; Mauthner and Doucet, 2003; Punch, 2012). Consequently, ethnographers engage in critical self-reflection in an attempt to identify areas in which they influenced the participants and what this reveals about their social worlds and the research. In this thesis, reflexivity is exercised in the remainder of this chapter, and is interspersed throughout the subsequent analysis chapters and the final discussion chapter. Specifically, reflexive notes are made regarding the 'success' of the various methods employed to collect data, how I engaged with the young people and the difficulties I had in setting myself apart from the role of staff member.

Introductions and Frequency of Visits

Upon 'entering the field' I had to decide on the best way to introduce myself and the study to the young people. During the pre-fieldwork meetings, the managers suggested

that I turn my arrival at Kelldale into an 'event'. This involved organising a meeting in the hostel with the young people. According to the managers, they were familiar with this type of gathering as the staff regularly arranged residents' meetings and social activities in the communal area known as 'the lounge'. I was advised to supply pizza and snacks to maximise the turnout. Following their advice, I designed a poster to be displayed in the hostel to advertise the date and time of the meeting. This was relatively successful as eight of the fourteen residents living in Kelldale at the time attended the meeting. I introduced myself, explained that I was a 'student' and that I needed their help with my research. Information sheets (Appendix 1) were provided and I informed the young people that I was interested in what it was like living in Kelldale and their drug and alcohol use. I also explained that not only would I be asking them about these things, but I was also looking for their permission to 'hang around' with them in the hostel. I talked them through the consent criteria involving anonymity, confidentiality, the right to refuse or withdraw, and who would see the data (ethical procedures are discussed later in the chapter). The meeting was largely interactive to enable the young people to ask questions. They struggled to understand what a 'PhD' or 'dissertation' was and when I said that it was like writing a book, this resonated with them and, for the entire duration of the fieldwork, my research was referred to as 'Jenny's book'.

A notable turning point occurred during the meeting when the residents stopped asking about the research and started asking about me. They explicitly stated that since I wanted to know about their lives, it was only fair that they should be able to ask questions about me. They asked for details about where I lived, what school I went to, what football team I supported and, crucially, if I drank alcohol and had ever taken drugs. Rather than refusing to answer these questions, I was forthcoming and honest which appeared to surprise some of the young people. I later learned that the residents regularly asked the staff about their personal lives to which the staff provided vague responses or explicitly refused to self-disclose. Thus, my self-disclosure proved to be an effective tool for separating myself from a staff role. In general, the residents responded favourably to my self-disclosure which was evident when they began sharing some of their stories as a means of looking for commonalities between us. For example, it turned out that Garry and I had grown up in the same town, which enabled us to discuss specific details about the area.

Despite its importance in my fieldwork experience, the issue of researcher self-disclosure is seldom discussed in existing literature. Derlega and Chaikin (1977) conceptualised self-disclosure as a means of simultaneously fostering relationships and drawing personal boundaries concerning privacy. They highlighted that boundaries serve to protect individuals in two key ways. First, it is important to remember that third parties may become privy to the information a person shares with a group. In my case, I was mindful that the residents might pass on my self-disclosed information to the staff and therefore I filtered these personal details accordingly. Secondly, self-disclosure is connected to self-presentation and power relationships.

How one regulates self boundary control mechanisms ultimately contributes to an individual's definition of self, including feelings of self-identity, autonomy, and self-esteem. (Derlega and Chaikin 1977: 104-105)

Similar to Goffman's (1959) work on self-presentation, Derlega and Chaikin (1977) argued that self-disclosure is a fundamental mechanism in the process of assessing a person in a particular situation. When the content of self-disclosure is personal, this increases the prospect of the audience liking and trusting the actor and, subsequently, reciprocating such disclosure. However, self-disclosure can also leave an actor vulnerable as he may become susceptible to control by others and may lose his influence in determining outcomes. As Derlega and Chaikin noted, when one person knows more about another person this leads to unequal power relations. Therefore, self-disclosure potentially 'weakened' my power in relation to the Kelldale residents and the ability to protect myself from exploitation. However, I argue that this served a greater benefit as such weakening of my position helped to reduce the researcher-participant power imbalance which led to the residents reciprocating with their own acts of self-disclosure,

After this initial meeting, I visited the hostel several times a week. During the first four months, I visited intensively as a means of establishing my presence. This involved three to five visits per week ranging from four to eight hours per visit. In total, I spent 292 hours¹⁷ in Kelldale over the course of seven months. I learned from my own observations and from the staff and residents that the optimum times to visit were on weekday

¹⁷ This total included four hours that I spent visiting Amanda in her new flat after she left Kelldale

afternoons/evenings and during the day at weekends. These were the times when the residents were likely to be in the hostel and to be awake. Typically on weekdays, the residents either slept until early afternoon or they were out at various appointments with social workers, youth organisations or the Job Centre. At weekends, they were provided with a cooked breakfast, meaning that most residents could be found in the lounge from 10am onwards. They usually socialised inside the hostel during the day at weekends before heading out in the evenings to meet friends. To maximise my chances of interacting with the young people, I typically visited the hostel between 4pm and midnight on weekdays and 10am and 6pm at weekends, although I occasionally altered these timings to ensure I was capturing data from other parts of the day.

Participant-observation

The majority of data were gathered from participant-observation in which written field-notes, complemented by my research diary, were the main methods of recording observations and interactions. These comprised of the participants' movements through the building, conversations between them, physical appearances, specific activities (e.g. watching TV, singing, dancing, play-fighting, art projects, cooking, domestic chores and smoking) and their reactions to any kind of event or news (e.g. when the police visited the hostel). Therefore, not only did this method capture what the young people said about their lives in Kelldale and their substance use, it enabled me to witness their lives in practice. In some instances I was not involved, and observed from a distance, but in others I directly participated in activities, conversations and 'hanging out'. All of these instances were recorded as fully as possible in my field-notes. The research diary was used to reflect on my feelings and observations, to make tentative links to theory and literature, and to note any gaps in my knowledge that could be addressed by further questioning.

I adopted a 'participant-as-observer' role (Gold, 1958; Junker, 1960) in that I tried to take my cues from the young people (and staff) and let them lead the interactions. However, sometimes I took the opportunity to ask specific questions relating to incidents I had witnessed, points of clarity and to enquire about their substance use. Moreover, since the young people (and staff) knew that my main goal was to learn about substance use, often

they would deliberately volunteer information which they thought might be interesting for my 'book'. Therefore, my presence as a researcher influenced some of the conversations that occurred in that they might not have taken place had I not been around.

While it was possible to highlight my influence on the conversations that occurred, it was more difficult to speculate about how my presence influenced the actions of the young people. In relation to substance use, for ethical reasons and because it was not necessary in meeting the research objectives, I had decided not to directly witness any drug taking or drinking. Sometimes, a young person would inform me that they were going into a bedsit to smoke cannabis and sometimes I was invited to join them. In these latter instances, I was able to make jokes about the young people trying to get me 'high' and this served to strengthen our rapport as some claimed that it was their mission to get me to smoke cannabis with them before the fieldwork ended. Although I did not let this happen, these friendly conversations offered a means of chatting more about their drug use. On one occasion though, I was socialising in a bedsit for a relatively long time before I sensed that some of the young people were becoming anxious. It turned out that they wanted to smoke cannabis but were unsure whether to do it in front of me in case I told the staff about it¹⁸. Once this became clear, I explained that I would leave and, if questioned by the staff, I would say that I had left the bedsit as I was going home soon (which was true). This instance served as a reminder that my presence sometimes influenced the actions of the young people. It was also one example of my compromised position as there were a handful of occasions, like this one, where the staff may have expected me to inform on the young people, despite me telling the staff that I would not do this. In each case, I was always able to maintain the young people's confidentiality and this strengthened our relationships as the young people were able to see that I was trustworthy.

In addition to not 'grassing up'¹⁹ the young people to the staff when they were breaking the rules, I employed several other strategies for engaging with them and building positive relationships. When I arrived at Kelldale each day, with the staff's permission I was able to sit with them in the main office. I opted to do this because the office also

¹⁸ As will be discussed in Chapter 5, using drugs in the building was strictly forbidden and there were consequences if the staff caught the young people doing this.

¹⁹ To 'grass' means to inform on someone

acted as a reception area. When a young person returned to Kelldale after being outside, they had to walk past reception. Furthermore, if a young person inside the building wished to speak to a staff member, they would do so by approaching this area. By positioning myself at reception, the young people were able to see that I was there and often they would stand in this space and talk to me. I could have sat in the lounge but this was at the back of the building and was out of immediate sight. Moreover, the young people could only access the lounge at certain times of the day. Thus, I had very little choice but to sit in the staff office if I wished to be visible to the young people.

This had implications for how I was perceived. It was important not to be viewed as a member of staff but this was difficult given the decision to sit in the staff office. I therefore had to find ways of distancing myself from this role. As mentioned, self-disclosure and not ‘grassing’ on the young people when they were breaking the rules were two strategies I used for doing this. Another strategy was to refuse to carry out any staff duties even when someone asked me to. For example, sometimes a resident would approach reception and ask me to give them access to the lounge or to hand them their mail. While I knew how to do these things, I mostly refused and reminded them that it was not my job. Furthermore, as soon as a young person went into the lounge I would find an excuse to follow her in. If a young person, or group, appeared to have intentions of standing in the reception area for a long time to chat, I would leave the office and walk around to the other side of reception to stand beside them. In other words, I would take any opportunity to leave the staff office to speak to the young people. As time went on, I received invitations to join them in a bedsit or to walk with them to the local shop, which were indications that these strategies had succeeded in separating me from the staff. Yet, given that these invites were inconsistent and that I had drawn my boundaries relating to partaking in cannabis use, I was likewise not perceived as a full ‘insider’. Therefore, as many ethnographers do (Allen, 2004), I straddled a line between outsider and insider as I was not a staff member but also not a resident. Thus, the data reflect this ‘in-between’ position.

With regards to recording the data, using the staff office as a base meant it was relatively easy to access this area to write something down and then re-join those to whom I had been talking. At times though, the office would be noisy which affected concentration. Sometimes I would go into the lounge to write if it was quiet and occasionally I ended up

writing notes whilst sitting in my car. I had decided not to carry my notebook around the building with me because when I did, the residents became curious and tried to read what was written. While I had no objections showing them what was written about them personally, I was concerned that they would see information written about others which might compromise confidentiality.

Rather than writing notes, I could have opted to record conversations using an audio recorder. As Perry (2013) noted in his ethnographic study, while not using an audio recorder limits the degree to which long quotations and dialogues can be recorded, quickly jotting down notes is much less obtrusive and this is significant when the research participants are 'vulnerable' and distrustful. Later in the fieldwork I learned that some of the young people associated a Dictaphone with a police interview and this made them uncomfortable. Despite this, no one objected to the use of a recorder during interviews and the focus group (these methods are discussed shortly).

On each occasion after leaving Kelldale, the written notes were typed up more fully. This typically occurred the following day since most of my visits to the hostel ended in the evenings, meaning I did not return home until late at night. Initially, I endeavoured to type the notes up as soon as I got home but fatigue meant that I struggled to remember specific details and rushed the process in favour of going to sleep. I soon realised that by waiting until the next day I was more alert, my recollections were clearer and there was more time to process my notes. This resulted in typed notes that were fuller, more detailed and which led to ideas about emerging themes.

Interviews and Focus Groups

The informal conversations that occurred between myself and the participants during the fieldwork could be conceived of as forms of unstructured interviews. As Hammersley and Atkinson (2007) noted, the line between participant-observation and unstructured interviewing can be blurred. Unstructured interviews differ from other types of interviewing in that the researcher gives the interviewee an indication of what he would like to talk about and then provides space for the interviewee to tell his story and guide the interaction (Corbin and Morse, 2003). This happened on many occasions as the

residents knew that I wanted to learn about their substance use and therefore spontaneously began discussing this subject. This also happened in relation to a multitude of other topics that I had not explicitly expressed an interest in. The young people would often make it clear that they were disclosing particular information for the purposes of my 'book'. As Collins (1998) noted, these data were not only interesting for their content but also because they revealed issues that the young people felt were important.

It is difficult to quantify how many of these interactions took place in Kelldale and how long a conversation needed to be before it became classed as an 'interview'. I recorded approximately 200-250 interactions with the young people that lasted anywhere from five minutes to three hours. These encompassed: (1) one-to-one conversations between the resident and myself, (2) group conversations in which several residents directly provided me with information, (3) group conversations in which I was a part and in which I indirectly gained information, and (4) conversations between residents and staff that I was also involved in. In addition, I engaged in 100-120 conversations with staff members when the residents were absent. These discussions often involved a staff member providing his views on events that had occurred and also his opinions about a range of topics including substance use and homelessness. Thus, the vast majority of data used in this study were derived from these types of informal, unstructured conversations.

In the latter half of the fieldwork, I informed the young people that I would like to do some formal semi-structured interviews. While the majority said they would be happy to do this, it proved difficult to find a time when a resident was willing to sit with me, on her own, to answer questions. Whenever a young person complained about being bored I took the opportunity to ask if she would like to spend the time doing an interview. These requests were usually met with one of two responses: either the resident directly said she did not want to do it at that time or she quickly found something else to do! With perseverance, I managed to conduct four semi-structured interviews with six residents (Table 3). Four broad topics had been identified as significant – substance use, housing and homelessness, life in Kelldale and relationships – and four different interview schedules were devised for each topic (Appendices 2-5). The young people were given a choice as to which subject they wanted to discuss meaning that not every interviewee addressed every topic (see Table 3). 'Relationships' was not chosen by any of the

interviewees but the other three topics were. In all interviews, however, discussions about one topic often crossed over into the others. The location of each interview was also the decision of the interviewee(s) although we discussed the need for privacy so that nobody could overhear.

Table 3: semi-structured interview details

<i>Interview</i>	<i>Participant(s)</i>	<i>Location</i>	<i>Topic(s) Discussed</i>
1	Jordan	Meeting room in Kelldale	✓ Housing and homelessness ✓ Life in Kelldale
2	Nathan	Lounge and then the IT suite (Nathan's interview was in two parts)	✓ Housing and homelessness ✓ Life in Kelldale ✓ Substance use
3	Amanda and Andy	Amanda's flat	✓ Substance use
4	Matt and Ryan	Lounge	✓ Substance use

Each interview was conducted in a semi-formal manner in that there was a clear question-answer dialogue. The use of an audio recorder further added to the interviews' formality and the young people were interested to examine the Dictaphone. Nathan, Matt and Ryan pretended to record themselves being questioned by the police as they had had first-hand experience of this. Given that I knew the young people well by this point, I found myself trying to be as informal as possible in a bid to speak to the interviewees in ways I was used to doing during participant-observation. Despite following the relevant interview schedule, I was open to them changing the direction of the interviews to other topics, as the purpose was to elicit information and new insights (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007). In all cases, there were interruptions to the interviews, either by other people entering the interview location, or by the young person becoming preoccupied with texting people or using social media on his mobile phone. In all cases, it became apparent when the

interviewees had had enough as their body language revealed that they were restless, tired or bored. No one explicitly asked if we could stop but when I made the suggestion they all agreed without hesitation. This indicated that they had perhaps felt forced to remain talking to me until I gave them permission to leave.

Sensing that the young people were not fully happy with being interviewed on a one-to-one basis and observing the more comfortable atmosphere during the two joint interviews, I decided to abandon semi-structured interviews in favour of conducting a focus group. In a similar format to the introductory meeting, I advertised the focus group and provided the young people with pizza and snacks in the lounge. This attracted six young people (Danielle, Tom, Craig, Chloe, Callum and Matt), only one of whom (Matt) had also participated in an interview. Therefore, between the semi-structured interviews and focus group, I spoke to eleven of the twenty-two young people in this more formalised manner.

At the beginning we discussed what a focus group would involve and I explained that I was interested in the same topics as I had been in the interviews. I had not devised a separate focus group schedule but had brought along the four interview schedules (Appendices 2-5) to act as prompts if needed. Since Matt was the only one present who had also conducted an interview, this material was new to the others. As with the interviews, I asked for permission to audio record the focus group and once again some of the young people were curious to inspect the Dictaphone and make jokes about police interrogations.

Overall, the focus group created a more natural atmosphere compared to the interviews, and the young people's frequent laughter, jokes and animated gestures indicated that they enjoyed the opportunity to debate, share stories and remind each other of past events. As Warr (2005) noted, in comparison to one-to-one interviews, focus groups produce different types of multi-layered data in that social norms and group dynamics may come to the fore and the participants have opportunities to challenge, argue and prompt each other to recall specific events. Furthermore, focus groups can be noisy and a coherent narrative is usually not produced. Warr (2005) contended that this was not a limitation and rather the 'messiness' can form part of the analysis. The Kelldale focus group was certainly noisy and 'messy' as the six young people spoke over each other and jumped

from topic to topic. I loosely adhered to the interview schedules as I only needed to mention the topic of interest before the young people jumped in with their views. Regarding substance use, for example, I explained that I thought I knew a lot about what they did but not why they did it or if they felt that it was a problem. This statement was sufficient to prompt the group to engage in discussions with each other about this topic meaning I was able to remain silent for a while and observe. Wilkinson (1998) has argued that if the researcher plays a minimal role in a focus group, this 'weakens' her power and control over the discussions and promotes the voices of the participants. Following this format of saying little other than to ask for points of clarity or to prompt on other topics, the focus group lasted for nearly two and a half hours. In addition to the four interview topics, the focus group covered a wide range of subjects including social norms and informal sanctions; crime and violence; self-harm; suicide; mental health; employment; health and weight; and parenting. This was a valuable method to employ as the data gathered added 'thicker' detail to the participant-observation notes, as well as generating new insights.

Subsequently, I attempted to arrange two further focus groups but this was unsuccessful. I had wanted to conduct a second focus group with some of the residents who had attended the first one. However, this was towards the end of the fieldwork and by chance, three of these young people moved out within one week, and two others started spending most of their time outside of the hostel. I also tried to conduct a focus group with some of the young people who had moved on from Kelldale and I had planned to organise this through Amanda as I had kept in contact with her. Amanda still spoke to several of the former residents and she had agreed to ask them to come together for a focus group. When I sent Amanda a message to arrange this, she did not reply and after several attempts I was forced to accept that she was no longer interested.

Engaging with the Staff

As mentioned, I met with Kelldale's managers three times prior to fieldwork and the managers had informed many of the staff about my impending arrival. Therefore, by the time I was introduced to the staff, they already had some knowledge of me. Throughout the seven months, I spent a considerable amount of time with the staff. I opted only to

record data provided by them if it involved any interactions they had with the young people; direct information about Kelldale as a service; reflections on their relationships with the young people; and opinions about my research. This information was recorded in written field-notes and my research diary. Although, at face-value, the staff were straightforward to engage with, in that they displayed no hostility towards me and, in contrast, were always very kind and helpful, I later learned that initially some had been suspicious. Specifically, some disclosed that they had wondered if I had been sent by management to ‘spy’ on them or if I was working for an undercover TV documentary! I did not notice any change in their attitudes towards me or their work over the course of the fieldwork, but those staff who had believed I was a spy joked that they had initially been on their ‘best behaviour’ when I was around. This served as a useful reminder that the staff were not immune from behaving differently as a consequence of my presence.

Being in the presence of the staff meant that I always had to be aware of not breaching the young people’s confidentiality. I had been clear with the staff from the outset that I would not disclose any information I learned from the young people unless I was concerned for someone’s safety (confidentiality is discussed in more detail shortly). Thankfully, the staff appeared to accept this and there was only a handful of incidents in which they asked for details of a young person. In these cases I reminded them that I could not disclose the information and this prompted them to apologise and explain that they had forgotten.

Leaving the Field

In the final three months, I cut back on my visits to Kelldale so that I was there two to three times per week. This decision was based on three main reasons. First, I found my visits increasingly tiring and as I had (by that point) established relatively good relationships with the participants, I felt that cutting back on my hours to have some rest would not jeopardise these relationships or the fieldwork. Secondly, I began coding my data which increasingly required longer periods of time as the coding became more in-depth. Thirdly, several of the young people who had become a significant part of the research had moved out of Kelldale. For unknown reasons, those participants who remained began spending larger portions of their time away from the hostel. Particularly

in the final weeks of fieldwork, there were occasions in which I sat in the hostel for several hours and did not encounter a single resident. Similarly, those who moved into Kelldale in the final months of fieldwork rarely spent time inside the hostel meaning I had few opportunities to introduce myself and engage them in the research. Consequently, by the time I had decided to finish this phase of the research, only three of the participating residents – Danielle, Matt and Callum – still lived in Kelldale.

Given the volume of existing ethnographic research, surprisingly little has been written about leaving the field. Those who have published on this issue often regard it as an emotional process which can last beyond saying ‘goodbye’ to one’s participants (Taylor, 1993; Roberts and Sanders, 2005). Since the majority of the Kelldale residents had moved out of the hostel prior to the termination of fieldwork, my decision to finish was straightforward as it felt as though my time in Kelldale had come to a ‘natural’ end. Nonetheless, upon leaving the field, I experienced waves of different emotions for several months afterwards including relief, stress, sadness and fear. As I had ‘successfully’ engaged with the young people and collected substantial amounts of data, I felt relieved that I could proceed confidently with the analysis and that this exhausting phase was over. However, despite the fieldwork being difficult, it had also been very enjoyable and rewarding. Therefore, transitioning from this positive, interactive period into the phase of coding, analysing and writing, felt stressful, daunting and lonely. Thus, it took me some time to re-adjust to my normal work pattern and to fully step back to view the data once again from a full ‘outsider’ position and proceed with the next stages in the PhD.

Keeping Everybody Safe: Ethics and Risk

This study used the ethical principles set out by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC, 2012) as guidance for ensuring minimal harm was caused to the young people, staff and Kelldale as a whole. These principles emphasise the importance of informed consent, confidentiality and vulnerability. Furthermore, the guidelines were also used to ensure that I was protected from any legal, physical or emotional harm throughout the process. Approval for this study was granted by the Ethics Committee in the School of Applied Social Sciences at the University of Stirling.

The Original Residents

Informed consent not only refers to the participants' indications that they are willing to be involved but also that they have a full understanding of what their involvement entails (ESRC, 2012). The difficulties of obtaining informed consent in an ethnographic study have been detailed by Murphy and Dingwall (2001). They argued that not only can signed consent forms jeopardise the participants' anonymity if they are not stored securely but also it is often impractical to obtain a signed consent form from everyone in the field. These practical issues were dealt with in this study by storing signed consent forms in a locked filing cabinet located in an office with restricted access. Where it was not possible to obtain signed consent from those who briefly entered the research field, care was taken to ensure that they were aware of the study and that data may be collected about them. Verbal consent was then sought where possible.

Murphy and Dingwall (2001) further explained that even if consent is obtained, it is not necessarily an indication of the participants' understanding. To maximise understanding, consent was treated as a continuing process rather than something that was negotiated at the outset. Consent forms (Appendix 6) were issued to the young people to read and sign, but this was not done straightaway in order to give them time to absorb the verbal and written information provided. I chose to approach the young people on a one-to-one basis within the first three weeks of the introductory meeting to ask them to sign a consent form. By this point they were more familiar with the project and were able to ask questions in an informed manner as they had had time to reflect. I explained that by signing the form they were being asked to consent both prospectively and retrospectively in order to capture any data that had been collected in those first few weeks. They were reminded that they could withdraw their consent at any time and that their participation was voluntary. It was also explained that, despite giving consent, they might not want certain information about them to be included. Similarly, they may have wanted to have me around on some days but not on other days and it was explained that this was perfectly within their rights. On many occasions throughout the fieldwork, the young people were asked if they were still happy to be involved.

Newer Residents and Those who did Not Consent

Because of the nature of Kelldale, throughout the seven months of fieldwork there was a steady turnover of residents. This meant that every time a new resident arrived at the hostel, the process of introducing myself, explaining the research and asking for consent began again. This was also the case for some of the original residents who did not attend the introductory meeting. For some, I was able to sit down with them on a one-to-one basis to conduct this process. For others, who were less willing to engage from the outset of their arrival, this required a softer approach where I had to find opportunities to provide them with snippets of information over a period of time. In these cases, some residents did provide consent as they grew more interested in the research and became more familiar with my presence. This partially depended on their assessment of how the other residents treated me. By developing positive relationships with the original residents, the newer residents were able to witness our interactions which assisted in their decision to become involved.

While none of the young people I engaged with refused to provide consent, it was not possible to explain the study to everyone as some spent the majority of their time outside of Kelldale and only returned to go to sleep. Therefore, it was relatively straightforward to separate those who provided consent and those who did not. In addition, some residents did not speak English as their first language. For two of these individuals it was felt that, without the use of an interpreter, it would not have been possible to clearly communicate the purpose of the study and what participation would involve. Even if they did provide consent, their ability to be fully informed would have been questioned. It is recognised that excluding residents based on language barriers is a limitation of the study since these residents may have provided an additional dimension to the data. Some have argued that failure to address language barriers in qualitative research threatens the credibility of a study (Squires, 2008). However, without the resources for interpreting, including them could have been unethical because of their limited understanding of the research.

Anonymity, Confidentiality and Disclosure of Illegal Activities

A significant part of the informed consent process relates to issues of confidentiality and anonymity. During the introductory meeting, some of the original residents were hesitant when they realised that participation might mean revealing details of their activities which they did not want the staff to know about or personal information that they held with great privacy. Some of them stated that my role was that of a spy who was there to ‘grass’ them up to the staff. These comments were a useful means for entering into discussion about confidentiality and anonymity.

While the use of pseudonyms may protect participants’ identities from the general public, it is more difficult to ensure anonymity from those who know them. In her study of children in residential care, Emond (2000) discovered that the children had disclosed their pseudonyms to each other. This compromised individual confidentiality and therefore it was explained to the residents of Kelldale that to avoid this scenario, their pseudonyms were not going to be disclosed to them. The young people protested but this did not prevent them from giving consent. Rather, for the duration of the fieldwork, some of them continued to ask the question “what’s my name in the book?” In the final weeks of fieldwork, two of the remaining residents had been persistent in wanting to know their pseudonyms and eventually I relented and told them separately. They immediately told each other and several others. They reasoned that it would be easy for other residents and staff who knew them to identify them anyway and therefore there was no need to conceal their pseudonyms. This was something that had been explained to the young people from the outset as part of the consent process: measures would be taken to ensure their confidentiality as much as possible but it could not be completely guaranteed that someone would not recognise them.

The subject of confidentiality also involved making decisions over which information could be held back from staff members and management and which information would need to be disclosed. Given that the young people were being asked about their drug use, keeping illegal activities confidential required consideration. Ethical guidelines do not offer specific advice about what should and should not be kept confidential as every research project has different requirements. Advice was sought from the Chair of the Ethics Committee about this issue and through this process it was decided that the only

exceptions to total confidentiality would be if a young person disclosed they were intending to commit suicide, if they were being harmed in some way, or if they were planning to harm another person. Therefore the young people were told that if they disclosed use of illegal drugs or participation in any other illegal activity that did not involve a plan to harm someone, this information would not be passed along to a staff member or anyone else. In addition, Kelldale's manager explained that any large-scale drug dealing within the premises could not be kept confidential for legal reasons. This information was passed on to the young people and they subsequently handled this by filtering what details were disclosed to me.

'Vulnerability'

The construction of young, homeless substance users as being vulnerable was discussed in Chapter 2 and although 'vulnerability' is a contentious term, ethics committees typically ask if a project will include 'vulnerable' people. Extra consideration was needed to ensure that participation in this study would not add to the young peoples' perceived vulnerability. Through early conversations with the managers, it was clear that there was a great deal of support available from the staff members. Furthermore, posters that provided details of external support services were displayed in the reception area. It was felt that the residents had relatively easy access to professionals who could help them with a range of problems should they require it. However they were reminded on several occasions that they did not need to disclose any information to me if they did not want to. These reminders occurred particularly when anyone began to divulge sensitive information.

Another aspect of 'vulnerability' is that of the power dynamics between the researcher and those being researched. Homeless people have been found to use strategies to assert their autonomy and power in order to demonstrate their right to privacy and to be treated equally with non-homeless people (Perry, 2013). This raises the issue of why researchers ask vulnerable people to reveal personal information that the researcher would be reluctant to reveal about himself. The expectation that the participants would divulge information about themselves was pertinent to this study and indeed was raised by one of the original residents during the introductory meeting:

We're not all going to tell you all about our lives when we've just met you.
(Ryan)

Once again the residents were reminded that they were not obliged to reveal any information to me at all but if they did, it would be treated sensitively and confidentially. Furthermore, the decision was taken not to look at any of the information written about the young people in their individual care plans, although some residents suggested that I do this. Reading their care plans would have provided detail about their histories and any problems they had, adding further to the data. However, given that care plans were not written *by* the residents but were written *about* them by someone else, I was concerned that this would undermine the aim of prioritising the young people's voices. Similarly, it may have increased the power imbalance between us if I were to read about them and make assumptions based on second-hand accounts rather than giving them control over what they wanted to reveal. Thus, the decision not to read any care plans was one means of not adding to their 'vulnerability'.

The Kelldale Staff

While the primary focus was on the residents, it was necessary to gain informed consent from those with whom the residents came into contact. Upon being introduced to some of the staff, it was clear that while they had heard about my arrival, there was confusion over the nature of the research. One staff member had prepared herself to be interviewed and was surprised to learn that the focus was on the residents rather than on the staff members' experiences with the residents.

Given the high number of staff members working in Kelldale, consent (Appendix 7) had to be sought on an opportunistic basis depending on whether an individual happened to be working while I was visiting. Staff members were given the same assurances as had been given to the residents regarding voluntary participation, the right to withdraw, confidentiality and anonymity. In addition, it was highlighted that any observed instances of malpractice would be treated as causing harm to a resident and therefore could not be kept confidential.

A significant proportion of the time spent at Kelldale involved sitting in the office alongside the staff members. Over time, many of the staff became familiar with my presence and there were often moments when they stated that they had momentarily forgotten why I was there and that I was writing down information that involved them. This highlighted the need to keep reminding the staff, as well as the residents, as to the purpose of my work to ensure that they were still willing to be involved.

Protecting Myself from Harm

Running in parallel to ethical concerns is the safety of the researcher. Lee-Treweek and Linkogle (2000) distinguished four types of threat that qualitative researchers may face when carrying out fieldwork: physical, emotional, ethical and professional dangers. Within the domain of ethical danger is the challenging issue of avoiding legal prosecution if the research involves exploring criminal behaviours. As discussed, the residents were afforded confidentiality which included not disclosing my knowledge of their involvement in criminal activities unless these activities involved a deliberate plan to harm another person. In addition to knowledge about their use of illegal drugs, I was made aware of other criminal offences they had perpetrated. It had been decided prior to fieldwork that in order to minimise the likelihood of being present when a crime was being committed, the majority of fieldwork would take place within the confines of the Kelldale building. This limited the type of data that were collected but it also protected against being accused of involvement in a crime or being asked by the police to breach confidentiality and inform on the residents.

Conducting the fieldwork inside Kelldale also added a degree of protection from being physically attacked. This was because most of the building was monitored by the staff through CCTV cameras and regular building checks. Unless an attack took place inside one of the resident's bedsits, the staff would witness it on the cameras and rush to the scene. Inside a bedsit, I immediately identified where in the room the panic button was located. Care was taken to sit close to the door and the staff members were informed of my whereabouts in the building as much as possible. Of course it was always possible that a staff member could be the perpetrator of an attack but there was no need to be in a

non-CCTV area with a staff member. There were always at least two members of staff in the building at any time and usually at least one resident. The presence of a mix of people offered an extra element of safety.

Ethnographic research is personally demanding as it can produce fatigue along with a huge variety of emotions regardless of how arduous the settings are (Coffey, 1999). Because of the biographies of the young participants, which contained episodes of family breakdown, mental health problems, attempted suicides and self-harm among other difficulties, it was important to implement strategies for coping with the emotions that these disconcerting details might evoke. It has been argued that a range of emotions is an inevitable part of the research process and that they should be embraced rather than suppressed:

Emotional connectedness to the processes and practices of fieldwork, to analysis and writing, is normal and appropriate. It should not be denied, nor stifled. It should be acknowledged, reflected upon and seen as a fundamental feature of well-executed research. (Coffey, 1999: 158-159)

My experience as a ChildLine counsellor had already provided substantial experience for handling difficult emotions. In addition, the research diary was a useful outlet for managing and reflecting the range of emotions that were experienced. As well as providing a tool for analytic reflection, a research diary can facilitate reflexive practice as it is a space to write about personal feelings which can be used to strengthen understanding about what the participants may also be experiencing (Punch, 2012). However this reflexive practice can provide an additional role as a method for coping with difficult feelings since the process of writing them down can be cathartic (Cooper, 1987). The research diary in this study provided a way of dealing with the stresses and strains of conducting ethnographic fieldwork as I wrote about a range of personal feelings from nervousness and exhaustion, to excitement and satisfaction. In addition, I relied on the support from my supervisors, family and friends as they continually asked about my wellbeing and were there to talk to about any negative emotions I was experiencing.

Analysing and Presenting the Data

Analysis

The data collected via field-notes, the research diary and audio recordings of the interviews and focus group were entered into NVivo 10 – a software package that assists in the organising and coding of qualitative data. In total, there were sixty-one field-note entries, four semi-structured interview recordings and one focus group recording along with twenty-seven research diary entries and an assortment of memos. An external transcriber was used to transcribe the interviews as well as research diary entries that had been verbally dictated and this individual had been approved by the School of Applied Social Sciences at the University of Stirling. I decided to transcribe the focus group myself as the audio recording was that of six voices all fighting to be heard over each other making it difficult to be understood by someone who was not present.

The analysis itself took a sequential approach based on the work of Howard Becker. Becker (1970) suggested there are four stages to data analysis; three of which normally take place during the fieldwork and the fourth upon completion of the fieldwork. First, the researcher needs to select and define problems, concepts and indices that seem likely to lead to the greatest understanding of the field under study and which may indicate phenomena that are harder to observe. In this phase, it can be concluded that a particular phenomenon exists and an event occurred, even if it was only once. In doing so, the researcher can begin linking a particular observation to sociological theories and concepts, which subsequently assists in defining problems for further investigation. For example, the Kelldale residents were often critical of people who broke their trust and told an authority figure (such as a member of staff) about any behaviours that person wished to keep hidden, such as using drugs inside the hostel (the young people called such a person a ‘grass’). Observing these narratives about being a ‘grass’ indicated that the residents followed a particular set of social rules. This became one line of enquiry for further investigation.

The second stage in sequential analysis involves checking the frequency and distribution of the observed phenomena. Becker (1970: 31) referred to this as a ‘quasi-statistic’ phase

since this phase assesses how typical a behaviour or event is. He suggested various factors that a researcher may wish to consider such as whether a phenomenon was revealed through direct questioning, voluntary disclosure or collective engagement in a particular behaviour. Several varieties of data may converge to provide evidence of a particular concept. In Kelldale, social sanctions which prevented a young person from being a 'grass' were most often revealed through voluntary disclosure, usually when discussing a specific incident. However, the staff also made reference to this phenomenon as they recognised that the young people typically kept each other's secrets and seldom 'grassed' on someone even if it meant that they would face negative consequences. Not only did the phenomenon of being a 'grass' appear in resident conversations several times, it also featured in some staff conversations, lending weight to its significance.

The third stage consists of incorporating the individual findings into a general model of the social system or organisation under study (Becker, 1970). Until this point, concepts have been investigated in isolation, but this stage brings them together in order to make broader statements about the relationships between them. According to Becker, conclusions at this level typically involve statements about necessary and sufficient conditions – statements about the importance of a phenomenon as an organising structure and statements about phenomena as indicative of more abstract processes. The example of being a 'grass' was viewed as an organisational structure which symbolised a 'them and us' mentality between residents and staff. This was further connected to theories of place-making (Wilson, Houmøller and Bernays, 2012) and belonging (May, 2013) as keeping each other's secrets enabled the young people to feel connected to one another and the wider Kelldale socio-spatial environment.

The final stage, which takes place after the fieldwork, involves checking the accuracy of statements, concepts and the constructed model and presenting the findings in a manner which preserves the thick description characteristic of ethnography (Becker, 1970). In this stage, negative cases may be revealed; recorded incidents that do not fully fit with the model constructed in the third analytic stage. To complete the example of being a 'grass', the main exception appeared to be when a resident's safety was threatened. For example, if the residents had taken drugs inside the building and then someone felt

unwell, sometimes the staff were called upon to provide assistance meaning that their drug use was revealed.

Despite the second and third stages of the analysis often beginning whilst the fieldwork is still being conducted, Becker (1970) pointed out that this can be constrained by time and other issues which may arise. Therefore the processes of checking a phenomenon's frequency and constructing a general model are often not carried out systematically until after the completion of fieldwork. This was the case in this study as the intensive nature of the fieldwork permitted little time to delve greatly into the data as they were being collected. However, during the fieldwork it was possible to note the phenomena that were observed through the behaviours and narratives of the young people and staff members, to pay attention to their frequency, and to begin building a picture of life at Kelldale and the young residents' substance use and wider lives. These analytic processes were recorded in the research diary entries and memos attached to the data in NVivo 10. Consequently, once the fieldwork was concluded, the analysis was already underway and time was taken to complete stages two, three and four in a more systematic manner by closely checking the data and sorting them into codes, categories and themes.

Presentation

Before moving on to exploring the key findings from this work, an explanation as to how the data are presented is needed. Because of the nature of the data and the importance of transparency, it was necessary to devise a system for differentiating between my own observations and the participants' own words. To do this, data extracts have been presented using an Arial font, with participants' own words denoted through the use of italics. In the majority of cases, all data have been left-indented but occasionally short phrases used by the participants have been embedded within the main textual body. In these instances, the font has remained unchanged but the phrases have been indicated using speech marks. Finally, after each indented datum excerpt, the date and location of the event is denoted in brackets. Where the data involve a participant's own words, the pseudonym of the young person or staff member has been included. This additional information is, again, intended to provide transparency, but the inclusion of the location also helps to draw out the spatiality of the young people's interactions and behaviours.

Conclusion

Transparency is a crucial element of the research process to ensure that a qualitative project is as credible as possible and the methodological details in this chapter have been provided in an effort to meet this specification. The chapter began by introducing the fieldwork site – Kelldale – and framing this as a form of case study in the sense that Kelldale’s socio-spatial contexts were interwoven with the day-to-day lives of those who occupied it. Despite being concentrated on one case study site, Mason’s (2002) assertions that generalisations can be made from qualitative research are relevant for this study as it is possible to suggest lessons for other organisations which accommodate homeless people; this point was discussed in this chapter and will be returned to in Chapter 8.

An ethnographic approach was chosen for this study as it was felt that this provided the greatest opportunities for developing trusting relationships with the participants and for incorporating the ‘doing’ of their lives. Moreover, it was the approach most likely to address the research objectives of (1) understanding how life in temporary accommodation is perceived and enacted by young homeless people, (2) exploring what substance use means to the young people living in these situations and (3) exploring how the socio-spatial contexts of young people’s lives in temporary accommodation are interwoven with their substance use. In outlining the main components of an ethnographic approach, a literature review on the subject was presented alongside the specific decisions made in this study. Writing in this manner demonstrated that every decision taken was made with the assistance of other ethnographers who have previously published on the topic. The Kelldale participants were introduced and the fieldwork process documented to outline how the data were collected and the challenges of trying to obtain an ‘insider’ position.

Unsurprisingly, a project that involves the combination of three ‘vulnerable’ groups – young people, substance users and homeless people – required substantial ethical attention. This was intertwined with the use of participant-observation as the main method of data collection. Ensuring that the young people and staff were protected as much as possible was an enormous endeavour and every measure possible was taken. Furthermore, protecting my own safety was of equal importance and this was one of the largest factors in the decision to conduct the majority of fieldwork inside the hostel.

The chapter concluded by detailing the analysis and how the data are presented in the following chapters. In the next three chapters, my interpretation of events that occurred during seven months in Kelldale are offered. I do not claim that these findings are representative of all young people in similar situations. Likewise, given the turnover of residents, it is not possible to claim that the young people who lived in Kelldale before and after my relatively short stay incurred the same experiences. The findings therefore pertain to a specific group of participants living or working in the hostel over a particular time period. However, the themes that emerged from this process, which are understood through an interconnected collection of theories, provide key messages for informing future academic, practice and policy work.

Chapter 5: Creating Place in Kelldale

Introduction

The literature review and theoretical discussions in Chapters 2 and 3 indicated multiple complex and interconnected aspects of being young, homeless and a substance user. Considering these discussions together, it is argued that people's everyday lives are embedded within webs of socio-spatial-self relations. 'Socio' refers to people's social networks which exist on multiple levels as they concern one-to-one relationships through to wider networks that give rise to social norms, rules and 'generalised other' attitudes. 'Spatial' relates to discussions of space, place and home as well as dominant representations of places which can influence people's actions. Finally, 'self' connects to the discussions in Chapter 3 regarding self-identity and processes of internalisation and 'othering'. This notion of socio-spatial-self relations provides an informative framework for threading together the data presented in this chapter and in Chapters 6 and 7. This chapter focuses on the 'spatial' aspects of living in Kelldale, while Chapter 6 concerns the 'social' and Chapter 7 focuses on the 'self'. However, it is important to keep in mind that the concepts of sociality, spatiality and self-identity cannot be neatly parsed as they represent co-existing dimensions of a holistic phenomenon. In other words, they exist dialectically as they are mutually influential and reinforcing.

Although out of sequence in terms of 'socio-spatial-self' relations, the subjects of 'space' and 'place' offer a useful starting point for setting the scene of life in Kelldale. In Chapter 2, it was argued that homeless people, particularly those who use substances, are often subjected to a battery of measures designed to control their use of public space. Smith's (1996) 'revanchist city' highlighted regulatory attempts at removing homeless people from prime urban spaces because of their perceived 'unacceptable' behaviours and presence. Arguably, one way in which this is executed is by accommodating homeless people in hostels, such as Kelldale, which are not situated in city centres but in disadvantaged areas on the outskirts. Being pushed out of prime space in this sense, though, was not the only way in which the young participants' use of space was controlled. Within the confines of the Kelldale building, the residents were offered little privacy from the staff and their movements through various parts of the building were

substantially constrained. Controlling the resident's use of space inside Kelldale was a frequent strategy used by the staff to exert their authority. This is the subject of the first half of this chapter which documents the use of surveillance technologies and bureaucratic processes – 'disciplinary mechanisms' (Foucault, 1975) – to monitor the young people and coerce them into conforming to prescribed normative, 'acceptable' behaviours.

The second half of the chapter analyses how the young people enacted their agency within such highly controlled settings. Attention is given to how they used the spaces that were accessible to them in order to carve out pleasant and meaningful places. Wilson, Houmøller and Bernays' (2012) concept of 'place-making' is used as a lens through which the young people's behaviours can be understood. This is connected to May's (2011; 2013) 'sensory belonging' as it is argued that the actions of the residents were attempts at enhancing such feelings of belonging through engaging in sensory-oriented activities. Place-making behaviours are divided into two types. The first has been termed 'permitted place-making' in that the residents' actions were deemed as 'acceptable' by the staff and sometimes were actively encouraged. These may be seen as actions that are typically 'homely' in that they characterise normative accounts of 'home-making' practices such as domestic chores, socialising and decorating. In contrast, the second type of place-making activities are those that were not permitted in that they involved breaking the rules of the hostel or deviating from the staff's beliefs about acceptability. These activities involved vandalism, entering prohibited spaces and, significantly, substance use. Such behaviours are not only seen as another way of enhancing the positive sensory-experiences of living in the hostel, but they are also understood as a form of resistance to the hegemonic norms and practices that the staff attempted to instil in the young people. As Gieryn (2000: 479) noted, resistance is always emplaced:

Constructions of behaviour, appearances, or even people as deviant depend upon where they happen...To engage in "out of place" practices is also a form of resistance...against forces imposing a territorialized normative order.

This notion of 'out of place' practices is a useful means of characterising the young people's actions in that they often transgressed the dominant representations of spaces within the hostel (Lefebvre, 1991). It has been noted elsewhere in the literature that

homeless people often challenge their restricted use of space by actively avoiding regulated areas and establishing their own homeless spaces in which they can create a sense of 'home' and autonomy (Cloke, May and Johnsen, 2010). Within Kelldale, it was difficult for the young people to completely avoid monitored parts of the building but their place-making activities acted to create meaningful places within the hostel as well as resisting the staff's authority.

Setting the Scene: Monitored Spaces

Located on the outskirts of a city centre in an area of high deprivation (ranked in the top quintile of the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation), Kelldale was a purpose-built hostel that began operating in 2007 after the service was transferred from an older building nearby. The surrounding area was multi-cultural, consisting of Scottish residents as well as a high proportion of Asian and Eastern European immigrants. This was reflected in the local shops that displayed copies of the Qur'an in their windows, next to signs written in Arabic and adverts for the sale of Halal meat alongside black pudding and Irn Bru. These shops lay behind the hostel: in front was a large derelict factory building sitting on the opposite side of the road, casting a shadow over Kelldale's front door. The hostel itself displayed no external sign to indicate its purpose, reducing the likelihood of passers-by identifying that it was a place for the homeless. However, given that the hostel made use of an electronic door system, operated by the staff inside, the relatively constant stream of young people approaching the door and waiting outside for a few moments before being allowed to enter, or turned away, may have given passers-by a clue as to what lay inside.

Not only were the external doors controlled with staff key fobs, many of the internal doors also required a staff member to open them. Beginning from the street outside, residents had to pass through three locked doors to access the bedsits and a fourth door if they wished to go into the lounge or the Information Technology (IT) suite. Therefore they were dependent on the staff's willingness to open these doors if they wished to move around the building. The hostel operated a CCTV surveillance system throughout the building meaning that the staff could monitor the movements of the residents from the screens located in the main office. CCTV cameras were present in the lounge which was

a common space for the residents and staff to use. Further cameras were fixed on the corridor leading to the IT suite and additional staff offices. The IT suite was a room containing several computers that the residents could access with permission.

Kelldale lay on three floors with the ground floor containing the main office, meeting rooms, smaller offices, the lounge, kitchen and IT suite. The two upper floors were dedicated to the residents' bedsits with ten rooms on the first floor and four rooms on the second. Each bedsit contained a single bed, bedroom furniture, armchair, small dining table with two chairs, kitchen unit and an en-suite bathroom. The CCTV cameras on these floors had been carefully positioned so that the staff had a view of the corridor area directly outside each of the fourteen bedsits with two other cameras at the foot and top of the stairs and lift. When a resident entered the building, the staff could monitor the majority of their movements until they went into their bedsit, which did not contain a camera.

The bedsits, however, were monitored using three further methods. First, the staff conducted 'room checks' approximately every four hours during the day which involved visiting each bedsit to enquire as to the whereabouts and behaviours of the residents. Secondly, each bedsit was connected to an intercom system – referred to by the residents as the "bing bong". This enabled a staff member in the office to communicate with a resident without having to walk up the stairs. Inside the bedsits, this translated as a voice suddenly being heard through a speaker in the ceiling informing the resident that she had a telephone call or telling her to keep the noise down. This intercom was only one-way: it was not possible for a resident to speak to a staff member without leaving her room and walking downstairs to the office. Thirdly, each room was fitted with a panic button on one wall meaning that if there was an emergency in a bedsit, such as a health issue or a fight breaking out, the staff could be contacted quickly resulting in someone rushing up to the bedsit to intervene.

This background information demonstrates that the residents were heavily monitored in Kelldale through various means. From a Foucauldian perspective, key fobs, locked doors, CCTV, room checks and other methods of control and monitoring are known as 'disciplinary mechanisms'. Such mechanisms, according to Foucault (1975), serve to manipulate people so that they conform to social norms and ideals. In this case, the

mechanisms were viewed as necessary by the staff on the grounds of policy, health and safety, their ability to manage the service and to ensure the residents were acting within the law: all examples of further types of disciplinary mechanisms.

Elaine (staff) went upstairs to do room checks and sent Garry, Ryan and Stephanie back down to speak to Gemma (staff). Apparently there was graffiti all over Stephanie's room which Elaine was unhappy with. Gemma told them off and told them they had until 1pm to clean it off. The three residents went back upstairs to clean the graffiti.

(Field Notes, June 2013, Reception)

Two of the themes in this extract (graffiti and the staff-resident relationship) are discussed later, but this extract was only one of many in which the staff, upon conducting room checks, discovered that a resident had broken the rules or acted 'unacceptably' and for which she was subsequently scolded and punished.

However, far from being a cold, prison-like setting, substantial effort had been spent on creating a 'homely' environment through decoration and frequent leisure activities. In many ways, Kelldale could be viewed as a 'space of care' in which the residents received practical assistance and emotional support from the staff (Johnsen, Cloke and May, 2005). As will be seen, these forms of care were varied and inconsistent but it would be misleading to portray the hostel as a 'total institution' in which the young people were afforded little opportunity to exercise agency, not least because they could leave whenever they desired (Goffman, 1961). Rather, Kelldale fell in between a space of care and a space of control. Within this context, the 'disciplinary mechanisms' described above penetrated life in Kelldale in many ways. As Matthews and Limb (1999) highlighted in relation to children, when people are faced with imposed restrictions, they respond by forming their own cultural practices and identities and will carve out their own spaces within the 'adult world'. The same can be said for the residents whose responses were within the context of being restricted within the 'staff world'.

The Conditionality of Entering Kelldale

Homeless people by definition face precarious circumstances. For as long as they are deemed 'homeless' they will not have a wholly secure place to live. In Kelldale, the residents' instability was further exacerbated because the staff conveyed, and sometimes acted upon, the warning that when a young person tried to enter the building, permission to do so was never fully guaranteed, despite the hostel being his temporary place of residence. Entering Kelldale by the front door required the resident to press a buzzer and identify himself to a voice on the other end of the speaker. By means of yet another CCTV camera positioned to view the area outside of the front door, the staff inside could see who the person was. If the voice decided that he could enter, the door was opened by an electronic mechanism. Sometimes, however, a resident would be prevented from entering the building if he was intoxicated or there had been conflict with another resident or staff member. Thus, when attempting to understand the spatial aspects of life in Kelldale, it appeared that these were characterised, to an extent, by restriction, uncertainty and instability.

Voluntary Exit, Conditional Return

When a resident left the hostel of her own volition, there was a risk that she would be prevented from re-entering, particularly if she was intoxicated. If intoxication was suspected, the staff carried out a 'risk assessment' at the front door to determine the likelihood of the resident posing a 'risk' to herself or others once inside the building. At no point did I witness a young person being refused entry for this reason but the threat was always there and re-entries for intoxicated residents were usually conditional. The residents interpreted this risk assessment procedure in relation to the level of intoxication: the more they were drunk or 'high', the higher the risk of being denied entry. Therefore the rule was perceived as a threat that depended on how 'mad wi' it'²⁰ they were, and in this respect acted as a disciplinary mechanism that attempted to control their substance use from a distance (Foucault, 1975).

²⁰ 'Mad wi' it' was the phrase use by the residents to refer to being drunk or under the influence of drugs

Rather than the young people curtailing their substance use, however, they found ways of adapting to minimise the risk of having to wander around the streets after being denied access to Kelldale. Sometimes this involved arranging an alternative place to spend the night:

Cathy (staff) asked Stephanie if she was planning to drink in the park to which Stephanie said “no”:

Cathy: I'm on night shift so don't want any trouble when you come back.

Stephanie reassured Cathy that she wasn't going to be drinking:

Stephanie: If I ended up getting drunk then I would arrange an overnight²¹ of course.

(Field Notes, July 2013, Reception)

This conversation was typical of the dialogue that took place between staff and residents when a young person was leaving to meet her friends. As the quote above indicates, the staff often suspected that if certain residents met their friends to drink alcohol or use drugs, there was a chance they would return to the hostel and “cause trouble”. ‘Trouble’ in this sense meant the intoxicated resident refusing to take direction from the staff and acting in ways to encourage excitement among other residents, which undermined staff rules and their efforts at creating a calm environment, particularly in the evenings. For example, it was common for residents to refuse to go to their bedsits at the specified curfew (discussed later) and even though these occurrences did not always involve intoxication, the staff believed that substance use could increase the likelihood. This attempt at controlling the residents from a distance was a pre-emptive measure to ensure the young people followed the rules upon returning to the hostel. Thus, although Kelldale was their temporary ‘home’, it was not always their ‘backstage’ (Goffman, 1959) since the young people had to perform in ways that met with the staff’s approval.

²¹ An ‘overnight’ referred to a resident arranging to sleep somewhere other than Kelldale for the night. These usually took place at a relative, partner or friend’s house

When someone did return to the hostel under the influence of alcohol or drugs, the staff differed in their responses depending on whether they thought the resident was drunk from alcohol or stoned from cannabis. In general, cannabis appeared to have a relaxing effect on the residents, often causing them to behave in a passive, sleepy and giggly manner and as such the staff did not feel the need to risk assess if they thought this is what the residents had taken. Consequently the residents were sometimes quite open about the fact they were intoxicated. Upon arriving back at Kelldale and being allowed to come inside, the following interaction took place at the window: a sliding glass panel that separated the main staff office from the reception area.

Jordan went out and returned about 15 minutes later looking even more stoned than he did before. Gillian (staff) commented that he hadn't been out for long:

Jordan: *Aye, I'm a power smoker!*

(Field Notes, July 2013, Reception)

Contrary to the threat of being refused entry, when residents felt as though they were free to disclose their intoxication without negative repercussions, this led to outward expressions of confidence and certainty. Their conduct was viewed as acceptable and they were thus permitted to engage in drug use without punishment. It is argued that this acceptance enhanced their overall sense of belonging (May, 2013) to the hostel since the ability to exert control over one's movements in space (i.e. by being allowed to freely enter the building) is one of the ways in which people can feel a sense of 'home', or a connection between themselves and the socio-spatial environments in which they are located (Parsell, 2012).

It was observed that alcohol consumption, on the other hand, often resulted in the intoxicated residents becoming noisy and clumsy, and the staff were concerned about the young people challenging or ignoring their authority and/or becoming aggressive. Therefore when residents were suspected of being drunk, there was a greater chance of them being risk assessed and likewise of being prohibited from entering Kelldale. For

example, one evening when Danielle and Chloe had gone to the pub, they returned inebriated and loudly laughing and singing Bonnie Tyler's 'Total Eclipse of the Heart' which they had apparently performed at a karaoke night. Upon their arrival at the front door, two staff members had gone outside to assess the residents and I could hear and see what was happening from my position in the main office. During the doorstep discussions, Danielle and Chloe responded to their risk assessment through a mixture of laughter, intermittent singing, and negotiation. In particular, the word "ridiculous" was used several times by the residents to convey the message that they felt the staff were over-reacting. Whenever their tone showed signs of becoming argumentative, they followed this up with statements like "no, seriously though, we're fine" before descending into laughter and more singing. It appeared that they knew if they showed any sign of aggression, this would dampen their chances of being allowed inside. Their continual singing was spurred on by Nathan, another resident whose return to the hostel had coincided with their own. Nathan stood behind Danielle and Chloe with a bemused look on his face and, at one point, he shouted to me through the office window to encourage me to come outside because I was "missing a good song".

After 20 minutes the staff decided to let them into the building. Emma (staff) explained later that this was because the girls were in "good spirits" and did not present as being aggressive. Danielle and Chloe were told to go to their rooms and were banned from spending any more time together this evening.

(Field Notes, August 2013, Staff Office)

The decision to allow Danielle and Chloe to enter was conditional on them going straight to their bedsits, despite the fact they were in "good spirits". In fact, it was precisely because of these good spirits that the staff wished to separate Danielle and Chloe since they feared the residents would disrupt the pre-bedtime calm atmosphere that the staff were trying to create. After being escorted by a staff member to their rooms, I could see on the CCTV monitors that the two residents immediately attempted to go to each other's rooms, thinking that the staff member had left. They were promptly escorted back again. Therefore, even when a resident had been risk assessed and granted permission to enter,

sometimes the staff would impose space restrictions within the hostel based on her conduct which was deemed inappropriate, albeit relatively harmless.

With the knowledge that consuming alcohol and, to a lesser extent drugs, while being away from Kelldale increased the risk of not being allowed to return, the residents often attempted to conceal their intoxication. Kelldale implemented a curfew policy whereby the residents were expected to have returned to the hostel no later than 11pm and had to be in their own bedsits by midnight. This curfew added to the residents' difficulties in entering the building while intoxicated as it limited the amount of time they had to drink or take drugs and also for the effects to decrease so that they presented as sober enough to ensure they would be allowed inside. Sometimes therefore, if it was nearly 11pm, the residents felt compelled to quickly finish their drinks/drugs so that they could get back to the hostel in time without having to discard the substances but before the full effects were felt. In one case this had serious consequences:

Chloe and Danielle had been out drinking. They had two bottles of wine on them when they returned to the hostel but since they knew they couldn't bring the wine in, they had quickly drunk it before coming inside. According to Chloe, this meant that when the staff saw them they appeared to be OK because the effect of the wine hadn't hit them yet. The girls had gone up to Callum's room. At 11:30pm last night, Callum had pressed his panic button and when the staff went upstairs they found Chloe lying on the floor having a seizure.

(Field Notes, October 2013, Reception)

Fortunately, this type of severe consequence was rare during the fieldwork period, and in this case Chloe fully recovered. However, it demonstrates that substance use was a significant part of the residents' lives and highlights the difficult subject of risk. Kelldale policies served to protect the young people and staff inside the building but sometimes this had the unintended consequence of increasing the risk for the residents when they were outside.

In a different attempt at circumventing the rules, it was often the case that the young people would sneak substances inside with them. When a resident returned to the hostel carrying shopping bags, he was questioned by staff as to what was in the bags in case they contained alcohol. The staff did not insist on checking the contents of the bags unless they had strong suspicions that the young person might have alcohol. For example, on one occasion Matt had been caught drinking in one of the bedsits. The next day, every time he had left the hostel and returned, the staff were more thorough at checking to ensure he had not brought alcohol back with him:

Matt returned a while later. He didn't have any bags with him but Morag (staff) asked him to pat the pocket on the front of his hoodie to show that he wasn't concealing a bottle in it.

(Field Notes, September 2013, Reception)

This level of policing of substance use demonstrates the unusual circumstances in which the young people were living. Kelldale was, at least officially, their temporary home, yet the residents were heavily monitored; perhaps more so than if they had been living in a family home. Making a comparison between such spatial control in Kelldale and a family home is complicated as the way substance use is handled within the home differs from one family to the next (Jones, Magee and Andrews, 2015). However, since most family homes do not operate a CCTV system and since many young people are trusted to be in possession of their own door key, it seems likely that they have a higher degree of autonomy and privacy compared to those living in Kelldale. When comparing the resident's situations with young people who live independently, the contrast in autonomy is even greater. For example, when Nathan moved out of Kelldale and into his own council flat, he started volunteering in the hostel and was consequently still around to talk to:

He told everyone that when he moved in he bought himself a crate of beer and found himself hesitating when he walked into his flat with it. This is because he was never allowed to bring alcohol into the hostel and so wasn't used to it.

Nathan: *It was so good being able to just walk about drinking a beer.*

(Field Notes, August 2013, Reception)

Involuntary Exit, Conditional Return

Over the fieldwork period, being told to ‘take a walk’ was a commonly used term in Kelldale. This meant that the residents had to leave the building and were not allowed to re-enter for a certain time period, usually one hour. This policy was most frequently enforced as a response to a staff member discovering that cannabis was being consumed within the building. If a resident was caught smoking cannabis or using any other drug or alcohol in the building, not only was she told to remove the substance(s), she was also told to ‘take a walk’. This measure was described by staff as a punishment, but also an alternative to contacting the police. If the staff were aware of illegal substance use in the building and did not attempt to stop it, then they were breaking the law. Not wishing to contact the police in every instance meant that ‘taking a walk’ was a more favourable option for both staff and residents.

During my time at Kelldale, the event of ‘taking a walk’ occurred on many occasions.

Ryan told me that on Friday night, him, Garry, Tom and Danielle had taken three buckets²² between them in Tom’s room and were caught by members of staff...The group were made to ‘take a walk’ at 11:30pm. I asked Ryan how he felt about this and he said “it’s shit”. He feels that being made to go out at that time of night is too late. When this happens he worries about getting into trouble by bumping into people that might try to start a fight with them:

Ryan: *Obviously when you’re stoned, you’re off your game, an easy target.*

(Field Notes, June 2013, Ryan’s Bedsit)

²² A ‘bucket’ refers to a bucket bong which is a homemade device used for inhaling cannabis.

.....

Around 6:45pm Kyle (staff) did room checks. A few minutes later Chloe and Craig came to the window:

Craig: *We're being papped out, did you hear?*

I asked why and he replied that Kyle could smell "green²³" in his room and they were being made to take a walk for smoking in the building.

(Field Notes, October 2013, Reception)

While 'taking a walk' involved the residents being barred from the building for one hour, occasionally I observed this time period being extended to several hours or an entire night. These actions were usually taken in cases which involved conflict either between the residents or between the residents and staff. On one occasion I arrived at Kelldale to find Garry standing outside the building and leaning against the front door. Inside I learned from the staff that earlier that day Garry had started fighting with Craig. Craig had managed to restrain Garry without fighting back and the staff had taken Garry into one of the meeting rooms in the lobby area while they called the police:

The police had arrived and explained that they couldn't arrest Garry unless a formal complaint was made. Rather than doing this, the staff decided to ban Garry from the hostel for the night and arranged a taxi to pick him up to take him to his mum's house. Garry got into a taxi, the police left, but then Garry got out of the taxi and made his way back to the hostel. He had been standing outside for ages trying to get back in and the staff had taken it in turns to go outside and try to reason with him.

(Field Notes, May 2013, Main Office)

²³ 'Green' was the term used by the residents to refer to a particular type of cannabis strain

On a different occasion, Amanda informed me of an incident that had occurred a few nights earlier. As well as enforcing a curfew whereby the residents had to be back in the building by 11pm, they were also expected to be in their own bedsits by midnight. On this night Amanda and Andy, who at that time were in a girlfriend-boyfriend relationship with each other, decided to deliberately “bam up²⁴” the staff. Andy was in Amanda’s room and when a staff member went up to tell Andy he needed to go to his own room the two residents disobeyed this instruction. Andy refused to leave Amanda’s room and the staff eventually resorted to calling the police:

Four police officers turned up, two spoke to Amanda and two spoke to Andy. They both got made to leave the building and were told they weren’t allowed to return until the morning. They stood outside the door for a while.

Amanda: I told them no way, I’m no’ walking about at this time of night.

They ended up walking about near to the hostel and returned at 3am and asked if they could come back in – the staff said yes.

(Field Notes, June 2013, Amanda’s Bedsit)

Amanda (above) and Ryan’s (page 121) statements that the staff were over-reacting and putting them in danger by forcing them outside, enabled them to reframe and divert attention away from their rule-breaking. This could be interpreted as a type of front-stage performance (Goffman, 1959) in that the young people were trying to ‘save face’ (Goffman, 1967) and is revealing of their feelings of belonging to the hostel. An alternative, and potentially more effective, way in which they could have ‘saved face’ would have been to find alternative places to spend the night. Instead, the residents conceded and asked to return. Although it may have been the case that the residents had no alternative, they frequently took ‘overnights’ at family and friend’s houses which suggested that they did. Therefore, Kelldale appeared to be a place that the residents preferred to remain in, signifying a greater sense of belonging compared to other places. Since belonging is an intersubjective feeling that relies on the acceptance of every

²⁴ To ‘bam up’ means to deliberately annoy or wind someone up

individual in a group (May, 2013) the actions by the staff of disconnecting a resident from Kelldale, even on a temporary basis, arguably threatened the resident's belonging. Their response was to try and re-connect by conceding and asking to be allowed back into the building, at the cost of reinforcing the staff's authority.

Permitted Place-Making

So far, this chapter has described the highly controlled conditions within which the residents were living. Their substance use was a salient feature of the ways in which the staff exerted authority over the young people's entries and exits from the building. The residents dutifully 'played along' or performed in ways to persuade the staff to enable them to enter, although sometimes these performances slipped and the residents displayed their true feelings, or they performed for a different audience (fellow residents) to 'save face' (Goffman, 1959; 1967). The chapter now turns to examining the young people's actions once inside the building by drawing on the concepts of place-making (Wilson, Houmøller and Bernays, 2012) and sensory belonging (May, 2013). As discussed in Chapter 2, 'place-making' refers to the ways in which people carve out subjectively pleasant places within an unpleasant or unfamiliar environment. It is argued that engaging in this process enhances people's 'sensory belonging' or their feelings of connection with their material surroundings.

The Lounge: A Young Person's Place?

The lounge was located next to the staff office and it was a space designed as a social area for the residents which contained comfortable couches positioned around a flat-screen TV, a table-football game and a dining table that was large enough to seat fourteen people. There were two rooms leading off from the lounge: a kitchen and a laundry room. The lounge was brightly decorated with one wall painted bold purple and another wall covered in stencilled phrases associated with youth culture such as 'YOLO' (You Only Live Once). Some of the residents had contributed to this decoration as, just before the beginning of the fieldwork, the hostel had employed an arts organisation to work with the young people in updating the décor. The staff had been keen for the residents to feel

an investment in, and connection to this space and therefore it was felt that a good way to ensure this was to allow them to decorate the space to their liking.

The young people who had helped to design the lounge did seem to feel a connection to the space as they would occasionally point out to either myself or newer residents that they had contributed, expressing a sense of pride. However, some of the newer residents who did not have such an investment, made passing comments about the perceived cheesiness of the YOLO-style stencils which they felt were embarrassing. These feelings were expressed through scoffing and eye rolling whenever they looked at the wall. When these gestures were made in front of those who had designed the lounge, the designers would join in and admit to its cheesiness, often blaming the arts organisation; yet another means of 'saving face' (Goffman, 1967). With the newly decorated lounge also came an expectation by the staff that the residents would 'look after' it and respect the work that had gone into it. However, the residents seemed to have other ideas about how to enjoy the space, which were not always conducive to preserving its appearance:

The three girls seemed to be in a particularly hyper mood. They started tickling each other, having a fight with the cushions and trying to whip each other with tea towels... Things escalated when Cara picked up an apple and threw it across the room at Amanda. It smashed off the wall and marked the paint. Pieces of apple went all over the couch. Cara quickly set about cleaning it up while giggling, although she did not clean the wall.

(Field Notes, May 2013, Lounge)

While this extract demonstrates some of the ways in which the young people engaged in sensory place-making activities in the lounge, they were soon scolded for making a mess. In other words, the lounge was constructed as a space for the young people to socialise but it remained a place of surveillance and under staff control.

Access to the lounge was controlled by the staff via a locked door and residents were only permitted to socialise there after 5pm on weekdays and all day at weekends. This was as a result of the staff's concern that the presence of the residents in the lounge during a standard working day (Monday to Friday 9am-5pm) would disrupt their work tasks

such as making phone calls, completing paperwork and discussing sensitive information. Therefore, one aspect of Kelldale's 'representation' (Lefebvre, 1991) was that it was a workplace which limited the place-making abilities of the residents as they could only create a pleasant, meaningful environment in the lounge during certain times. In their study of children's residential homes, Dorrer et al. (2010) reached a similar conclusion in that, despite efforts by the staff to create a 'family home' environment, the function of the space as a workplace resulted in the children feeling constrained and inhibited in their sense of belonging. Kelldale appeared to be similar.

The main exception was that residents could enter the lounge during office hours to carry out domestic chores such as laundry, cooking and taking their bins outside. Danielle, in particular, took pride in keeping her bedsit clean and tidy and she would frequently appear at the lounge door with a basket of laundry. She highlighted the significance of doing laundry in the form of expressing frustration when it was disrupted:

Danielle went into the laundry room to take her washing out of the drier. She realised that Craig had already taken her clothes out and dumped them on the worktop so that he could use the drier. Danielle's clothes were still damp and she started yelling at Craig. At first, Craig ignored her but when Danielle got louder and walked towards him he defended himself and said he didn't know her clothes were still wet. Danielle continued to yell and was clearly very angry.

(Field Notes, October 2013, Lounge)

This routine was an important aspect of place-making for Danielle. Not only did it signify a desire to maintain cleanliness and a subjectively pleasant bedsit space, it also involved acting independently and exerting control within the confines of the hostel regulations. According to Neumark (2013), being able to make changes in the 'home' is just as important for displaced people as having shelter and food. Simple acts of home 'beautification' enables feelings of autonomy, agency and control which, over time, can carry over into other areas of a person's life. Although, Kelldale as a 'home' is questionable (this is discussed further in Chapter 7), taking care of her personal bedsit

and her possessions as an extension of place, appeared to be beneficial for Danielle's wellbeing.

This connection between wellbeing and domestic chores was reinforced during a later conversation between Danielle, Tom and some of the staff. The two residents argued that living in Kelldale could de-skill them and remove their motivation to take personal responsibility:

When Tom lived in his flat he said he enjoyed having his routine of doing housework in the morning and then watching TV for the rest of the day. He explained that he doesn't like the fact that the hostel provides things like laundry tablets and toilet rolls. When he first moved in he bought a big box of Daz (laundry powder) because that's what he did when previously living in his own flat:

Tom: *I got slated for it!*

The staff told him not to buy these things because they were provided for him.

Tom: *It's taking away things you've already learned.*

(Field Notes, October 2013, Reception)

By being provided with basic household items, it appeared that some of the residents felt that their ability to place-make was compromised. In doing so, the residents' transition to autonomous adulthood may have been stalled or even reversed, as Tom indicated by pointing to the skills that were being unlearned as a consequence of living in Kelldale.

Aside from domestic chores, carving out a pleasant and meaningful place in the lounge during the evenings and weekends was sporadic and depended on the individual desires and moods of the residents. Craig was sometimes found sprawled out on one of the couches watching TV by himself. This was his place to relax and have some quiet time away from the other residents and the noise they usually created. In this instance, place-making occurred through Craig's auditory engagement as he deliberately found

somewhere peaceful to spend time. On several occasions I attempted to start a conversation with Craig while he was alone but he usually gave short, vague responses to my efforts and focused most of his attention on the TV. Craig's responses, plus his body language of lying down, indicated that he felt comfortable and relaxed in that space and did not want this to be disrupted.

The peacefulness of the lounge did not usually last for long as frequently it was used as a space for games or similar activities that were either pre-arranged by the staff or occurred on a spur-of-the-moment basis. Organised games nights included playing bingo, card games and having table-football competitions, whereas impromptu games typically involved the PlayStation 3 (PS3). These games facilitated place-making in the lounge and a sense of belonging among the residents. The young people were encouraged to use the lounge for entertainment and they did this in ways which involved the stimulation of their visual, physical and auditory senses through the use of material and virtual games which were shared activities. These moments of fun distracted the residents from unpleasant feelings of boredom and prevented problems arising as Cara pointed out:

Cara explained that she thinks the reason why things can kick off in the evenings is due to boredom and everyone becoming sick of seeing each other's faces. She thinks the staff should organise more activities in the evenings. Gemma's (staff) the only one who does this and Cara thinks Gemma realises that if the residents are bored that's when trouble starts.

(Field Notes, May 2013, Tom's Bedsit)

Playing these shared games, therefore, was used to create positivity, comfort and pleasantness in an environment which was often perceived by residents to be boring and prone to conflict. When asked what he liked and disliked about spending time in the lounge, Jordan's response indicated that he associated games in the lounge with feelings of comfort and sensory belonging:

It's good 'cause like it's a wee social area and all that, like, you can just sit there and chill...[When asked if he would take his Xbox from his bedsit to the lounge] I will actually, and I actually want to do this at one point when I'm, like, high, like get my Xbox and just sit there on the couch and play it!...It's 'cause the couch is that comfy, like, you just sink into it normally, so if you were high you'd just be... sink, you'd be engulfed by it! (Jordan)

(Interview, July 2013, Meeting Room)

Often, being under the influence of drugs can heighten one's senses, meaning that tastes, visuals, sounds and tactile feelings are perceived and enjoyed to a much greater extent (Parker, Aldridge and Measham, 1998). Because heightened senses result in greater sensory pleasure, the significance of place-making and sensory belonging is elevated. Jordan's use of the word 'engulfed' and his emphasis on the word 'sink' indicated that the comfort of the lounge couches would be enhanced if he was high.

Another lounge-based sensory activity in which substance use featured was art. Art projects were typically arranged by the staff and on one occasion when the residents were informed that there was to be a Halloween party, arrangements were made to have an art evening for the young people to make their costumes. During a conversation with Chloe, I asked what she was planning to dress up as:

Either a vampire bride, or me and Danielle are gonna go as 'drugs are for mugs' where Danielle's gonna dress up as a pill, like an eccie²⁵ or paracetamol, and I'm gonna go as a mug. (Chloe)

(Field Notes, October 2013, Reception)

Chloe's idea was intended to be humorous and ironic as the two residents frequently took drugs, including ecstasy. The corporeal effects of intoxication and general chit-chat about substance use themes were therefore woven through the activities that occurred in the lounge. This not only contributed to place-making and sensory belonging but also to

²⁵ Slang for the drug ecstasy

cultural belonging (May, 2013) as it was a topic in which most residents had a shared interest.

Bedsits: The Prime Sites of Place-Making

Despite staff attempts at transforming the physical space of the lounge into a place infused with pleasant meanings and experiences (through decoration and organised activities), the residents preferred to spend time in their bedsits. These were the only parts of the building that were exempt from the gaze of CCTV cameras. Furthermore, the physical separation of the bedsits from the staff areas because they were on different floors, afforded the residents a greater degree of privacy in these spaces. The bedsits, however, were still prone to staff surveillance. As mentioned earlier, each bedsit was fitted with a one-way intercom system – the “bing bong” – allowing a staff member in the main office to communicate with the residents. Arguably though, it was the room checks, according to residents, that interrupted privacy in the bedsits most of all.

Approximately every four hours, a staff member would go up to the bedsits and knock on the doors one-by-one before opening the door and looking inside. If nobody answered the door then the staff member used his master key to unlock it. The purpose of these checks was to monitor the whereabouts of each resident, to carry out health and safety inspections and to ensure no one was breaking the rules by drinking alcohol or using drugs in the building. Although the residents generally tolerated these checks, it was not uncommon for a staff member to enter a room while someone was in a vulnerable position such as being asleep or in the shower. Embarrassing moments were sometimes mentioned by the residents who were either amused or annoyed. On one occasion, Kyle (staff) walked in on Amanda and Andy having sex and later when Andy appeared at the reception window he burst into laughter when he made eye contact with Kyle. On a separate occasion, Tom angrily stated that staff had walked into his bedsit just as he had come out of the shower, wearing nothing but a towel around his waist.

Such incidents led the residents to raise the subject of room checks at one of the monthly resident's meetings²⁶. They argued that many of the staff were not giving them enough time to answer the door as they would knock and then walk straight in. Although Suzanne (the staff member present at the meeting) agreed to ensure the staff waited for a few seconds before entering a bedsit, she reminded them that if they took too long to answer, the staff member would still need to walk in. Therefore, although accidental, room checks could sometimes result in humiliation for the residents and this reinforced the lack of full control they could exert over their bodies and actions in Kelldale spaces.

Despite not having full control over who did and did not enter a bedsit and what activities occurred there, the young people exercised place-making to its fullest possible extent. Place-making was enacted through expressions of comfort, leisure and security. Furthermore, acts of playfulness, relaxation and autonomy were heightened in these spaces compared to the lounge, as were acts of conflict. This was largely because the residents socialised in each other's bedsits as well as spending time there alone. Each resident had different preferences for how her bedsit was used. Some happily shared their space with the entire group, some were more selective and others chose to hang out in other people's bedsits so they could reserve their own bedsit for being alone. When those in the latter two positions ended up with unwanted guests in their own space, it often led to frustration:

Andy became irritated by the number of people in his room and set about tidying up – picking discarded tobacco pouches and pieces of litter off the floor and arranging everyone's shoes in a neat line in front of the drawers. In general Andy's room was very clean and tidy and he has told me before that he doesn't tend to let other people hang out in his room.

(Field Notes, July 2013, Andy's Bedsit)

For Andy, ensuring that he kept his bedsit clean and tidy was connected to both his past and future in relation to maintaining a tenancy. Prior to Kelldale, he had lived in his own

²⁶ These meetings were opportunities for the residents to raise any issues or requests to the staff concerning the day-to-day running of the hostel.

council flat and was in a long-term relationship. When his relationship ended, he struggled to cope and began drinking heavily. He described a period in his life that was full of vague, drunk memories of his friends using his flat to have continual parties and Andy doing little to stop them. He explained that he lacked “door control” in that he did not stop people, some of whom were strangers, from entering his flat to join in with the parties. These individuals trashed his flat over time and he was given the ultimatum by his landlord to either voluntarily give up his flat or have it taken off him: he chose the former. Having learned from this experience, Andy was determined to ensure he developed the ability to control his personal space so that he would not face similar problems in his next tenancy. In Kelldale, this was manifest in Andy being selective about who he allowed into his bedsit and what occurred there. Thus, he became frustrated and anxious when things began to get out of his control.

Andy, along with Cara and Nathan, all preferred to keep their personal space and their socialising space separate. Although their reasons varied, they all had, in common, the fact that they usually reserved their bedsits for times when they wished to be alone and relax in an environment away from the noise and busyness of the rest of the hostel. This supports Korpela et al.’s (1991 in Matthews and Limb, 1999) findings that children connect their home – and their own bedroom in particular – to relaxing, clearing their minds and having a say in what happens there. Linking this to the ‘home’ literature suggests that these young people perhaps felt more able than others to place boundaries on their own ‘backstage’ space and control who did and did not enter (Goffman, 1959). They did this by not being forthcoming with invitations to hang out in their rooms, by keeping their doors locked and by spending time in other parts of the building.

In contrast, others were happy to make their bedsits available for socialising. Tom, Danielle, Ryan and Stephanie would frequently invite many of the residents, and me, up to their rooms where they would hang out, chat and smoke roll-ups²⁷. Rolling and smoking tobacco formed an important ritual²⁸ in the bedsits because they were the only location in the hostel that the residents were permitted to smoke. Despite Scotland implementing a smoking ban in work and other public places under the *Smoking, Health*

²⁷ Roll-ups refer to rolled tobacco which was a cheap alternative to smoking cigarettes

²⁸ A ‘ritual’ is defined here as a collective experience that represents a similar, yet temporary anchor for people (Moss and Richter, 2010).

and Social Care (Scotland) Act 2005, Kelldale was able to allow the young people to smoke in their bedsits as these were their place of residence. The staff also had a designated smoking area which was in the back garden and was off-limits to the residents. As the smoking ban has largely resulted in people having to go outside to smoke, the young people found it strange and amusing that they were prohibited from smoking in the garden, an outdoor area, but permitted to smoke in their bedsits indoors.

Smoking rituals typically began outside of the bedsits in another location in the hostel. If several residents were in the lounge, someone would usually suggest they go for a smoke and they would proceed to walk upstairs to someone's room. This example highlights how the hostel policy, and indeed how legislation, played a determining role in the residents' use of space and the tight connection that developed between smoking and their bedsits. Many were frequent smokers and their desire for tobacco combined with these rules also meant that activities in the lounge were interrupted or cut short as a result of the young people leaving for smoke breaks. Smoking rules arguably strengthened the residents' sensory belonging to the bedsits as well as fostering a shared culture among those who smoked and also non-smokers who did not want to be left alone in the lounge.

Once inside a bedsit, the young people usually set about rolling as soon as they entered:

Ryan asked Matt to roll a cigarette and Ryan also rolled one...After they rolled, Matt stood up and smoked out the window – I've noticed that this seems to be a habit of his, he always goes to the window to smoke regardless of where he is. Ryan sat on the armchair and smoked. Amanda, who was sitting on Ryan's bed, looked at the two boys:

Amanda: Who's gonnae save me a draw of that? Matt gonnae save me some of that when you're done.

Matt passed his roll-up to Amanda when he had had enough.

(Field Notes, July 2013, Ryan's Bedsit)

This extract was typical of the smoking patterns that were observed in the bedsits which involved sharing tobacco (this will be discussed further in Chapter 6) along with vying for particular positions in the room. The armchair and bed were the prime spots for sitting when hanging out in someone's room, followed by one of two wooden chairs and lastly leaning against the kitchen worktop. It was an implicit rule that the occupier of the bedsit and his/her girlfriend/boyfriend could sit where they wished and that whoever ended up sitting closest to the door had to get up to let someone in if there was a knock. The young people demonstrated their familiarity and belonging in a bedsit, even when it was not their own, by claiming their preferred seat without waiting to be invited to sit down. This included sprawling out on another person's bed. Such acts contrasted with my own background which instilled a sense of impoliteness if I were to make myself 'at home' without being instructed to do so. Therefore, whenever I was invited to join some of the young people in a bedsit, I would hover awkwardly at the door until someone told me where to sit. Often I was offered the top location of the armchair which acted as a reminder that the young people viewed me as being different and in an authoritative position.

As well as smoking, when a group of young people were socialising in someone's room they generally sat chatting, watching TV and videos on their mobile phones, listening to music and complaining that they were bored. For those whose bedsits were at the front of the building, they were also able to hang out of their windows to watch the movements of people on the street outside and to have conversations with friends who were passing by. Occasionally, these front bedsits became the central focus for the young people if something interesting was happening outside. One day, while Amanda and I were chatting in the lounge, we heard the distinctive drumming and whistling music of an Orange Order parade²⁹. Amanda, who played the drum in an opposing religious parade, became angry and agitated and found it difficult to ignore the sounds of the approaching march:

²⁹ This is a procession connected to Protestant loyalism. See Hamilton-Smith, Malloch and Ashe (2015) for more information

Come on Jenny, let's go up to my room to watch it properly, you might need to stop me from shouting out the window at them. (Amanda)

(Field Notes, June 2013, Lounge)

Similarly, when the nearby high-rise flats were due to be demolished as part of an ongoing regeneration project, the front bedsits offered a good view and everyone excitedly crammed into Amanda and Nathan's rooms to watch the spectacle of the flats being blown up. Such events provided a momentary break in the everyday routines of the residents which they often described as boring and repetitive. Consequently, these events became the substance of many of their stories that they enjoyed telling and re-telling to those who had been absent, and reminiscing about with those who had been there.

Events such as the Orange Order parade or the demolition of the high-rise flats, along with stories of drug-taking which are discussed in the next section, formed a part of the residents' memories of living in Kelldale which they carried with them and brought up in later conversations. Story-telling and memories are interconnected and stories often make distinctions between 'them and us' which facilitates group unity (Leonard, 2006). In this case, the re-telling of events reinforced a sense of belonging among those who had 'been there' in contrast to other residents and staff:

Danielle: *The other morning [Chloe] was eating a sausage, right, wrapped up in a bit of fuckin' tissue paper*

Chloe: *I was eating my breakfast!*

Danielle: *In my room! In my room, she'd left it so I thought fuckin get the Fairy Liquid, squeezed it in her sausage and she's munching away on it*

Tom started laughing loudly

Chloe: *I didnae know and you were like that to me "sing that mad song I'm Forever Blowing Bubbles"*

Craig: [singing] *I'm forever blowing bubbles*

Chloe: *I was sitting munching it and I haven't even noticed and I said to them "did you put Fairy Liquid in my sausage?" 'cause I seen the empty Fairy Liquid bottle and they're like that "no no we wouldnae dae that" so I didn't even think anything of it and kept eating it man like that*

(Focus Group, Lounge, October 2013)

Tom and Craig's contributions to the story were minimal but their laughing and singing served to inform me and the other residents that they had been present during this event and that this was a collective story which they shared. The bedsits, as the sites of these events, were interwoven with these memories. Even when the event itself had been unpleasant, such as when Tom had overdosed on ecstasy in his bedsit, there was still an element of positivity that was taken from it because it was an extraordinary event that broke up the perceived mundaneness of their everyday lives. Positively associating the bedsits with memories thus reinforced place-making and feelings of relational and sensory belonging because the residents were able to say 'I was there' which carried a certain level of status.

The same could be said for the photographs and pictures that the residents displayed on their bedsit walls which physically symbolised memories. These were usually pictures of a resident alongside his/her family members, partner, friends and pets that had been taken months or years prior to arriving in Kelldale, although Ryan also had photographs of his current girlfriend on the wall beside his bed. Some of the residents were young parents although at the time of fieldwork, none of them had access to their children (see Chapter 7). For these residents it was important to display the photographs they had of their children so that they could continue to feel connected to them. In addition, the young residents also used other objects to personalise their bedsits. Ryan displayed posters of naked women torn from men's magazines next to his bed; Callum hung a large football flag from his ceiling; Tom had a small wire statue in the shape of a lizard which

sat on his floor beside the door and which he referred to as his “guard dog”; and Danielle had stuck Buckfast³⁰ labels to her wall in the shape of her name. Cara had carefully written out a poem about friendship on an A4 piece of card and had given this to Stephanie and Stephanie had stuck this on her wall. Some of the residents also displayed painted canvases which they had created with the help of an arts organisation that occasionally visited the hostel.

While some had decorated their rooms to greater extents than others, every bedsit I was permitted to enter had some form of personalisation which gave the space meaning through sensory engagement. Each object also linked to relational and cultural belonging (May, 2013). Relational belonging concerns a person’s connections with other people and was most apparent in the content of the young people’s photographs and Stephanie’s poem. Cultural belonging is associated with feelings connected to wider cultural values and practices and was apparent in Callum’s flag and Danielle’s Buckfast labels. Overall, displaying objects enabled residents to form connections between their self-identities and the physical space and this can positively influence wellbeing (Neumark, 2013). Although Kelldale was not their home, such personalisation was an attempt at creating a ‘homely’ feel. It should be noted, however, that I was not permitted to enter the bedsit of every resident and thus it was not known how these bedsits were decorated, or if they were at all. Some of the young people appeared to use Kelldale mainly as somewhere to sleep, preferring to leave the hostel early in the morning and return late at night. Therefore, it is possible that they may not have decorated their bedsits and perhaps did not feel the same level of sensory connection to the hostel as others did.

Breaking the Rules as Acts of Place-Making and Belonging

In contrast to permitted place-making, this section examines those behaviours which broke the rules and which the staff viewed as problematic. Substance use constituted the most significant of these behaviours since it was an activity that dominated a great deal of the young people’s attention and efforts. Other unpermitted behaviours were also witnessed including vandalism and entering prohibited spaces. Rather than constructing these acts as ‘deviant’ or ‘criminal’, it is argued that they can be understood as further

³⁰ Buckfast is a brand of tonic wine that is popular in Scotland

attempts at transforming Kelldale spaces into meaningful places. In Chapter 2, the concept of place-making was connected to resistance. Given that the staff disapproved of the actions discussed in this section, and actively tried to prevent them, such actions are interpreted as forms of resistance. Using drugs in the building, vandalising and entering prohibited spaces are all acts that are ‘out of place’ (Gieryn, 2000) in that they transgress the normative representations of space (Lefebvre, 1991) and, in some cases, change their meanings.

Drug and Alcohol Use in Kelldale

Cannabis was the most frequently used illicit drug in Kelldale and consequently the majority of data concerning drug use involved this substance. Over the fieldwork period, it was common for one or more of the residents to return to the hostel visibly stoned which was generally accepted by the staff. However, as well as smoking cannabis outside of the hostel, the residents also regularly smoked inside, usually in their bedsits which offered the most privacy and the least chance of being caught. Because of the regular room checks, the young people had developed tactics for attempting to hide what they were doing.

What the staff dae is, we’ll go to the shop and [when we return] the staff are like ‘right we’ll gie them ten minutes’ and they’ll wait ten minutes and we’ll get the bucket out and we’ll be half way through the round and they’ll come in [to the bedsit] and all that and it’s stinking so they know when we dae them most. But now we just wait till they dae checks. Nae point in getting caught and doing an hour’s walk in that weather and that, so we wait and as soon as, straight after checks we go ‘checks’ and as soon as we shut the door that bucket comes right out. (Danielle)

(Focus Group, October 2013, Lounge)

In addition to timing their drug use so that it did not coincide with room checks, the residents took³¹ their cannabis buckets in the en-suite bathroom rather than in the main

³¹ ‘Taking’ cannabis was the equivalent to ‘inhaling’ the drug via a bucket

space of the bedsit. Despite hearing from the staff that this occurred, it took quite a while before the young people admitted to me that this is what they did. The reason for smoking in the bathrooms was because they contained an air vent which the residents believed carried the smoke out of the building and thus reduced the smell inside. Furthermore, they could close the bathroom door meaning that if room checks happened, the staff could not instantly detect what the person in the bathroom was doing. On one of my first days in Kelldale, I was invited into Tom's bedsit along with Garry, Ryan and Stephanie. As this was the first chance I had had to properly socialise in the bedsits I had been slightly nervous about what they thought of me and consequently put a lot of effort into appearing 'cool' – as if I belonged to that space. I was aware of the residents going into the bathroom one after the other but did not want to say anything for fear of appearing stupid or nosy. Months later, Tom explained what had happened:

See when me and Garry were in my room, did you know that we were doing buckets in the toilet? I took my bucket in and then came out and sat and he took his in. (Tom)

(Focus Group, October 2013, Lounge)

Tom took great pleasure in knowing that I had not realised what was going on and, as well as using it as a chance to tease me, it reinforced to them that the strategy was effective.

As well as hiding the act of drug-taking, some residents also concealed the actual substances and their paraphernalia. Andy described how, one night, he had returned to the hostel with several other residents and although he was drunk he appeared sober compared to the others. Assuming that his arrival with the others was coincidental, the staff allowed Andy to go up to his bedsit while they risk assessed the others. Unknown to them, Andy was concealing a six-pack of beer which he proceeded to drink in his bedsit. Furthermore, he explained that he hid the cans in different parts of his bedsit when the staff did room checks as they had not suspected he was drunk and had no reason to search his bedsit. Amanda added to this conversation by disclosing another strategy for hiding alcohol:

The good old way, drinking it out a McDonald's cup, 3L³² straight! I had like eight cups and was away wi' the fairies. (Amanda)

(Interview, August 2013, Amanda's Flat)

Cannabis buckets were a type of paraphernalia that the residents had to hide from the staff otherwise the bucket would be confiscated. A 'bucket' was a homemade bong created using two drinks bottles, a 'socket' (piece of pipe) and water. The residents put great effort into making their buckets and therefore it was a large inconvenience when they were confiscated. Ryan explained that although the staff were not allowed to search through the young people's drawers, it was not possible to hide a bucket there because the drawers were not tall enough meaning there was a danger of the contents spilling. Consequently they found a variety of alternative hiding places in their bedsits.

The fact that many young people went to great lengths to conceal their consumption of drugs and alcohol in their bedsits without being spotted by the staff, meant that their rooms took on a parallel meaning. Not only were the bedsits spaces for sleeping, socialising and having alone-time, they were also spaces of substance use and intoxication. The bathrooms took on a dual meaning of being used for showering and using the toilet along with being used for drug consumption. Thus, the residents altered the dominant representations (Lefebvre, 1991) of these areas. Although these acts could be interpreted as forms of deviance, they can also be viewed as another dimension of place-making and belonging. The young people often stated a preference for smoking cannabis in the hostel because of the relaxing effects of the drug. If they were forced to smoke outside this meant they then had to walk around intoxicated when all they wanted to do was find somewhere comfortable, familiar and safe to sit so they could enjoy the effects of intoxication. Therefore, the bedsits were a more pleasant place to take drugs than on the streets. Implementing the various tactics to use substances without being caught was demonstrative of creating and maintaining the desirability of the bedsit spaces.

³² '3L' refers to a 3 litre bottle of cider

Not only were drugs and alcohol consumed in the personalised places of the bedsits, substance use was a part of this personalising, place-making process. This was apparent through the numerous accounts of substance use in the bedsits that the residents took delight in telling and re-telling. For example, several young people separately told me of an incident involving Matt taking the ‘legal high’ Salvia. Salvia, which is a hallucinogen, can look similar to cannabis and is smoked or inhaled through a bucket, although it has very different effects. One evening, in one of the bedsits, some of the residents had made up a bucket containing Salvia but they told Matt that it was cannabis. Matt took his share of the bucket while the others waited to see what effect it would have on him:

It was hilarious, he just kept saying “I don’t feel well, I don’t feel well”.
(Chloe)

(Field Notes, October 2013, Lounge)

Later during the focus group, the same incident was brought up again and everyone who was there, including Matt, found it funny and spoke about it in a tone that conveyed excitement and pride. Danielle had filmed the incident on her phone and she showed me the video which was of several residents sitting in a bedsit laughing at Matt who was rocking back and forth on a chair and becoming “paranoid” because the staff were “bing bong-ing” him to tell him the Job Centre was on the phone and wanted to speak to him. This incident, along with many others of a similar nature, demonstrated the significance of the bedsits to intoxication. The furniture in the bedsit, the ‘bing bong’ intercom and the presence of several other residents sitting or standing in close proximity to one another were all integral features of the story. Thus, the physicality, sociality and constructed meanings attached to the bedsits were interwoven with the intoxication experience. Intoxication, therefore, contributed towards feeling a sense of belonging to the environment, not just for the person who was intoxicated but for everyone who was present.

Vandalism

Studies have reported that graffiti and acts of vandalism are used as a means of physically marking symbolic ownership of a space (Robinson, 2009). In Kelldale it was common for the residents to graffiti some of the furniture in their bedsits. Inside their cupboard door was a favourite spot as it could be hidden from the staff during room checks. Most of the graffiti consisted of “menshies”: writing your own name in a specific design that is identifiable as belonging to you. Some of the residents “menshied” their own furniture and walls as well as those in other bedsits:

Callum: *My room’s fuckin, [Tom’s] name’s fuckin menshied on ma cupboard*

Matt: *Garry’s name is on my cupboard*

Danielle: *Aye Garry did it on a few of them*

Callum: *Aye and Stephanie*

(Focus Group, October 2013, Lounge)

Menshies were a form of marking territory and leaving a physical reminder that the resident was connected to the space. Although the residents did not explicitly state it, menshies served as a way of preserving the memory of past residents. This can be seen in the above extract as Matt had moved into Garry’s bedsit after Garry left the hostel meaning the two of them had never met. Yet Matt knew of Garry, not only through stories told by others who had known him, but also through the physical mark he had left in his bedsit which subsequently became a feature of Matt’s space. Garry’s menshie was a reminder to others that he shared a connection with that particular space and this belonging lasted beyond his time living in Kelldale.

Graffiti was not the only form of vandalism that occurred in Kelldale. In preparation for a residents’ meeting, the staff put together a list of acts of vandalism that had occurred in the weeks prior:

(C)igarettes being stubbed out on corridor walls, door hinges being broken due to people swinging on them, litter being thrown out of bedsit windows, drinks being spilled in communal areas and not cleaned up, one of the panes of glass in the front door being cracked, and one of the 'fire exit' signs being ripped off the wall.

(Field Notes, September 2013, Main Office)

When Suzanne (staff) brought up these examples in the residents' meeting, she tried to get her point across by emphasising that Kelldale was their 'home':

Suzanne frequently mentioned the fact that this is a "shared space", that it's their "home" and that everyone is expected to look after the place and not let it get too "shabby":

Suzanne: You wouldn't stub out a fag on your own living room wall if you had your own place so why do it here?

(Field Notes, September 2013, Lounge)

Although the young people were not asked specifically about what the physical conditions of their previous 'home' were like, it is possible that their vandalising acts were reflective of how they and others had treated their homes in the past. This may have been particularly relevant to people like Craig who had been a rough sleeper, to Jordan who had sofa-surfed or to Andy whose previous flat was used for constant parties. For these young people, it had been a long time since they had lived in a conventional 'home' and it is possible that some had never lived in homes that conformed to the same cleanliness and quality standards as Kelldale. Dominant social norms about how a property should be treated do not condone the acts of vandalism that the staff had listed. This is apparent through the legal rights that private and social landlords have to tackle behaviours that are deemed 'anti-social' (Flint, 2002). However, it is entirely possible that the Kelldale residents were behaving in ways which reflected their own norms and backgrounds. Furthermore, given that place-making is subjective, some of the young

people may have preferred to live in a building that was untidy, marked with graffiti or damaged in some way. These conditions may have been familiar to the residents and comforting as they provided a more 'homely' feel (and thus a sense of belonging) compared to immaculately maintained environments. For example, Chloe argued that although her bedsit was a mess, she knew exactly where everything was and demonstrated this by pulling out a particular dress from one of the several heaps of clothes scattered around her room. Therefore, while the staff had particular views about how a home should look, they failed to realise that some of the young people may have held different meanings about home. Alternatively, in this latter example, given that 'home-making' practices are associated with self-care (Dyck et al., 2005), it may have been the case that Chloe had not learned these skills or that her messiness was reflective of her self-identity and interwoven with her alcohol problems.

'Out of Place' Routines

The final way in which the residents strengthened their belonging to the hostel through place-making actions was through using spaces in ways that were different to the norms and expectations of the staff. This section differs from discussions of substance use and vandalism in that the behaviours outlined here partially fell within the official rules of the hostel but they deviated from the typical day-to-day routines and norms. 'Routines' refer to people's movements through space and time (Moss and Richter, 2009) and the data examined here concern movements that were unusual or 'out of place' (Gieryn, 2000).

Games were typically activities that the staff exerted a degree of control over either by pre-arranging the games or monitoring games that had been spontaneously initiated by residents in the lounge. Now and again, some young people would play games in the bedsits which the staff disapproved of when it came to their attention. For example, I was informed by a staff member one evening that earlier in the day, some of the residents had started a water fight in the upstairs corridors. According to Claire (staff), when she had gone upstairs to put a stop to the water fight Amanda had become verbally abusive towards her and threatened to phone head office. This had "spoiled" the positive atmosphere there had been in the morning and she was now in a bad mood with the residents and hoped that several of them would sleep elsewhere that evening. On another

occasion, the residents were confronted about a game they had been playing which involved tying someone up, pushing them into the shower and turning the water on. The staff were concerned that this game was “inappropriate”, amounted to bullying and therefore had to stop. When I later asked the residents about this they thought it was hilarious that the staff were taking it so seriously and they argued that everyone had consented to being a part of the game; it was not bullying and it was done out of boredom. The fact that these games were disapproved of by the staff was yet another indicator of the normative differences between them and the residents. Being a part of these games was a form of belonging to the culture and material spaces in Kelldale as well as to fellow residents. Furthermore, the material spaces in the bedsits and corridors were key features of these games demonstrating how the young people transformed the typical meanings of these spaces into landscapes for play.

The dominant representations of Kelldale spaces were also altered when the residents entered spaces that were usually off-limits. In particular, the main office and garden were designated ‘staff spaces’³³ and yet throughout the fieldwork, these spaces were sometimes opened up to the young people either with or without staff permission. It was common for the residents to try and enter the staff office and usually when they did, they were instructed to leave. However, on a handful of occasions, some of the young people entered the office and spent a considerable amount of time there:

Danielle and Tom asked if they could get into the lounge and when the door was opened for them they came into the office instead...Danielle sat on one of the office chairs and leaned back comfortably making herself at home while Tom perched on a set of drawers next to the door. He picked up a magazine and started flicking through it.

(Field Notes, October 2013, Main Office)

This extract indicates that the young people quickly acted in ways to demonstrate that they belonged to these spaces even when they were usually ejected. The body language displayed by Tom and Danielle was slightly exaggerated which suggested that they were

³³ The difficulties I encountered in situating myself in these ‘staff spaces’ were discussed in Chapter 4

performing a sense of belonging rather than it being necessarily internalised (Goffman, 1959). Furthermore, on separate occasions when residents entered the office, they copied the activities that were usually carried out by the staff such as monitoring the CCTV cameras, checking the whiteboard to see which residents were currently in the hostel and pretending to ‘bing bong’ someone in their room. All of these behaviours could be interpreted as active place-making and ‘doing’ belonging. In addition, they reinforced the view that this was a staff space which had specific meanings, representations and expectations of conduct.

The back garden was another space that was off-limits as it was designated as a smoking area for the staff. However, during the summer months when the weather was hot, the staff allowed the young people to socialise in the garden. This began with an outdoor barbecue and the staff decided it would be alright for the residents to smoke outside rather than forcing them to go up to their bedsits. There was a fence that separated the garden from the carpark and the residents were instructed to stand on the outside of the fence on the carpark side so they were technically not in the garden. The young people interpreted this as being given permission to smoke in the garden whenever they wished despite some members of staff subsequently telling them that this was not the case:

Ryan then said that he wanted a fag and headed towards the back door leading out into the garden. He gestured for us to follow him which Nathan did. Matt and I sat for a minute debating what to do because we both knew this was against the rules. I said this to Ryan who said it’s not and they’re allowed to smoke as long as it’s on the other side of the fence and not in the garden.

(Field Notes, July 2013, Lounge)

Breaking down this rule offered the residents an additional space in which to carve out their own place and extended their sense of belonging to Kelldale. However, this was only temporary as it was not long before the previous rule was reinstated by management on the grounds of the importance of ensuring the staff had a space of their own away from the residents. This reasoning again highlighted the challenge of finding a balance

between Kelldale being the residents' living space but also the staff's workplace (Dorrer et al., 2010).

Whilst these examples concerned being given permission to access otherwise off-limits spaces, some residents also attempted to enter these spaces without permission. The window which separated the reception area and the office provided opportunities for residents to reach or climb through into the office. Usually this involved reaching through to pick up the 'bing bong' telephone or to pretend to steal items of stationery. During the occasion detailed above when Danielle and Tom were allowed to sit in the office for a while, Callum took it upon himself to climb through the window so he could join in. Usually these behaviours were out of curiosity to see how the staff would react. Occasionally, a young person would enter the office with a specific intent. For example, one evening I was sitting in the office alone writing notes while the staff and several residents were in the lounge preparing for 'tea and toast'³⁴. Matt had been barred from tea and toast as a consequence of not paying his rent³⁵ and the letter 'B' (for 'barred') was written next to his name on the office whiteboard to indicate this. In the lounge Matt was trying to convince the staff that he was not barred and when they were not looking, he ran into the office and quickly rubbed off the 'B' next to his name. He paused when he saw me and then held his finger to his lips to indicate that he did not want me to 'grass' on him. These actions suggested that Matt knew he was entering a forbidden space, one in which he did not fully belong. However, this resistant act, suggested he felt a degree of belonging as he felt able to take the chance in the first place and knew that the consequences of being caught would not be too severe. Arguably, when he realised I was there, this added slightly to his belonging in that space and moment as he knew that I was permitted to be there but would not tell the staff and therefore his secret was safe.

Finally, the midnight curfew paved the way for residents to be 'out of place' when they were supposed to be in their own bedsits. Sometimes, they waited until after the midnight curfew before leaving their bedsit and sneaking into someone else's. Since the staff did not typically conduct room checks throughout the night, if a resident successfully

³⁴ 'Tea and toast' was the name used in the hostel for supper that was provided to the residents every night between 10:30-11pm in the lounge

³⁵ Although the resident's Housing Benefit covered most of the costs of living in Kelldale, the young people were also expected to pay an additional £10 per week to cover costs such as 'tea and toast'. This was referred to as their 'rent'

managed to sneak into another room then she was able to remain there for the entire night. The challenge, therefore, was to get from one room to another without the staff catching her on CCTV. In a similar manner to using cannabis in the bedsits without being caught, the residents had developed certain tactics for doing this. Cara explained that they had become familiar with the habits of particular staff members when they were doing the night shift and therefore they knew which staff were more likely to monitor the CCTV cameras than others. Jordan informed me that he had figured out where the blind-spots on the cameras were and he ran as quickly as possible to these certain parts of the corridors where he would pause before continuing to the next spot until he reached his destination. Some of the residents took greater risks by climbing out of their window and scaling the roof to enter another window. Tom and Danielle – who were in a boyfriend-girlfriend relationship – often did this as their bedsits were next door to each other. The staff were aware that this happened because usually when morning room checks were conducted, the two residents would be found in bed together. However, Tom and Danielle always claimed that one of them had simply woken up early and walked into the other's room.

Conclusion

This chapter has examined the spatial dimension of the *socio-spatial*-self relations within which people and their actions are embedded. More specifically, this chapter analysed the transformation of material spaces in Kelldale, into places with constructed meanings. Existing literature has concentrated on the ways in which homeless people's use of space is controlled as they are pushed out to the margins of society in order not to compromise the commercial purposes of prime urban spaces (Smith, 1996). However, once homeless people have been accommodated in hostels, situated far enough away from prime spaces to meet these objectives, little has been said about how they continue to face spatial restrictions inside temporary accommodation. This chapter addresses this gap in homelessness literature as it has revealed the form that social control measures take in temporary accommodation through discussing the multiple 'disciplinary mechanisms' implemented in Kelldale to monitor and control the movements and behaviours of the young people. These mechanisms meant that the young people's belonging to the hostel was conditional on their 'appropriate' behaviours and, despite being their temporary

'home', Kelldale was not their 'backstage' as the residents had to maintain certain performances to meet the staff's approval while concealing their unpermitted place-making activities. As well as adding to the homelessness literature, this notion of conditional belonging and 'playing the game' extends May's (2013) work as it indicates the power underpinning the reciprocity that is needed for belonging to occur

The 'disciplinary mechanisms' in Kelldale ensured that as soon as a young person approached the front door of the building, the staff could watch them as they entered the building and make their way up to the bedsits. There were no cameras inside the bedsits but the use of room checks and the 'bing bong' intercom meant that the staff could continue to monitor the young people, albeit to a lesser extent. Room checks represented a contentious issue. On the one hand, the staff felt it was necessary, on the grounds of health and safety, to enter the bedsits every few hours regardless of whether a young person was present. On the other hand, this compromised the privacy of the residents; potentially putting them in vulnerable positions if the staff walked in while they were sleeping, naked or having sex. The example of room checks highlighted the challenging negotiations that are required when one physical space (i.e. the Kelldale building) has multiple dominant meanings such as being both a temporary 'home' and a workplace. This tension was also apparent in the time restrictions of the lounge and the use of the garden as a smoking area. As will be discussed in Chapter 8, this tension calls into question whether temporary accommodation is the most effective means for responding to homelessness and the findings here add to the growing interest in the Housing First approach.

Risk was also a theme that emerged through the various measures employed to control the young people's entries to, and exits from the building. Risk assessments were carried out when a resident returned to the hostel if there was suspicion that they may pose a threat to those already inside. Protecting the people inside occasionally had the unintended consequence of increasing the risks to those on the outside, such as the case of Chloe taking a seizure caused by rapidly drinking a bottle of wine in order to 'pass' the risk assessment before the effects kicked in. Similarly, forcing residents to 'take a walk' as punishment for consuming drugs and alcohol in the building was believed by the young people to increase their risk of running into 'trouble'. Interestingly, none of the young people explicitly recognised that the alternative would have been for the staff

to call the police. In this sense, the risk associated with ‘taking a walk’ could be viewed as a consequence of the country’s prohibitive approach to drug use and its associated legislation. In other words, this particular finding feeds into broader discussions about the need to rethink the ‘war on drugs’ agenda and to provide safe spaces for substance use to occur; this is explored further in Chapter 8.

While these negotiations of space played out regularly on a daily basis, many of the young people found the ‘cracks’ within the tightly controlled and monitored spaces. These cracks were opportunities to exercise agency and, in this chapter, agency was interpreted through place-making activities (Wilson, Houmøller and Bernays, 2012). Place-making – carving out a meaningful place through the use of sensory engagement – was apparent in many aspects of Kelldale life. Such activities ranged from those tolerated or endorsed by the staff to those which explicitly broke the rules and, in some cases, the law. When place-making was permitted, such activities were usually aligned with the dominant representations of a space, such as doing laundry in the laundry room. When place-making involved breaking the rules, the dominant representations were transgressed and, as such, were interpreted as forms of resistance. Through actively engaging with the physical features of the hostel – including the shell of the building; its internal layout and décor; its material furnishings; objects; and the young people’s own personal possessions – and making use of all available senses, the young people were able to develop connections between their self-identities and their physical environment. This spatial connection is what May (2013) has referred to as ‘sensory belonging’. In this way, place-making can be understood as the ‘doing’ of sensory belonging, since belonging is not a static concept, but an ongoing, embodied experience. Thus, place-making offers a useful addition to May’s (2013) theory of belonging as it symbolises belonging in practice.

Following this argument, the use of drugs and alcohol and its varying repercussions existed in a dialectical relationship with place-making and sensory belonging. The routines and rituals of preparing and using drugs, along with the experiences of intoxication, served to give alternative meaning to parts of the building which, in turn, created sensory connections that reinforced and incentivised further drug use. Using drugs in the en-suite bathrooms, for example, transformed their dominant representations from being places to shower and to use the toilet, to places to get stoned. In doing so, not only did it increase the likelihood that the young people would continue to repeat this

behaviour in that particular place, it also enhanced positive familiarity with the place – a key characteristic of sensory belonging (May, 2013). In other words, drug use always occurs ‘in place’ and by using drugs repeatedly in the same place, the sensory landscape becomes a part of the drug use experience. In this way, the meaning of substance use becomes entangled with the meaning of places. In Kelldale, just as games, domestic chores, photographs and vandalism were used as tools for carving out meaning in a tightly regulated place, so too was substance use.

This conception of substance use adds to both the addictions literature and to May’s (2013) theory. It is suggested that this is the first time that substance use has been theorised as a means of facilitating sensory belonging. Many researchers from varying disciplines have noted the significance of place – especially in terms of the relationship between nightclubs, alcohol and drugs – and it is well known that environmental factors can trigger relapse if they are associated with a person’s substance use biography (West and Brown, 2013). As discussed in Chapter 2, however, the majority of substance use research is framed in medical and psychological terms, with sociological explanations being the least developed. A systematic connection within the literature regarding the influence of place on substance use, in order to construct a useful theoretical framework, has yet to be made. Sensory belonging is one way to advance understandings of how substance use is mediated by place, and the findings in this chapter offer a starting point for taking this forward.

Beginning with spatiality in the endeavour to explore experiences of homelessness and substance use enables a picture to emerge of how spaces and places are dialectically related to the other two components in the web of relations used to frame this study – sociality and self-identity. Sociality or society was apparent in this chapter through the constructions of legislation, policies, staff expectations of conduct and social norms which structured the movements and actions of the young people. On the other hand, self-identities were expressed through personalising the bedsits, games, arts projects and vandalism, to name a few examples. While this chapter emphasised the spatial component in the interconnected web of relations, the next two chapters attend to sociality and self-identity respectively.

Chapter 6: Social Relationships, Belonging and Substance Use

Introduction

This chapter moves on to taking a closer look at the young people's socio-emotional relationships and thus emphasises the 'socio' component of the socio-spatial-self framework. However, as previously discussed, each of the components in this web are dialectically related and so examinations of sociality in this chapter continue to overlap with spatiality and self-identity. Substance use is prioritised in this analysis because it emerged as a substantial feature that was interwoven within the relationships that the young people held with various groups, although other aspects of relationships are also highlighted. As Zinberg (1984) argued, the social environment or 'setting' is the most influential aspect in a person's substance use, with social relationships determining sanctions and rituals that place limits on one's intoxication. Relational belonging is one of three forms of belonging (May, 2013) and is arguably the most important as it is concerned with the connections between two or more people and can cause a substantial amount of emotional pain when such belonging is compromised (May, 2015). Given Mead and Blumer's assertions that mind, self and society exist only because people interact with one another, personal relationships can be viewed as the most fundamental elements of meaningful experience. Examining how people interact provides insights into individual and group self-identities, the meanings that people associate with different objects and people's actions and performances in daily life (Mead, 1934; Blumer, 1969).

The chapter is structured according to the groups of people that many of the residents had relations with. The first is the family because, despite literature suggesting that homeless youth have little family support, some Kelldale residents were still involved with their families but to varying degrees. Using family as a starting point enables an exploration of the young people's journeys prior to Kelldale which were characterised by different forms of family breakdown. It is argued that, for some residents, being forced to leave the family home represented a 'critical moment' in their transition through the life-course which likely altered the connections they felt towards their parents. The section proceeds by examining how family belonging had been retained despite turbulent histories. Not

only was substance use a feature of their family relationships before Kelldale, it remained a central issue that could facilitate or weaken feelings of connection.

The chapter then explores the relationships that some of the residents had with each other and this represents the largest section to reflect the centrality of friendships and romances in their everyday lives. Borrowing from Bourdieu, May (2013) asserted that belonging develops through knowing the 'rules of the game' and this section begins by analysing the experiences of newcomers who had to rapidly learn the ways of the hostel and, more importantly, the existing residents, if they wished to be accepted. The ways in which some of the young people used social media are also analysed to demonstrate the digital component of their relational belonging. Some friendships were further characterised by shared cultural interests in drinking alcohol, smoking tobacco and using cannabis, and a proportion of the young people had devised systems to share resources and intoxication experiences. Substance use, it is argued, dominated the daily lives of some of the young people and this was a group activity that enhanced both cultural and relational belonging.

The final part of this chapter considers the relationships that some of the residents had with Kelldale's staff. The staff appeared to enact different performances for the residents in different circumstances (Goffman, 1959) and this had implications for the young people's feelings towards them. On the one hand, they were 'rule-enforcers' and consequently the residents felt negatively towards them if they believed the rules served the staff's purposes over their own. On the other, they provided care and support which appeared to be critical in meeting the young people's emotional needs. However, from the residents' perspectives, care was not always received and this had negative consequences for their fragile relationships.

It is important to note that the residents held significant relationships with other groups of people that are not included in this study. Notably, many had friendships and romances with young people who did not live in Kelldale. These appeared to offer an invaluable form of support as often a resident would spend the night sleeping over at a friend's house, thus providing them with an opportunity to have time away from the hostel. However, given the design of the study which prioritised data collection from inside Kelldale, data concerning these other relationships were limited. Nonetheless, examining relationships with family, fellow residents and staff provided valuable insights into the

social contexts within which the residents were embedded and how these connected to their substance use.

Family Belonging in the Face of Family Breakdown

Since a person's sense of self develops in interactions with other people, the family is often regarded as a key source of relational belonging (Mead, 1934; May, 2013) although it cannot be assumed that all children experience connectedness with their parents or carers (Emond, 2014). Since family breakdown is the leading cause of youth homelessness (Johnsen and Quilgars, 2009) and is associated with substance use problems (Green, Mitchell and Bruun, 2013) it would be expected that family belonging in these circumstances would be compromised. Yet many young people who have experienced family breakdown, even in the most extreme cases of violence and abuse, maintain positive relationships with their families and/or express a desire to improve the quality of these relationships (Barker, 2012; Green, Mitchell and Bruun, 2013). Furthermore, extended family members can play a crucial role in the lives of homeless young people (Oliver and Cheff, 2014). Many of the Kelldale residents occasionally referred to continuing relationships with siblings, grandparents, aunts, uncles and cousins but the majority of data collected concerned their parents. These parental relationships are the primary focus in this section but with the acknowledgement that relational belonging was felt between some of the residents and their extended family.

Before Kelldale

When asked about the circumstances that had led the young people to becoming homeless and living in Kelldale, only a few talked about their families; partly because it had been some time since they had lived with a relative. Blair had been living in the care system followed by at least one other hostel prior to Kelldale, whereas Craig had been a rough sleeper for several months in addition to sofa surfing. Andy explained that he had maintained his own council flat for seven months before he voluntarily moved out otherwise he would have been evicted for anti-social behaviour. Tom and Danielle had lived in several council flats and hostels prior to Kelldale.

Those residents who did talk about their families in relation to their housing situation were typically younger (16-18 years old) and had had a shorter period of time between living in the family home and in Kelldale. Callum, for example had been living with his father:

I just turned sixteen and got kicked out, that's just what happened.
(Callum)

(Field Notes, October 2013, Lounge)

In Scotland, 16 is the legal age at which a person can live on their own and Callum's statement suggested that his father had only let him live with him until this age, although it appeared that there were also tensions between Callum and his father that may have contributed to his homelessness. This tension was apparent when Callum first moved into Kelldale and was waiting for his father to drop off a TV for him. When Callum told the staff that this was going to be happening he had clarified with a staff member that his father was not allowed to come into the building. He was reminded about the rules forbidding visitors to enter the premises. Callum responded:

No that's good! I don't want him to come in. (Callum)

(Field Notes, October 2013, Reception)

Callum displayed a degree of anger which was unsurprising given that his father had recently kicked him out of the family home. By stating that he did not want his father to enter Kelldale, Callum seemed to regain some of the control in this relationship. The socio-spatial dimensions of Callum's experience suggest that Kelldale was Callum's 'backstage' – a place where he could relax and not have to perform for his father (Goffman, 1959). Backstages are also areas in which a person can control who can and cannot enter. In this case, the staff, not Callum, had control over this but the staff-enforced rules aligned with Callum's preferences and served as an important emotional purpose as he would not have to face his father. In this sense, the staff could be understood as a team of actors working together in a performance front-of-stage (via the

telephone or front door) as a means of preserving the backstage area for themselves, Callum and the other residents (Goffman, 1959).

Arguing with parents was identified by three residents – Nathan, Jordan and Matt – as the reason for them becoming homeless. When Nathan turned 16 he was told to leave home after frequently arguing with his mother which culminated in stealing his mother's car and accidentally bumping it against the side of their house. Nathan described an extensive list of places that he had lived and slept in after being evicted from his family home including a period of time at Kelldale nearly two years ago as well as other hostels:

I turned 16 it was just chaos, got asked to leave, moved into Springton Place, put into Kelldale here, put into Jamieson, ended up fighting with staff, got kicked out of Jamieson a year later and back in here...I've slept rough as well, slept on a park bench...just a night...fucking brutal! You wake up with a fucking crow poking at your head. (Nathan)

(Interview, August 2013, Lounge)

Similarly, Jordan described a period in his life which involved a pattern of being kicked out of his home as a result of arguing with his father, sofa surfing with a friend or walking around outside all night, and then returning home after a day or two only for the cycle to repeat itself.

Although Matt's homelessness was the consequence of family conflict, his circumstances differed from others in that he was legally not allowed to return home. He had lived with his family and one night had ended up drunk and fought with his father and older brother. The police were called and Matt was arrested. He was charged and released on bail with the legal condition that he was no longer allowed to remain in the family home:

The hostel scene aye, I've been in two other hostels before here. It's no good man, all because of a drunken night man. I got papped oot. My maw and da' didnae think I would have got the jail though, didnae think I would have got bailed oot...of my address to end up in a hostel. (Matt)

(Interview, July 2013, Lounge)

He had therefore been legally forced to leave his family home with Matt, suggesting that perhaps his parents would have allowed him to stay despite the violence that had occurred through being intoxicated.

To some degree, becoming homeless represented a ‘critical moment’ in many young people’s biographies and transitions to adulthood. ‘Critical moments’, ‘turning points’ or ‘epiphanies’ are events that punctuate people’s lives and that can change their ‘fundamental meaning structures’ (Thomson et al., 2002: 337). Some young people, such as Jordan, appeared to ‘fall in’ to homelessness in that they moved back and forth between homelessness and living with parents until their homeless periods became longer and eventually full-time. Others, like Callum, Nathan and Matt, had a more instant shift from the parental home to homelessness. Through emphasising that the incident with his father and brother had led him to join the “hostel scene”, Matt identified it as a critical moment which altered his transition to adulthood and sense of self.

Family Belonging Despite Turbulent Relationships

The circumstances described above only scratch the surface of the complexities present in the relationships between the Kelldale residents and their families. Since parents appeared to be the instigators of some young people’s homelessness and other problems, it would have been anticipated that these residents would have cut ties with them. This, however, was not the case as most retained contact with their parents and some even appeared to have relatively close relationships. For example, Vince described a strong bond between him and his mother who was suffering from a health condition meaning she only had a few more years left to live. He explained how difficult it was for him to see his mother’s health deteriorate as she had always been an active and outgoing person.

When his mum was first diagnosed she only told Vince and his dad and siblings. She asked them not to tell any of the extended family. Later, when his aunts and uncles found out, they expressed shock that he had kept it a secret for nearly 3 months – at this Vince said he “broke down”.

(Field Notes, May 2013, Lounge)

Despite this closeness with his mother, when I asked Vince why he no longer lived with his parents, his response was simply “it’s complicated” and he implied that his use of cannabis had something to do with it although he did not elaborate.

The strength of Vince’s relational belonging with his mother was exceptional compared to the other residents. Matt’s mother gave him regular amounts of money and tried to treat him to a family meal for his 18th birthday, indicating that his mother wished to maintain the role of carer and that she still felt a connection to her son. While Matt was happy to receive his mother’s money, some of his actions indicated that he was less accepting of his mother’s wishes. On one occasion, his mother had given him money specifically to get his hair cut but Matt spent the money on cannabis and Craig attempted to cut his hair. Similarly, Matt initially agreed to go to the birthday meal his mother had organised but at the last minute he decided to attend a house party with his friends instead. During adolescence, friendships overtake family relations with regards to their significance for self-identity and future thinking (Antalíková et al., 2011) and in many ways Matt’s actions were consistent with this. Although this literature does not dismiss the continual importance of family in the lives of young people, it suggests that the fluidity of the self prioritises some forms of relational belonging over others at different points in the life-course. With the addition of Matt’s difficult past with his family, it appeared that his sense of self and consequent behaviours were being shaped by living in Kelldale and his new friends to a greater extent than did his mother’s influence.

The relational belonging felt between some of the residents and their parents persisted in the face of painful and turbulent experiences characterised by arguments, distrust, and being kicked out of home. This persistent nature of belonging was epitomised by the desire of some of the residents to move into a flat or house near to where their parents were living. Craig, Nathan, Andy and Jordan all stated that they wished to apply for a

council property in the area where one or both of their parents lived indicating a sense of belonging both to the relationships and to the place. Nathan was shocked that a staff member suggested it might be problematic for him to live near his mother:

Why on earth would I have a problem living next to my mum? (Nathan)

(Field Notes, July 2013, Lounge)

Andy's situation, however, demonstrated that despite his desire to develop a close relationship with his family, this was not always reciprocated. His mother and grandmother had both died some time before, leaving Andy with no immediate family. In 2011 he met his father for the first time and had subsequently kept in touch with him. Andy explained that he felt a connection to his father although he described only brief encounters with him. Despite not having known them for very long, Andy thought of his father, as well as his father's pregnant fiancée and their unborn baby, as his family. Although Andy stated that he wanted to continue strengthening his relationship with his father and father's family, he did not explain why this was or what his feelings about it were. However, during one conversation in which we discussed his father's upcoming wedding, I asked Andy if he thought he would be invited, to which he replied:

Aye of course! They have to invite me! (Andy)

(Field Notes, June 2013, Lounge)

This suggested that Andy felt there was enough of a connection to warrant an invitation despite the brief time they had known each other. In addition, Andy demonstrated his desire for family connection by taking the bold decision to register for a council house near to where they lived which happened to be in an unfamiliar town, 30-miles away from Kelldale, his friends and his girlfriend. He was successful and was allocated a house in this new town. However, shortly before moving in, he learned that his father and family were planning to move away from the area. In giving me this news, Andy explained that he found this amusing and ironic, yet it was clear in his tone of voice that he was unsettled. Rather than moving into his new house, Andy remained in the city and moved in with his girlfriend. Given that 'not belonging' – or 'misrecognition' – affects a person's sense of

self as well as how he views those who have rejected him (May, 2015), it is possible that the act of his father moving away reshaped how Andy understood himself and his father, while his relationship with his girlfriend may have buffered some of the negative emotional impact.

Substance Use: Damaging or Enhancing Family Relationships?

As with many other aspects of the young people's lives, substance use was a feature in some of their family relationships. The use of cannabis and alcohol was mentioned by several residents as playing a part in the arguments that occurred between them and their parents that ultimately led to them being kicked out of the family home, thus lending weight to the evidence that substance use can be a causal factor of homelessness (Neale, 2001). In addition to these past relationships, some of the young people's continuing family relationships were also tied to substance use. Chloe, Jack and Craig all mentioned that they drank alcohol alongside their parents:

Jack told me it's his birthday on Monday and when I asked what he's going to do he said:

Get steamin³⁶ wi' ma family.

(Field Notes, June 2013, Lounge)

Likewise, Chloe and Craig (who were in a girlfriend-boyfriend relationship) spent one Saturday night at two different house parties getting drunk: the first was at Craig's uncle's house and the second was at his mother's. In these situations, alcohol was used to celebrate and have fun. Similarly, Amanda, Craig, Ryan and Liam all mentioned drinking or smoking cannabis with siblings and cousins at parties or when they were 'hanging out'. In these cases, alcohol and cannabis appeared to strengthen the sense of relational and cultural belonging between the residents and their relatives.

³⁶ 'Steamin' is a Scottish slang word that means drunk

In contrast, several of the residents alluded to the negative side of substance use in relation to their families. Jordan returned to his family home regularly to visit his two younger sisters but had been told by his parents that if he brought drugs anywhere near his sisters then he would be banned from visiting again. Danielle admitted that her mother was an “alcoholic” and Tom strongly implied that this was also the case for his mother:

My maw just sits in the house all the time wi’ a bottle. (Tom)

(Field Notes, October 2013, Reception)

Rather than drinking alcohol as a shared experience, Stephanie actively avoided her mother when she knew she was drunk. After a small fire had occurred in Stephanie’s bedsit, she had phoned her mother to find out if it would be possible to stay with her for the night as the fire damage meant it was not possible to sleep there. However she discovered that her mother was drunk which meant there was no way Stephanie could stay with her and she described her mother as “mental” to sum up the reason for this. In the end, Stephanie ended up sleeping in Chloe’s bedsit for the night and Chloe went to stay with her own mother.

In many ways, the data in this section fit with existing literature about the relationships between substance use, youth and homelessness (Neale, 2001; Johnsen and Quilgars, 2009). For some, there was evidence of substance use being a causal factor in their homelessness and for straining current family relationships. When considering relational belonging as a sense of reciprocal connection between two parties (May, 2013), substance use arguably weakened this belonging. However, it seemed to have the opposite effect for those family relationships in which both parties engaged in the shared cultural practice of becoming intoxicated. This highlights the importance of reciprocity in May’s (2013) theory of belonging and demonstrates the symbolic interactionist argument that an object (in this case drugs and alcohol) can have different meanings depending on the circumstances in which it is used and how this use is perceived by others (Mead, 1934; Blumer, 1969).

Friendships and Romances

During adolescence and early adulthood, peer relationships become increasingly significant and can overtake familial relationships as the primary source of socialisation, identity and support (Antalíková et al., 2011; Emond, 2014). These peer relationships sometimes develop into sexual ones which are often salient features of the transition from childhood to adulthood (Elley, 2011). For young people who are homeless, such relationships can be even more significant in the absence of stable and supportive family relationships (Ennett, Bailey and Federman, 1999). Sometimes young homeless people refer to close friends as family members because, for many, friendships offer the companionship, love, trust and support that they had not received from their biological kin (Stablein, 2011). However, such friendships have also been argued to entrench marginality, as homeless friendship groups can reinforce ‘deviant’ behaviours including substance use and criminal involvement (Barker, 2013). While it is acknowledged that the Kelldale residents had friends and partners outside of the hostel, this section examines the relationships the residents had with each other.

Learning the Rules of the Game

Within groups of young people, individuals adopt different roles based on their personalities, knowledge and length of time spent with the group (Emond, 2003; Robinson, 2009). This is connected to Bourdieu’s (1977; 1979 in May, 2013) argument that an individual feels comfortable in a situation where her habitus³⁷ corresponds with the social field³⁸ and consequently she has an awareness of what to do, how and when. May (2013: 81) associated this understanding of the ‘rules of the game’ with belonging: those more familiar with these rules or norms will feel a stronger sense of connectedness to the group and situation. Similarly, she asserted that there are ‘hierarchies of belonging’ whereby, on a societal level, certain groups who do not conform to politically favoured cultural norms and values, do not belong as much as other groups do. However, belonging, according to May (2013), is inter-subjectively constructed rather than

³⁷ Bourdieu’s notion of ‘habitus’ is defined by May (2013: 50) as ‘habitual ways of being in and seeing the world’ which are reflective of the social fields one is immersed in.

³⁸ A social field, according to Bourdieu, is the combination of geographical space and social interaction (May, 2013)

objectively determined and it is argued here that, within the context of the Kelldale resident group, the notion of a belonging hierarchy can be viewed on a micro-level.

These ideas, along with Goffman's (1959) work on the presentation of self, help to understand how the residents responded when someone new moved into Kelldale. The arrival of a new resident was a large source of excitement in the hostel and when this happened, the newcomer was assessed at the first opportunity which subsequently determined the actions of the group:

Me: *So see when someone new comes in, how do...*

Chloe: *We terrorise them!*

Craig: *It depends on who they are, what they look like and all that, if they get terrorised.*

(Focus Group, October 2013, Lounge)

The residents were vague on the details about being 'terrorised' and, when questioned further, they could not pinpoint specific examples of this activity. Furthermore, no one could identify occasions where they had been terrorised by others. Therefore, although the more established residents wished to portray an image of being tough so that newcomers understood their place as being at the bottom of the hierarchy, the manifestation of this was more subtle than outward attempts to bully or haze new residents into submission which the word 'terrorise' suggested. For example, during the focus group, the participants suggested names for 'the book' but when Callum spoke up, he was quickly told that he did not get a say in this discussion as he was new and had not contributed to the study as much as the others had. The tone used when making this assertion was a mixture of asserting authority while also being humorous. This enabled the residents to put Callum in his place but in a manner which conveyed the message of 'no hard feelings, this is just the way things are'. Therefore, from a Goffmanian (1959) perspective, the more established residents attempted to convey the impression of being tough but friendly in order to assert authority without creating animosity.

When a new resident arrived in Kelldale, they were subjected to an apparent induction ritual by existing residents consisting of making assessments based on first impressions, followed by questioning and then educating them about life in Kelldale. Appearances mattered when making a first impression and this was evident on the day that a new resident was introduced to the group by a staff member in the lounge. The newcomer was wearing a Rangers Football Club scarf and after he left, Callum told me:

I don't know if I can be friends with that guy, it's the scarf. (Callum)

(Field Notes, October 2013, Lounge)

Callum went on to explain that it was not problematic that the new resident was a Rangers supporter but that he was wearing the scarf, with the implication that displaying a football scarf is associated with hooliganism and violence (Dunning, Murphy and Williams, 1986). Thus, whether the new resident intended to or not, he had given Callum the initial impression that he was someone to be avoided.

In addition to appearances, a newcomer's demeanour also influenced first impressions. Although I had not been present when Blair had entered Kelldale for the first time, it was noticeable that many of the residents did not like him from the beginning. Andy explained his reasoning:

Ooft I don't trust him man, he's too quiet. My maw always said you shouldn't trust the quiet ones. (Andy)

(Field Notes, July 2013, Lounge)

Blair's stay in Kelldale was relatively short and he tended to keep to himself which provided further evidence to those who disliked him that he was untrustworthy. As will be discussed in Chapter 7, not all residents chose to spend time with the young people who constituted the main group of participants in this research. Those who were not part of this group were usually non-English speaking migrants who did not socialise in the hostel. However Blair, who was a Scottish native, often did remain in his bedsit during

the day which the others interpreted as odd and in turn they judged him to be strange and someone not to be associated with.

However, in the majority of cases new residents were welcomed as they symbolised a potential new friend. If the first impression of a new resident was favourable, then the young people proceeded to question him about various aspects of his life. In particular, residents were always interested to find out if they shared mutual friends with the newcomer which was often the case if he had stayed in other homeless accommodation prior to Kelldale. Similarly, it was important to work out if the new resident smoked tobacco, drank alcohol, and/or used other drugs (particularly cannabis). Even more vital was the question of whether or not the newcomer had any of these substances that he was willing to share. Despite his reservations about the scarf-wearing resident, when Callum learned that he had brought a bottle of vodka into the hostel and was willing to share, any initial bad feeling seemed to subside. Sharing mutual acquaintances, prior experience of hostel-living and substance use were all symbols of cultural belonging and indicated that a resident already had knowledge about the 'rules of the game' (May, 2013). This in turn paved the way for developing further belonging, specifically to the Kelldale culture and the current residents.

Although newcomers were still regarded as such for weeks or months after their arrival, the initial questioning allowed the residents to ascertain what type of person the newcomer was and how he might fit in with existing group dynamics. Therefore a transition occurred between being an initial stranger who might threaten the status quo, to being "alright". This early acceptance could lay the groundwork for a sense of relational belonging to develop between the newcomer and established group. In order to help the newcomer to learn the 'rules of the game', the next step in this process was for the residents to educate him about the ways of life in Kelldale and the people there:

The new resident, Matt, came into the lounge with Ryan. Referring to Matt, Ryan said to the group:

Can you believe this boy hasn't chapped on everyone's doors yet to meet everyone?

Andy, Tom and Ryan started telling Matt about all the residents. Stephanie came into the lounge and Andy said to Matt:

That's Stephanie that I was telling you about. I think you've met everyone now.

(Field Notes, July 2013, Lounge)

The process of making an initial judgement of a resident based on appearance and demeanour; followed by questioning; and then educating, was typical in most cases. Sometimes, a newcomer would already know an existing resident which could speed up the process of acceptance. For example, Chloe already knew Craig when she moved into the hostel, and Liam (who moved in after Ryan) was the cousin of Ryan's girlfriend. In these situations, Craig and Ryan were able to convey their knowledge and personal opinions about the newcomers to the other residents. Positive endorsements meant that the newcomers, Chloe and Liam, were not subjected to the same level of questioning as complete strangers and were quickly integrated into the group. However, having a relationship prior to Kelldale did not always go in the newcomer's favour. Blair's exclusion by the others was partly facilitated by Nathan who had lived with Blair previously in another hostel. Nathan explained to me and his fellow residents that Blair was "trouble" and that he planned to stay away from him. Through establishing a positive self-impression among the group (Goffman, 1959), individual residents had achieved the clout to convey their impressions of newcomers who, by association, could profit or lose out from these pre-assessments. Chloe and Liam benefitted greatly from the endorsements of Craig and Ryan respectively, whereas Blair suffered through being denigrated by Nathan. This suffering came in the form of Blair being ostracised from the group.

Relational and Cultural Belonging Online

Assuming a newcomer was judged to be a friend, an additional part of the induction process was exchanging contact details. This did not only involve swapping phone numbers but also adding each other to Facebook and BlackBerry Messenger (BBM).

BBM allows people to send individual or group texts and voice messages via the internet. Because this service is free and easily accessed by mobile phone, it was the main online method of communication between the residents and their friends. The young people used BBM prolifically and it was common for them to send messages to other residents who were in a different part of the hostel or even in the same room. This allowed many to communicate in a covert manner so that nobody else around them could eavesdrop on their conversations. The group dynamics that were played out in a public nature, therefore, represented only one part of the residents' social lives as the constant checking of mobile phones and texting indicated that the young people were leading a parallel social life online.

Engaging in this online community appeared to strengthen relational belonging. Being able to sit in a room and physically socialise with other residents while at the same time texting another resident who was, for example, in her bedsit, allowed a young person to maintain her relationships with several people in different places at the same time. Furthermore, technology presented a solution to the young people's need to socialise after midnight when the curfew was implemented. In addition, BBM could be used to alert residents in one part of the hostel that something was happening elsewhere. One night, Andy refused to leave Amanda's bedsit after the curfew started and this escalated into a stand-off between the two young people and the staff. The staff threatened to call the police but Andy and Amanda did not believe them. Ryan, who was standing in reception when the staff began to call the police, sent Amanda a BBM message to tell them what was happening. This prompted the two residents to run to reception to apologise in order to avoid being kicked out for the night.

BBM therefore facilitated online friendships and could be used as a means of pacifying conflict. However, social media was also a place where conflict could escalate. The following extract illustrates the complexities of socialising online and how this was interwoven with the offline world:

Cara and Chloe stood typing BBM messages into their phones and talking to each other in some sort of code. They seemed to know something and could both see the same BBM messages. [Cara explained that they] were messaging Amanda because earlier this evening Amanda and Andy had broken up. Amanda had posted on Facebook saying it was the hardest thing she's ever had to do, then a while later she posted saying they were back together, and then a third comment which made the girls think the couple were off again. Cara explained that Andy had accidentally left his Facebook logged on and Amanda had read his private messages. He had been sending messages to his ex-girlfriend saying that he still loves her.

(Field Notes, August 2013, Main Office)

This extract highlights how social media perpetuated a relationship problem which was then made public through Amanda's Facebook posts. As Marwick and Boyd (2014) have noted, the visibility of young people's problems has increased with the advent of social media websites. Platforms such as Facebook have transformed interpersonal relationships, meaning that conflict can be aired in front of an online audience (in this case Cara and Chloe) who then can act as jury members by 'liking' or commenting to add their opinions. The reach of 'front stage' impression management (Goffman, 1959) has greatly expanded and been transformed through the use of social media with evidence that this can negatively impact on people's relationships (Clayton, Nagurney and Smith, 2013).

Nonetheless, technology was a central feature of the residents' friendships and romances. Several of the young people took pleasure in showing me 'selfies'³⁹ they had taken with their friends and partners. These photographs were important as they represented the closeness of these relationships. It was significant for someone to possess a selfie with their boyfriend/girlfriend as this acted as a status symbol of their commitment to each other. Shipley (2015: 404) has argued that selfies are a new 'multimedia genre of autobiography or memoir that makes the image maker the protagonist of stories of his or her own composition'. Taking selfies can be a means of creating and documenting a

³⁹ A 'selfie' is a photograph that a person has taken of oneself usually via mobile phone

person's transition through the life-course in real-time. Uploading selfies to platforms such as Facebook could be understood as another attempt at making connections between the self and other people while simultaneously presenting oneself in a favourable light (Goffman, 1959; May, 2013). This may be particularly significant for young people in marginalised positions who arguably have to work harder at positive self-impressions within a context of social disapproval at their perceived 'spoiled identities' (Goffman, 1963).

Similarly, for Chloe, stating her 'relationship status' on social media sites was a means of portraying a public image of commitment and being 'off the market' (Orosz et al., 2015). When an unknown male tried to contact her on BBM, Chloe exclaimed:

He must think I'm a wee dirty 'cause it clearly says on my profile that I'm goin' wi' Craig! (Chloe)

(Field Notes, June 2013, Lounge)

This statement is indicative of how Chloe engaged in 'front stage' work (Goffman, 1959) via her BBM profile. Disapproval of the male for assuming she would want to have sex despite knowing she was in a relationship, enabled Chloe to present herself as adhering to the norm of monogamy. Not only is this norm specific to Western cultures, it is also associated with adulthood (Seidman and Rieder, 1994). In doing so, she simultaneously rejected being labelled as someone who sleeps around. This label is strongly gendered since females who have sex with multiple partners are highly stigmatised in Western cultures as was depicted in Chloe's use of the phrase "wee dirty" which is a Scottish equivalent for the term 'slut' and is almost always attributed to females (Reger, 2015). Proclaiming herself as being in a relationship on BBM can be viewed as serving three functions: (1) it symbolised Chloe's sense of relational belonging and commitment to Craig; (2) it indicated her knowledge of the 'rules of the game' for her wider culture which condemns adultery and stigmatises sexually active females; and (3) it pointed to Chloe's adult identity.

Reciprocity, Drug Use and Degrees of Belonging

Among many of the Kelldale residents, various forms of sharing and exchanging took place. Cigarettes, cannabis and money were the main items at the centre of the informal economy that took up a significant portion of the residents' time. This system was reliant on two key aspects for it to work effectively and in a way that enabled all parties to feel as though it was fair. First, the system relied on reciprocity: each party was expected to contribute what they could and in turn would receive their share. Second, underlying this reciprocity was trust. If one person was going to contribute to the 'pot' then he had to trust that others would do the same, otherwise he would end up giving more than he received. This system was summed up by Amanda and Andy:

Andy: *You scratch their back and they'll scratch yours kind of thing.*

Amanda: *Like, if you've not got any fags and somebody else does, they'll give you a fag, then when you've got fags you'll give them a fag. We just help each other out.*

Andy: *Help each other out.*

Amanda: *It's not like a... I don't like him, I'm not going to give him a fag. Everybody gets on so it's not just one specific person that you're going to help out.*

Andy: *Just help everybody.*

(Interview, Amanda's Flat, August 2013)

This system was seen as necessary in Kelldale for the simple reason that the residents had little money and so it was a means of making their money stretch as far as possible. If someone had no money and could not afford to buy tobacco, for example, she would ask around to find out if anyone was willing to share. Given that this was on the understanding of reciprocity, when a resident did not return the favour, this caused bad

feeling. For example, Stephanie frequently complained that she shared her cigarettes more often than she received from the others.

In contrast to swapping cigarettes on a one-for-one basis, the residents who used cannabis regularly pooled their money together to buy a quantity that could then be shared around. There were three main reasons for this. First, cannabis is usually purchased as a chunk of resin or bag of buds and leaves and therefore the quantity is intended to be divided into smaller amounts. Rather than dividing a large quantity into lots of small ones for a single person to use, it was more convenient to divide it into medium-sized amounts that are sufficient for multiple people to use in one sitting. Second, because of its illegality, it is more difficult to purchase cannabis compared to cigarettes. It was easier for one resident to buy for everyone from one dealer rather than each resident having to source cannabis individually. Third, cannabis smoking is typically a group activity which is regarded as social (Becker, 1963) and therefore the joint purchasing of the drug added to this sociability. While the first two reasons were practical, the third relates to ideas of belonging since being a part of the cannabis system in Kelldale symbolised having cultural connectedness (May, 2013). This is tied to subcultural theories that conceptualise drug taking and knowledge as a key element of group membership and acceptance (Becker, 1963; Young, 1971).

During the focus group, Craig explained how the cannabis system worked:

Right see if we have a puff right? So say it's my turn to get paid, I smoke them in and whatever right? And when it's [Tom's] turn he smokes everybody in and when it's [Danielle's] turn she smokes everybody in and it goes on. (Craig)

(Focus Group, October 2013, Lounge)

In line with this explanation, each of the residents knew which day everyone got paid⁴⁰. For example, it was known that Tom and Chloe were paid on a Thursday whereas Craig received his money on a Monday. When a resident was paid, one of his priorities was to

⁴⁰ Being 'paid' meant receiving their welfare money

buy enough cannabis for the whole group. This ensured that on a different day when it was someone else's turn to get paid and buy cannabis, the resident who had done the same previously was "smoked in" by being provided a share of the drug.

Being a part of this cannabis system symbolised a form of cultural belonging on a micro level. Some residents participated in this system more than others and the young people could roughly be divided into four groups representing their level of engagement. The first group, what I have called the 'core group', consisted of Craig, Chloe, Tom, Danielle, Matt, Callum, Garry, Ryan and Stephanie. These young people were known to regularly participate in this reciprocal system and were expected by the group to contribute and receive their fair share. It could be argued that these residents experienced the strongest degree of cultural belonging to this micro-level culture. Next were the 'sporadic group' who used cannabis less frequently but when they did, they typically relied on the core group members to provide this. In return, the sporadic group members (Amanda, Andy and Nathan) normally paid their dues in the form of money rather than providing cannabis at a later date. The third group included Jordan, Liam, Jack and Vince who were all regular cannabis users but whose use largely took place with 'outside' friends and therefore were less reliant on the core group. This group could be called the 'peripheral group' since the majority of their drug use took place alongside the core group but not with them, although occasionally there would be some overlap. Finally, there were the 'non/unknown users' who either explicitly said that they did not use cannabis, such as Cara, Rob and Dinesh, or whose cannabis use was unknown, such as Blair, Grant and Stacy.

The further away from the core group the residents were, the less likely they were to feel a sense of cultural belonging. This is because the cannabis system was inter-subjectively constructed and those who were a part of it were both the creators and the subjects of the system. For the most part, non-membership of the core group was by choice and there were no apparent hard feelings about this from any of the residents. However, as discussed, Blair had not been accepted as a friend by the majority of residents and therefore he may have faced some difficulties had he expressed a desire to participate.

These groups could be viewed in terms of a 'hierarchy of belonging' (May, 2013) whereby the core group were at the top of this hierarchy and the non/unknown users were

at the bottom. However, this suggests that those at the bottom had a desire to increase their belonging and move up the hierarchy but were unable to do so as a result of not being accepted by those further up. The implication of this was that those at the bottom lacked agency but this was not the case within the Kelldale cannabis micro-culture. In contrast, the vast majority were not a part of this core group by choice. Belonging, in this context, can therefore be conceptualised in terms of *degree* rather than a *hierarchy*. Every young participant outside of the core group to some extent likely felt a sense of belonging to the cannabis culture. This is because many still used cannabis and some interaction took place with the core group to provide or obtain the drug. Even some who were non-users, such as Cara, were still connected because they were constantly around those who were users and had a high level of cultural knowledge. This supports the ‘normalisation’ position which purports that drug use has become a mainstream activity among young people meaning that even non-drug users are still connected to the culture because of its pervasiveness (Parker, Aldridge and Measham, 1998). This was apparent when non-user Cara identified that Stephanie was highly intoxicated. Knowing that if the staff realised Stephanie had become intoxicated inside the building everyone would be sent out for a walk, Cara took responsibility for looking after her. Therefore, there were degrees of cultural belonging whereby one could feel more or less connected to a culture or could feel a sense of belonging to certain aspects of a culture.

The politics of reciprocity had accompanying difficulties, two of which occurred often. The first related to what the residents termed a “hold back”. This was the name given to someone who was in possession of tobacco or cannabis but who claimed that she had none so that she did not feel compelled to share and could keep the items for her own use. Being a ‘hold back’ damaged the trust between residents as it was considered a breach of the social rituals that characterised the drug-sharing systems (Zinberg, 1984):

Danielle, Stephanie, Tom and Garry had been smoking in one of their rooms last night but between them they hadn't had much tobacco or weed so they only had enough for two joints. They had pooled their supplies of tobacco and weed together for the occasion. To find out that Garry and Tom had been smoking weed this morning meant that the boys had had more tobacco and weed but instead of sharing with the group last night they had pretended they had run out and were therefore being "hold backs". Stephanie and Danielle sat at the breakfast table trying to recall who had supplied how much tobacco and weed, how many joints they had been able to roll and who had smoked them, in order to prove their point to Tom and Garry who were denying being 'hold backs'. Danielle became more and more angry and started shouting at Tom.

(Field Notes, June 2013, Lounge)

A second related problem, which came to the fore during the focus groups' discussions, was one of mathematics. While nine of the residents were conceivably in the 'core group' of cannabis users, they did not all live in Kelldale together and normally there were only four or five members at any one time. At one point, though, there were as many as seven young people looking to combine their resources to share cannabis. Although more members meant more money to share, the group began to struggle to buy enough cannabis to meet everyone's needs. This was, according to the core group, because they had all gradually become more tolerant to the drug meaning that they needed a larger individual quantity to achieve the desired effects. The consequence of this was that some of the core group began secretly sharing with a smaller number and then telling the larger group that they had nothing to share. The focus group exclusively consisted of members of the core group and Danielle decided to own up in front of everyone:

Danielle: *See to tell you the truth, I got a £20 bit today right but wee Matt, he's been in the least, but see the amount of green I've seen that boy bring in and the amount he's given me is unbelievable. So I was like that, you know what I mean, there's not enough to do a round but I gave Matt one and I feel pure terrible going into that toilet*

Matt: *I know how you feel man*

Danielle: *He's like that "you just want the ground to eat you" and I was like "aye I know what you mean"*

Matt: *Sitting in that bathroom knowing other cunts are outside man still choking for a bucket*

(Focus Group, October 2013, Lounge)

In this extract, Danielle explained that she had some cannabis but not enough to share with everyone. Therefore, she decided only to share with Matt who had previously been generous to her. In this sense, Danielle was being a 'hold back' from everyone other than Matt. The two young people had secretly gone into the en-suite bathroom in one of the bedsits and were taking a bucket while others were sitting outside desperately craving cannabis. The extract highlights how badly the two residents had felt but also that these feelings were not enough to deter them from using cannabis, thus demonstrating their strong desire for the drug. Being viewed as a 'hold back' would have damaged their performance of being committed and honest in relation to the cannabis system. Therefore, keeping their use a secret (until the focus group that is) enabled Danielle and Matt to preserve this performance and maintain a particular 'front' (Goffman, 1959).

This strong desire led many members of the core group to claim that they were "addicted" to cannabis. It became apparent that the system of sharing dominated their day-to-day lives. A substantial amount of time and effort went into figuring out who had money and how much collectively they could spend on cannabis. One of the consequences of desiring cannabis but not always having enough money meant that sometimes the drug was purchased "on tick". This meant that a resident would be given cannabis from their dealer on the understanding that the resident would pay for it as soon as they received their benefits cheque. Therefore, the cannabis sharing system operated on the basis of everyone being in debt, not only to each other but also to their dealers. This debt seemed to be never-ending because as soon as a resident was paid, he had to use most of his money to pay back those he was in debt to, either in the form of cash (to the dealers) or

cannabis (to the residents). If a resident did not have enough money to pay back his dealer, he then had to borrow from a friend or relative, thus shifting the debt from one person to another.

The 'core group' all recognised that their money problems would improve if they stopped using cannabis, but many felt that this was not possible or desirable. The strongest evidence of this came from the focus group when Danielle stated that if they had no food and no cannabis and were down to their last £10, they would spend the money on the drug, with which several others agreed. As Zinberg (1984) asserted, drug use can be understood as a combination of the biological effect of the drug (drug), psychological mind-set of the individual (set) and the socio-spatial environment (setting). While addiction is popularly attributed to the drug or set, Zinberg regarded the setting as more influential. The system for sharing cannabis that was inter-subjectively constructed, then reinforced and perpetuated the resident's drug taking. In contrast to the social sanctions and rituals identified by Zinberg as measures which are used to control drug use, the rules that the residents adopted were designed to maximise their drug use (and intoxication) as much as possible. Similar evidence has been found concerning the weekend economies of nightclubs and pubs in which young people set out with the purpose of achieving a desired level of drunkenness (Measham and Brain, 2005). Any control shown by the residents involved keeping some cannabis back so that they had enough to last them for the next few days until someone was paid. Given that the cannabis sharing system can be interpreted as offering a sense of cultural belonging (May, 2013), it is argued that this feeling of belonging further strengthened their commitment to the system and acted as a disincentive to stop using cannabis. To give up cannabis would mean giving up their membership of the core group which would possibly impact on their sense of belonging to the micro-level culture and perhaps to each other. Therefore belonging can be viewed as a way in which the setting in Zinberg's (1984) model influenced drug taking among the group.

The Staff

As well as their relationships with family and each other, the staff represented a group with whom most of the residents interacted with on a daily basis. Cloke, May and

Johnson (2010) have drawn attention to the acts of kindness and support that service providers give to homeless people. However, the authors also highlighted narratives among service staff about those who were ‘deserving’ or ‘undeserving’ of their assistance and there was evidence of some homeless people feeling that staff treated them disparagingly. In addition, McGrath and Pistrang (2007) examined the relationships between keyworkers and homeless young people in a temporary accommodation setting. They highlighted how staff experienced tensions in balancing their rule-enforcement responsibilities with those of providing care and support. The data examined in this section unpack the complex relationships between Kelldale residents and staff that were characterised by rule-enforcement, care and conflict.

The Staff as Rule-Enforcers

As discussed in Chapter 5, the staff enforced many rules concerning the conduct of the residents and which spaces they could and could not enter. In addition, the young people were prohibited from having visitors enter the hostel unless they were there for professional purposes (e.g. social workers or drug treatment workers). When directly asked about the rules, the residents expressed negative feelings towards the staff and their role in this:

Nathan: *They're a pain in the arse, they don't let you do anything. You're not allowed visitors and all that shit in here, but, like, they're trying to make you get ready for your own tenancy, but if you were getting ready for your own tenancy, you'd be allowed people in. Come on dude what's the score?*

Me: *So apart from that rule, is there any other reason you think the staff are bastards⁴¹ or is it just because of that one rule?*

⁴¹ In the same conversation, Nathan had previously referred to the staff as “bastards”

Nathan: *Just the fact that they're just pains in the arses and don't let you fucking do anything. Like, if you've had a [cannabis] joint or something, you can't come down for something to munch, even if you've got your own food.*

(Interview, August 2013, Lounge)

Here, Nathan, along with others, had expressed negative feelings towards the staff which they directly associated with their role as rule-enforcers: in many ways the rules were conflated with the staff themselves. Residents liked particular members of staff and disliked others, partially because some were more lenient at enforcing the rules than others. For example, Cara explained that she liked Keith who often worked during the overnight shifts. Cara described one night when Keith caught her sneaking into Stacy's room. The two residents had had an argument and when Keith went upstairs to investigate, Cara asked if she could stay with Stacy for a while longer so they could sort out their differences. Cara explained that rather than insisting she return to her bedsit, like others would have done, Keith had allowed her to stay. Instead of displaying a 'strict rule-enforcer' performance, Keith's actions suggested a more caring, friendly and mentoring role which, unsurprisingly, Cara preferred.

The narratives and actions of the young people indicated strong views about how the staff should treat them. For example, sometimes the young people were adamant that they felt the staff should retain a 'professional' role when in Kelldale and leave their 'personal' feelings at home.

Danielle: *See if the staff's had a bad day they've got tae, we've got tae deal wi' it*

Matt: *They should keep their personal stuff at home man, know what I mean?*

Danielle: *Aye, work should be work, their hoose should be their hoose, or else they shouldnae have this fuckin job...it's just like they come in in a mood and you say one thing wrong to them and it's like 'boom', out fae an hour's walk.*

(Focus Group, October 2013, Lounge)

In this conversation, the residents blamed the 'bad mood' of the staff, rather than their own behaviours, for the outcome of being made to 'take a walk'. Despite the staff arguing that the rules were in place to protect the wellbeing of everyone inside the hostel, any indication that those enforcing a rule were angry, impatient or did not want the residents around was taken to mean that they did not care about the young people. As such, rule enforcement was understood by some residents as punitive and serving the interests of the staff rather than them. Literature has found that negative perceptions of service providers are counter-productive to young people's wellbeing and their relationships with therapeutic professionals (Soenen, D'oosterlinck and Broekaert, 2013). In this instance, Danielle and Matt indicated that not seemingly being able to separate their home-life from their work-life meant that the staff were being unprofessional and the residents had to pay the price.

The staff appeared to hold mixed attitudes towards the young people's substance use which sometimes resulted in the residents receiving different messages. Some believed that the young people's level of substance use was detrimental:

Craig came down to the window still looking really stoned.

Claire (staff): *Stop wasting all your money on that rubbish!*

(Field Notes, August 2013, Reception)

It was likely that the staff had more direct discussions about the residents' substance use during their keywork sessions but I was not made aware of the content of these meetings. Rather, it was observed that the strongest 'anti-drug' sentiments were conveyed through rule enforcement including 'taking a walk' and risk assessing intoxicated residents at the

front door (see Chapter 5). The majority of data collected about substance use from a staff perspective concerned their annoyance and sometimes anger upon discovering that the young people had taken substances inside the building:

Matt came to the window a while later. Jim (staff) became angry at him and started telling him off because he thought Matt was stoned meaning he must have been using cannabis in the building. Jim warned Matt that if he caught him in the act then he would be made to take a walk:

Jim: It's totally disrespectful!

(Field Notes, August 2013, Reception)

The ways in which the staff spoke to the young people about their substance use appeared to be reflective of a strict parent who scolded her child for spending money on “rubbish” or being “totally disrespectful”. It was also notable that the observed ‘anti-drug’ messages conveyed by the staff usually related to following the rules rather than pointing out how substance use might be damaging to the young people’s wellbeing. This was reflected in the young people’s conversations as the staff only seemed to feature in relation to the topic of ‘taking a walk’:

Ryan started telling Matt about Suzanne (staff) and the fact she is tough on residents if they are caught smoking cannabis in the building:

Ryan: Mad Suzanne's on tonight, she won't let us away with anything

He seemed annoyed that Suzanne was on shift.

Matt: It's alright I know where we can get a bucket up the road

Ryan said it was OK, that if they were going to do a bucket later they should do it in Ryan’s room. That way if they get caught and Ryan is made to take a walk, he can just go to his girlfriend’s house.

In contrast, some staff members told the residents that they believed cannabis should be decriminalised but they had to enforce the rules regardless of their own opinions. Through dropping their front-of-stage performances (Goffman, 1959) that embodied the rules and policies of the hostel, and revealing an aspect of their personal beliefs, the staff attempted to show the young people a different side to them. While this could be interpreted as a change in the performance, rather than fully revealing their backstage selves, the staff seemed to be trying to re-engage with their audience as a means of encouraging them to endorse their (staff) performance of rule enforcement. In other words, by showing the residents that their performances were not aligned with their 'true' selves, they were asking the residents to 'play along' without holding negative feelings towards them. It was unclear though as to how successful this was because the acts of scolding and punishing the residents for using cannabis and alcohol seemed to overshadow any attempts at negotiating. The young people continued to partake in substance use, argue and think badly of the staff when these practices were implemented.

Being Cared For

The relationships between residents and staff were, however, more complex than rule-enforcement interactions. Support staff can provide people with practical assistance but they can also enhance a person's emotional wellbeing through providing care and social interaction. With regards to homeless youth, Oliver and Cheff (2014) found that those instances, when the staff in their sample spent time with the young people, got to know them, listened to them, and enabled them to feel as though they were genuinely cared for and not judged, were beneficial to their mental wellbeing. In relation to substance users, Green, Mitchell and Bruun (2013) noted that the process of engaging in this type of relationship with a support worker helped some of the young people to develop healthy communication skills that could be transferred to other relationships. Staff, therefore, have the ability to develop relational belonging (May, 2013) with their service-users through the medium of care and emotional connectedness.

In Kelldale, feeling cared for was a significant part of the resident-staff relationships. Through observations, 'care' appeared to involve a resident being able to talk to a staff member and for a staff member to pay attention and listen. However this was only when the resident wanted to talk and not when it was forced upon him. It was common for keyworkers to discuss the problems they were having in trying to get a resident to commit to a keywork meeting which indicated that some residents did not want to sit down in this formal manner to discuss the practical and emotional issues they were dealing with. Instead, often a resident would spontaneously approach a member of staff if he had a problem he wished to discuss or if he simply wanted someone to talk to.

Many of these conversations happened at the reception window. Sometimes a resident would come to ask for material resources such as permission to make a telephone call or to have some emergency food⁴². During these occasions, it was common for the resident to begin chatting to the staff suggesting that the material request provided him with a concrete reason for being there whilst also allowing him to engage in a conversation that may have satisfied an intangible need for interaction. Sometimes, though, the residents would arrive at the reception window with no material request but with an explicit desire to share exciting news or because they were feeling bored and wanted to fill their time. The staff normally responded by listening to them and engaging in conversation but the length of time the staff dedicated to these types of conversations partially depended on their personal feelings about a resident. For example, Cathy (staff) had informed me that she found Andy to be quite annoying. One day, Andy came to the reception window and was excited because he had received a telephone call to inform him that he had been allocated a council flat. He wanted to share this news with as many people as he could in a celebratory manner:

He asked Cathy to give him a hug but Cathy mumbled "no" and seemed to be trying her best to ignore Andy...he seemed disappointed that she wasn't happy for him.

(Field Notes, August 2013, Reception)

⁴² The staff kept a store of 'emergency food' which could be given to a resident if they had no food or money left

Cathy later told me that although her behaviour was partly a result of her feelings about Andy, she was also aware that receiving a telephone call did not mean that his flat was confirmed and she did not want to raise his hopes further by being excited for him. Although Cathy felt that caring about Andy's feelings was partly behind her response, Andy had not interpreted it in this way and had left feeling disappointed at her apparent lack of care.

Supporting the residents and giving them attention depended upon the other work commitments of the staff. This was apparent on the day that Stephanie was leaving Kelldale to move to another homeless service that offered more independent living. Stephanie had expected that a staff member would accompany her to this new organisation but the staff were unable to do this as they had other work priorities to attend to. She was visibly disappointed and in the few hours leading up to her departure, Stephanie complained that it was "shite" that nobody was going with her. However, when her taxi arrived and everyone gathered on the pavement to say their goodbyes, she appeared to perk up and expressed gratitude that they had made the effort to see her off. Taking the time to give Stephanie attention at that moment appeared to make her feel as though she was cared for and belonged to Kelldale and its people.

As well as listening to, and engaging in conversations when the young people wished, food was used as a tool for showing feelings of care. Emond, McIntosh and Punch (2014) have argued that the consumption and preparation of food has social and emotional significance. In the context of their study, which examined food practices in children's residential homes, the authors highlighted examples of how both the staff and children expressed caring and painful emotions through the medium of food. In Kelldale, caring gestures were apparent when the staff celebrated Jack's 21st birthday by presenting him with a cake or when a group of residents told the staff they were going to McDonald's and asked if they wanted them to bring anything back for them. These relatively small gestures not only conveyed that the giver of food cared about the receiver but they also promoted feelings of belonging. In order to belong, it is necessary for someone to be accepted into a group or a place (May, 2013) and, in these cases, offerings of food were symbolic of this acceptance.

Cooking activities were also opportunities for the residents and staff to come together to develop social and emotional connections. Sometimes cooking sessions were used as a way of holding a keywork meeting in an informal way. Kyle (staff) had decided to use a group barbecue as a keywork session for Jordan who had only moved into Kelldale three days earlier. Alongside Kyle, Jordan had agreed to take charge of the barbecue and consequently the other residents engaged with him as he dished out burgers. Jordan later explained the significance of this for him:

Kyle, my keyworker, he's actually quite fun like, our keyworking sessions are quite fun. Both our keyworking sessions, the only two that we've had, both of them have involved cooking...the first one was the barbecue...I did enjoy it, plus everyone got a munch out of it anyway, and like yesterday as well, making the cake. (Jordan)

(Interview, July 2013, Meeting Room)

Dedicating time to the residents in ways that were resident-focused (McGrath and Pistrang, 2007) and informal was therefore an effective means of allowing the residents to feel cared for. In doing so, it enabled the young people to feel a sense of belonging to Kelldale and the staff through these caring relationships.

"You Don't Care!"

As indicated in the examples of Andy and Stephanie in the previous section, some residents expressed their desire for care in the form of being disappointed when they felt uncared for. When a resident declared that the staff "don't care" this was usually accompanied by feelings of anger, sadness or desperation. On one difficult day, one of the residents disclosed that he was feeling suicidal. When I explained that I could not keep this information confidential and I would need to tell the staff, he said that all of the staff knew anyway and none of them cared. By stating that they felt uncared for, the residents implied that they wished somebody did care. Through the lens of the family, Smart (2007) has pointed to the multi-layered emotions and complexities that characterise people's interactions and relationships. Simply put, the interactions between self and

society are emotionally laden meaning that people's emotional experiences and needs are dependent on others. Since emotions are shaped and constructed through social interactions (Mead, 1934), declarations of "you don't care" indicated that the young people were looking for the staff to pacify their emotional pain. These instances also suggested that 'care' was a fluid concept and the young people had ideas about a 'reality' of care. It seemed that the residents believed that the staff had the capacity to demonstrate care in concrete ways (although these were undefined) but the staff chose not to. This feeling that the staff were deliberately withholding care seemed to exacerbate some of the outward emotional pain that I witnessed, as was the case for the resident who felt suicidal.

One particularly tense relationship was between Garry and his keyworker Jim. Whenever Jim's name was mentioned, Garry expressed anger towards him and on several occasions he made threats towards Jim such as "he better watch his back". Jim was fully aware of Garry's feelings and often consulted other staff members for their advice about how best to support Garry and help him to understand that Jim was on his side. Garry's drug use appeared to be a catalyst for his aggressive attitude towards Jim, as Jim claimed that the threats were usually made when Garry was intoxicated. Therefore, in considering how the social contexts of living in Kelldale interacted with a young person's substance use, as outlined in the research objectives, according to Jim, Garry's substance use exacerbated their difficult relationship.

Whenever I asked Garry about the reasons behind his feelings towards Jim, he always responded with specific incidents in which Jim had let him down. For example, Kelldale was connected to an organisation that arranged for disadvantaged young people to gain work experience in Holland. Garry had put his name forward for this opportunity but was rejected. He pinned the blame on Jim claiming that Jim had "fucked up" his application form. In Garry's view, Jim was the cause of many of his problems and rather than feeling that Jim cared about him, Garry felt that Jim was deliberately trying to make his life worse. It appeared as though Garry and Jim had different ideas about the best way to construct their relationship. They had little in common and Garry seemed to be unwilling or perhaps incapable of compromising with Jim meaning that every time they interacted, they clashed. Their lack of connection was indicative of absent relational

belonging although arguably Jim was the one to be ‘misrecognised’ as it was Garry who kept rejecting him (May, 2013; 2015).

While Garry’s feelings of anger were specifically targeted at Jim, towards the end of her stay in Kelldale, Amanda increasingly felt angry towards the staff in general. Despite Kelldale being a short-stay hostel, Amanda ended up living there for fifteen months and the staff attributed this lengthy duration to her increasing frustration and conflict with them. However, in contrast to the staff’s perception that Amanda had been living in Kelldale for “too long”, Amanda told me that she did not want to leave:

Amanda said she will “greet”⁴³ when she leaves the project to move to her own place

Amanda: When I’m bored I can just chap on someone’s door, there’s always someone about.

Amanda is worried that she will be bored and lonely in her new place.

(Field Notes, June 2013, Lounge)

In addition, Amanda was worried about leaving Kelldale because she had formed a relationship with fellow resident Andy. Amanda’s reluctance to leave escalated when the staff had to call the police to force her to move out of Kelldale. One week after being given the keys to her new flat, Amanda was still living in the hostel as the staff had agreed to give her a transition period to move. It seemed that Amanda was trying to stall her move and when she refused to leave, the staff felt compelled to use force. Subsequent to her departure, Amanda frequently returned to Kelldale to socialise on the street outside the front door with Andy and other residents. On each of these occasions, Amanda’s feelings of anger and hatred towards the Kelldale staff were visible.

⁴³ ‘Greet’ is a Scottish word meaning ‘cry’

Amanda and Andy spoke aggressively about what they thought of Kelldale and they also spoke loudly hoping that the staff would hear them through the window...there was a loose brick at the windowsill in front of the building and Amanda pretended to pick it up and throw it through the office window.

(Field Notes, August 2013, Outside the Front Door)

As a result of living in Kelldale for a long period and spending a significant amount of her time in the hostel engaging with fellow residents and the staff, Amanda had developed a strong connection to the building and its people. This was evident in her comment that she enjoyed being able to chap on someone's door if she was feeling bored or lonely and that she stalled her departure after being given the keys to her own flat. The emotional turbulence that someone can feel when she is forced out of her home-place has been noted in the literature (Neumark, 2013) and given that 'home' can offer ontological security (Giddens, 1991), a sense of control (Parsell, 2012) and is interwoven with self-identity (Jacobs and Malpas, 2013); when a person has to leave her home-place, it is possible that she may experience this as a greatly unsettling time. Amanda's deteriorating relationships with the staff upon leaving Kelldale may have been outward expressions of this unsettling transition.

Conclusion

In emphasising the social component of the *socio-spatial-self* framework, this chapter has analysed the residents' relationships with three main groups of people in their lives: family, friends and the Kelldale staff. According to Zinberg (1984), the 'setting', including social relationships, is the biggest influence in a person's substance use. This is because other people construct and shape a person's ability to become intoxicated through social sanctions and rituals that place limitations on use to minimise harm. The data revealed that substance use was strongly interwoven within the young people's relationships in multiple and complex ways. Symbolic interactionists view relationships as fundamental to human life as they assert that a person's mind, sense of self and society only exist through interactions with others: without relationships, human experiences and

actions would be meaningless (Mead, 1934; Blumer, 1969). Feeling connected to another person through affinity with her sense of self is what May (2013) has referred to as 'relational belonging'.

With regards to homeless youth, academics have paid substantial attention to the relationships they hold with various parties as it is believed that the nature of these relationships can either 'lift' people out of their marginality, or they can entrench them further (Barker, 2013). Thus, social relationships strongly influence a person's actions and social position. Yet, reducing the influence of relations to a binary of lifting or entrenching means that other aspects of such relationships are neglected. While the findings in this chapter are in some ways consistent with this existing literature (particularly the role of the cannabis system reinforcing the act), they also reflect a more nuanced approach to disentangling key aspects of the relationships discussed.

Family breakdown is the leading cause of youth homelessness (Johnsen and Quilgars, 2009) and this appeared to be the case for many of the Kelldale residents. The younger residents were more likely to make direct connections between family and their homelessness mainly because there had been shorter periods of time between being kicked out of the family home and arriving at Kelldale. Some could point to specific incidents that had led to their homelessness which arguably represented 'critical moments' in their youth transitions (Thomson et al., 2002). The older residents were less likely to cite their families when discussing their housing experiences prior to Kelldale because they had traversed the homelessness system for longer and had lived in several other forms of housing between leaving the parental home and arriving in Kelldale. These housing (and sometimes rough sleeping) experiences appeared to be more salient features of their biographies, although many were reluctant to discuss their family histories which were suggestive of painful memories.

Despite the residents' hesitations at discussing their families, many had retained relationships with their parents and other relatives. Some of these were perceived positively by the young people and were epitomised by requesting council properties close to where their relatives still lived, although the families did not always reciprocate the desire for close relational belonging as was the case with Andy and his father. Notably, substance use could either enhance or weaken a young person's closeness to

family members. In some cases, substance use created distance between a young person and his parents if either party felt that the other's substance use was problematic and potentially harmful. However, where residents and their relatives used alcohol and drugs together, this shared cultural interest served as a tool for their connectedness. This argument – that substance use can sometimes be experienced as 'enhancing' family relationships – is novel and is an original piece of evidence as current research is dominated by studying the destructive effects of drugs and alcohol within families.

Having a shared interest in drinking alcohol, smoking tobacco and using cannabis was a prominent feature in the relationships that the young people had with each other. From the moment a new resident moved into the hostel, processes were set in motion to establish how the newcomer would fit in with the existing residents and their substance use behaviours. The existing residents performed in ways to communicate their expectations of a newcomer and to establish a loose hierarchy in which those who had lived there the longest were at the top. In the rare cases in which a newcomer was judged as an undesirable addition to the group, he was ostracised and thus left to find alternative sources of relational belonging. If a newcomer was accepted, his stay in Kelldale became a group experience both in the 'real' world and the residents' online worlds. It appeared that communicating via social media was just as important as conversing in person since relational belonging was enhanced, as well as documented and promoted, online. These worlds ran in parallel but bled into each other since 'real' world experiences were expressed online and vice versa. This finding is consistent with claims made by recent youth research that the use of digital technologies has become so pervasive in the lives of young people that it is no longer possible to analyse their social media use separately from their wider lives (Morimoto and Friedland, 2011). Thus, the findings from this chapter regarding the different uses of social media among a group of young people who have few resources, but who are digitally proficient, adds to both understandings of contemporary homelessness and youth culture.

Zinberg's (1984) social sanctions and rituals relating to substance use were clearly present among the young people's constructed systems for sharing tobacco and cannabis. However, rather than these serving to limit intoxication, they were designed to maximise substance use on a group level within the context of having limited money and ensuring fairness. In this chapter, the young people were loosely divided into four groups to

demonstrate the extent of their involvement in the cannabis-sharing system. Those in the ‘core’ group were the heaviest users of cannabis and they spent an extraordinary amount of time craving, planning, sourcing, funding and dividing up cannabis among the ‘stakeholders’ on a day-to-day basis. Their tolerance, debt and cravings which were the consequences of this system meant that several young people referred to themselves as “addicted” to the drug. Yet, the system also enhanced their feelings of belonging to the cannabis culture and their relationships to each other. Not only would ceasing their cannabis use prevent them from experiencing the bodily pleasures of intoxication, it seemed likely to affect the strength of their belonging to their cannabis-using friends. Thus, the systems they devised acted as disincentives to cutting back on their drug use. This aspect of the young people’s lives again adds to May’s (2013) theory of belonging because it indicates that belonging can be ‘double-edged’; it offers subjectively positive feelings of closeness even when this closeness may lead to other problems.

The final type of relationships considered were those between the young people and Kelldale’s staff. Very little research has considered the relationships between homeless people and those who provide them with support and the findings here not only make a contribution to this area but they should be taken as a baseline for future exploration. In the face of the young people’s mutual encouragement of substance use, the staff represented the ‘anti-drug’ voice in that they were responsible for implementing the multiple rules of the hostel. When the residents felt that the rules served the purposes of the staff rather than them, they responded unhappily and sometimes aggressively. Alternatively, when the staff performed a more supportive role, the young people were more receptive. The staff were expected to perform in multiple ways to multiple audiences (Goffman, 1959) and sometimes these performances were conflicting. With regard to cannabis, for example, such conflict was apparent among the staff’s expected ‘professional rule-enforcer’ performance and their own personal ‘backstage’ beliefs about decriminalisation. Relational belonging was arguably strengthened on occasions when a young person’s need for emotional care was met by the staff’s actions. However, care was not always provided when requested and consequently the sense of connectedness between residents and staff appeared fragile.

Overall, this chapter has documented some of the complex relationships in which the residents were embedded; emphasising the ‘socio’ aspect of their socio-spatial-self

relations. Understanding these relationships is crucial for conceptualising the behaviours of the young people. This is because a person's sense of self and her subsequent actions exist in a dialectical relationship with the social interactions that she encounters. In other words, interacting with family, friends and the staff continually influenced the ways in which the young people thought and felt about themselves; how they felt about other people; how they positioned themselves relative to these other people; and how they responded through their performances (Mead, 1934; Goffman, 1959; May, 2015). If substance use is taken as the behaviour that is the consequence of a person's social interactions, unpacking these interactions can provide greater insight into such a behaviour. For the Kelldale residents, their friendships and, in some cases, family relationships, encouraged the continual use of substances because intoxication and its accompanying rituals afforded them feelings of cultural and relational belonging (May, 2013). These relationships trumped those with the staff perhaps because the staff *had* to perform in particular ways and any connectedness that developed was tinged with a sense of falsity. Furthermore, of the three types of relationships discussed, those with the staff were the least likely to last beyond a resident's stay in Kelldale and thus there was no need for the young people to place great investment in these relationships. Adding to both the substance use and homelessness literature then, it is argued that continuing to engage in substance use provided the young people with the social relationships and feelings of connectedness that are so crucial for subjectively meaningful experiences and which could potentially be continued after leaving Kelldale.

Chapter 7: Self-Identities and Society

Introduction

This final empirical chapter completes the socio-spatial-self set of dialectical relations by focusing on the concept of self-identity. It was argued in Chapter 3 that an individual's sense of self is comprised of an 'I' and 'me', with the 'I' referring to an unconscious 'inner self' that only becomes known to the person in the moment, whereas the 'me' is a reflection of socialisation whereby a person learns and subsequently internalises the 'generalised other' attitude (Mead, 1934). Over time, a person's 'me' dominates the self and people learn to adapt their performances to suit the particular audience and situation in which they find themselves (Goffman, 1969). Therefore, self-identities, their outward expression and societal attitudes are tightly intertwined. May's (2013) idea of belonging offers a complementary, yet alternative, means for conceptualising self-identity whereby she purports that framing the connections between self and society through feelings of ease and affiliation with cultures, people and places can overcome essentialist notions of identity which label people by placing them into discrete categories. Thus, from an interactionist and phenomenological perspective, self-identity can be viewed as the product of internalising the 'generalised other' attitude (Mead, 1934) and 'rules of the game' (Bourdieu, 1977; 1979 in May, 2013), understanding how to align one's performance with such rules and attitudes (Goffman, 1969), and feeling emotionally connected to them (May, 2013).

In addition to using these frameworks to theorise identities, youth researchers have recently revisited Beck's (1992) concept of individualisation. As explained in Chapter 3, Beck argued that the breakdown of social structures and increase in insecurities has led to identities becoming fragmented. Young people must now take responsibility for their own self-identities and reflexivity has become compulsory. While Beck has been heavily criticised for privileging agency over structure, youth researchers have recently attempted to reinsert structure into the equation. Woodman and Wyn (2015), for example, have purposefully sought to amalgamate individualisation, which is associated with rapid social change, with continuing structural inequalities. They assert that individualisation is not a theory of agency but is a consequence of changing social institutions. In

agreement with this position, and in the context of homelessness, Farrugia (2011: 772) argued that:

In the absence of collective structures on which to draw for identity and material support, young people feel personally responsible for events in their lives that are the outcome of structural processes.

Although it is the position of this thesis that collective structures are not ‘absent’, individualisation can be usefully interpreted as a means of understanding how people feel and construct their identities in the context of changing structural conditions. As Farrugia (2011) notes, people do not always recognise the influence that these structural forces have on their identities and, instead, they perceive their inability to live up to social expectations as a reflection of personal failure. When a young person becomes homeless, for example, this translates as an individual failing, resulting in self-identities being affected by low self-worth and mental health problems (Farrugia, 2011).

As will be seen, these frameworks are useful for theorising certain aspects of the Kelldale resident’s self-identities. It is also necessary to address here the phenomenon of labelling because in order to examine self-identities, this chapter also concerns the labels ascribed to, and used by, the young people in this study. Despite May (2013) and others being critical of labelling, often people’s self-identities and feelings of belonging are *expressed* through the endorsement or rejection of labels pertaining to, for example, ethnicity, gender, age, religion, politics, occupation, intimate relationships and lifestyle (King and Mai, 2009; Fadjukoff, Pulkkinen and Kokko, 2016). As discussed in Chapter 3, labels can be both imposed upon people externally, often against their will, or they may be co-constructed, embraced and moulded to suit a specific purpose (Eliason and Schope, 2007; Parsell, 2011). While labelling (or categorising) is closely connected to notions of self-identity, it is important, however, to remember that they are not synonymous. Rather, labels can be understood as forming one dimension of the more complex notion of self-identity, as Lawler (2014: 7) notes:

My sense of myself, others perceptions of me, my reactions to others perceptions, the social categories that attach themselves to me and to which I attach myself, all may be referred to as 'identity', yet clearly there are important differences between them.

Therefore, although it is imperative not to enter a 'circular logic' whereby a person only becomes viewed through a label that has been externally imposed on him (May, 2013), labels remain helpful as heuristic devices for opening up discussions of self-identity.

With this in mind, this chapter highlights the 'self' dimension of the socio-spatial-self framework discussed throughout this thesis. It considers the Kelldale residents' self-perceptions and how they negotiated various labels that were socially imposed on them, as well as those which they attributed to themselves. Some, but not all, of these labels were understood as stigmatising by the young people who responded by distancing themselves from the label or by perceiving their association with the label as reflecting a sense of personal failure. In these latter cases, it is clear that alignment with a stigmatising label, or 'spoiled identity' (Goffman, 1963), had detrimental consequences for the young people's self-worth. Yet, not all of the labels discussed were perceived negatively and in many cases the residents embraced and even celebrated their association with particular social categories, such as those of 'youth' and 'drug user'. Thus, this chapter is not solely about stigmatising labels (although these are certainly important) but about completing the discussion of the socio-spatial-self web and using labels as a means for exploring aspects of the resident's self-identities and perceptions. In sequential order, the identity-related themes that are discussed in this chapter relate to: employment/education; being young; ethnicity; being parents; gender and the body; using drugs; and being homeless. The ways in which these were discussed and negotiated by Kelldale's residents offer additional insights into their day-to-day lives as well as some of the broader emotional and practical challenges they faced relative to their positions in wider society.

Education/Employment Transitions or Life on Hold?

The starting point for unpacking some of the dimensions of the young people's self-identities and perceptions is that of education and employment. Normative ideals about self-identities encourage engagement with education and employment as a means of

creating strong citizenship (Korhonen, Komulainen and Rätty, 2011). In May's (2013) terms this can be linked to the idea of a hierarchy of belonging in that those with strong educational and employment prospects are politically and socially constructed as being at the top of this hierarchy as they embody these hegemonic ideals. Failure to succeed in education and employment have led to politically constructed labels such as NEET (Not in Education, Employment or Training) which have been criticised for homogenising young people and highlighting their perceived deficiencies; placing responsibility for 'failing' squarely at the feet of the individual (Reiter and Schlimbach, 2015). As Reiter and Schlimbach (2015) note, young people classed as NEET are aware of how they are negatively perceived by wider society which is detrimental to their emotional and mental wellbeing and they work hard to maintain a positive sense of self in the face of these challenges. This is consistent with recent conceptualisations of individualisation in which people are becoming more reflexive in the face of challenging structural conditions (Beck, 1992; Woodman and Wyn, 2015).

Much of the literature on youth transitions considers the movement through the education system and into the labour market (European Group for Integrated Social Research, 2001), but homeless youth are considered to be less able to engage in education, voluntary or paid work as a result of multiple disadvantages (Savelsberg and Martin-Giles, 2008). The Kelldale residents had mixed experiences of this transitional route with Callum being the only resident in education during his stay in the hostel. Callum was a college student when he arrived at Kelldale and persevered with his studies after moving in:

Callum explained that he wants to stay on at college to sit his Higher Exams and then he wants to go to university to study accountancy because he's always enjoyed maths.

(Field Notes, October 2013, Lounge)

Kelldale was often a noisy place and provided many distractions but Callum seemed able to continue with his college work and not be side-tracked by his temporary living conditions. For Callum, college represented an important aspect of his life as it provided him with a routine as he attended college Monday to Thursday from 9am until 4pm. Interestingly, Callum was also able to form connections with Kelldale despite his student

status setting him apart from his fellow residents. This was partially because of his use of cannabis and his belonging to the ‘core group’ of residents who consumed the drug (as outlined in Chapter 6). In addition, Callum often changed his appearance to reflect his cultural belonging to both college and Kelldale. At college he would wear jeans and carry a rucksack meaning he blended in with the student population whereas often he would return to Kelldale and get changed into tracksuit bottoms which more closely resembled the attire of his fellow residents. These external appearances were indicative of embodied internal feelings of cultural belonging to each social world (May, 2013) and the fluidity with which they were navigated. College may also have offered Callum a means of enacting an alternative self, set apart from the negative images that are often associated with homeless people (Parsell, 2011).

Despite his college studies, Callum rarely talked about education in the hostel, perhaps reflecting another means of separating the two worlds. Similarly, few of the residents spoke about their time at school. Those who did suggested that their school experiences had not been particularly positive. For example, Stacy revealed that she was kicked out of high school during her second year meaning she would have been 13-14 years old at the time. During a card game involving a level of mathematical skill, Stacy, who had been doing well at the game, joked that she should take her score card into her old school to prove to her teacher that she was “smart”. This glimpse into Stacy’s educational history suggested that she had not been academically successful in her school years and that she had perhaps internalised a belief that she was not ‘smart’.

In contrast to Stacy, Jordan explained that he had considered going to university but his lack of interest in a specific subject area prevented him from pursuing this goal. At the time of this conversation, Jordan was 17 years old and had dropped out of school. Vince’s story was similar in that he expressed interest in Higher Education but he cited his mother, not school, as being the biggest influence in this:

Vince explained that his mum has a HND in social sciences and he used to help her study – he was able to name a few sociological and psychological theorists (such as Marx, Weber and Freud) and used phrases like “social stratification” to demonstrate his knowledge.

(Field Notes, May 2013, Lounge)

Later, Vince explained that his desire to pursue Higher Education remained as something that might happen in the future but he felt his current mental health problems prevented him from going down this route.

Callum, Jordan and Vince were the only residents to express an interest in Higher Education. For Jordan and Vince, attending university was something that they thought might happen in the future but they felt unable to do so in their current situations. This implied that they wished to follow the educational trajectory that many young people follow in their transitional periods. However rather than pointing to structural barriers such as their current housing situation, both residents focused on individual barriers which hinted at feelings of personal inadequacy. In the same way that Stacy suggested she was not smart, Jordan blamed his lack of interest in a subject while Vince blamed his mental health problems for their stalled educational transitions. This is consistent with accounts of homeless youth's self-identities being characterised by feelings of personal failure and shame underpinned by a belief that they ought to take individualised responsibility for their lives (Farrugia, 2011).

For other residents, employment or training opportunities were viewed more favourably to Higher Education, although some remained open to additional education if they felt it would increase their job prospects. Danielle had already attended college for a year prior to Kelldale and had had two jobs working in the kitchen of a restaurant and a hotel. When asked why she no longer had these jobs her response was simply:

But then I got into drugs and that. (Danielle)

(Field Notes, October 2013, Lounge)

On the day of this conversation, Danielle was due to attend a job interview for a position in a call centre. She explained she did not have clothes that were suitable for an interview and did not have any money to buy some and therefore she felt that she could not attend. Having inappropriate clothing to access the job market has been highlighted as a

particular concern for those living in poverty (Turner-Bowker, 2001) and can add to the barriers that young homeless people face in gaining employment (Centrepoint, n.d.). Despite this, Danielle seemed to feel as though she was more adult-like with regards to her employment transition compared to others. This became apparent when Danielle was asked by a staff member if she wanted to apply to do a vocational course. In responding, she appeared to present herself as more motivated and adult-like in comparison to other residents who she framed as childish:

Danielle said she was interested

Danielle: It's another qualification isn't it? I've already got an NVQ in cooking.

Sharon (staff) asked if any of the other residents would be interested in the course and Danielle didn't think they would be. She mimicked what they would say in a childlike, whiny tone:

Danielle: I'm nooo' goooing.

(Field Notes, November 2013, Reception)

Following this, Danielle, along with Tom, spoke to the staff about jobs and they indicated that they felt they were “serious” about getting a job in contrast to the other residents who were either younger or were “daft”.

Despite, these feelings, there was evidence that several other residents were just as keen to follow the transitional pathway to employment. Through the Job Centre's work programme, Nathan secured a job in a supermarket meaning he would receive an additional £22 per week on top of his welfare money. Nathan's initial excitement about the work was as a result of the status of having a job in which he constantly expressed an interest. When Nathan returned to the hostel after his first day of work, wearing his brightly coloured uniform, it was clear that he felt proud and enjoyed the praise he received from the staff and other residents. He appeared to relish the ‘worker’ identity. This was evident on one occasion when he returned to the hostel to find the other residents

and staff enjoying a barbecue. As he joined in, Nathan made a point of telling everyone that he had just “nipped home” from work for a burger before going back out to meet his girlfriend; this was vastly different from the other residents’ day which had been spent in the hostel. However, he also joked that everyone had been having much more fun than he had. His uniform and tiredness from working meant that he stood out from the other residents and while Nathan seemed to enjoy this status, there was a hint that the reality of working was not as exciting as he had imagined. He started to complain that the extra £22 per week was not reflective of the amount of work the job required. Furthermore, he thought his colleagues were boring as they were older and they had nothing in common. Nathan’s situation, therefore, appeared to be indicative of his youth transitional period since he enjoyed the status of having a job while simultaneously he wanted to have fun with people of his own age which his work did not provide. After three weeks, Nathan quit his job because the Job Centre had not delivered on his travel expenses meaning that he was out of pocket.

Several other residents indicated a desire to find a job but their expressions appeared vague in comparison to Callum, Nathan and Danielle’s actions:

I want to get my life sorted out first, get a job. (Cara)

(Field Notes, June 2013, Walking to the Local Shop)

.....

It would get me away from here and I can’t wait to have my own money.

(Matt)

(Field Notes, August 2013, Lounge)

.....

I need a job man, something to get me out during the day. (Amanda)

(Field Notes, August 2013, Outside the Front Door)

These statements can be interpreted in two ways. First, these residents, along with several others, often complained about having a lack of routine, coupled with being bored. Psychologists have pointed to the benefits of establishing a daily routine as being important for mental health as people need to feel a sense of purpose as well as looking to the future and not dwelling on the past (McKee-Ryan et al., 2005; Hoye and Lootens, 2013). Secondly, however, it was possible that statements like those above were expressions of the young people's internalisations of cultural norms to work. It has been argued that people's sense of self and their subsequent narratives and actions are the product of the complex webs of social interactions within which they are engaged (Mead, 1934). Given the political drive and social norms in the UK that strongly encourage engagement in the labour market (McKendrick, Scott and Sinclair, 2007), it is likely that stating a desire to work was a way for the residents to present themselves as endorsing and belonging to this prevailing culture (Goffman, 1959; May, 2013) with the undertone that the actual job seeking process was not something they felt able to do in the present moment, but would in the future. In this way, there was a sense that, for some, their transition to Higher Education or employment was 'on hold' until their circumstances changed.

The Young Self

In addition to 'youth' being defined according to someone's transitional status or engagement in specific cultures and activities, researchers have been interested in people's subjective understandings of the term and whether or not they self-identify as being young (Plug, Zeijl and Bois-Reymond, 2003). In Kelldale, youth identities were apparent during conversations about the ages of the residents in relation to my own as at the time of fieldwork I was 28 years old (6-10 years older than the residents):

Ryan raised the subject of my pizza poster⁴⁴ and said he had a picture of it on his phone. In the photo on my poster he thought I had looked about 17 years old and that now he knows me I'm a lot different than what he had expected. This seemed to be in a good way – the impression I gave from the poster was that I was a 'wee silly girl' but apparently now I'm "cool".

(Field Notes, July 2013, Ryan's Bedsit)

Before being introduced to the residents, Ryan positioned himself as being older and perhaps more mature than I was based on his perception of my pizza poster. However, after getting to know me, he altered his position as he recognised that I was older and my performance was aligned with my age. This appeared to be more preferable to him; perhaps because I represented the age that he was moving towards which he seemed to respect more. On a separate occasion, Ryan once again noted my age as significant:

(T)hey laughed about a bird pooping on Ryan's shoe and this led to a string of conversations which ended with Tom telling a story about overhearing a guy talking to two woman saying "aye and I stabbed him twice but he was alright". The two boys joked saying "well of course he's not alright if he's been stabbed twice!" The conversations were peppered with laughing and singing. Music was playing in the background and now and again Cara or Ryan would sing a line of a song. They also like teasing each other and at one point Cara and Ryan started trying to hit each other's sunburned areas (Cara's arms and Ryan's chest) in a friendly play-fighting manner. Ryan turned to me and said with a smile:

Ryan: *I bet you wish you were our age again!*

(Field Notes, May 2013, Tom's Bedsit)

⁴⁴ When advertising my 'introductory meeting' (see Chapter 4), I created posters to display around the hostel to advertise the event. In one poster I included a photograph of myself in which I was holding a slice of pizza and making a silly face.

Ryan made this comment because I was an observer to these events and he thought I was feeling left out which he deemed understandable because I was older. The implication was that my leisure interests and ideas of fun were different from theirs because of our age differences. This contrast, therefore, highlighted how the residents enacted distinctive forms of leisure and playfulness that were perceived as appropriate for their age. While they did not specifically use the word ‘youthful’, these interactions can be interpreted as such, as they contained a significant age dimension.

While the Kelldale residents seemed to identify with the youth label, their actions and assertions could fluctuate between embracing and celebrating this identity, as seen in the above extract, to frustration about being unable to fully access the ‘adult world’. The context of this fluid youthfulness was that it was enacted within Kelldale – a highly-controlled living space that accommodated people whose ages fell both below and above the legal age (18-years old) for engaging in various activities. Indeed, there was a notable difference in how the ‘young’ selves were constructed between the residents who were aged 16-17 and those who were older. In a conversation with Liam about the adult responsibilities of budgeting, the 17-year old responded:

Fuck being a grown up! I never want to grow up! (Liam)

(Field Notes, July 2013, Lounge)

Being young was a very strong part of Liam and also Jordan’s (aged 17) sense of selves as it was tied in with their belonging to the ‘Goth’ subculture. As is typical of this subculture (Hodkinson, 2002), these two residents made a considerable effort to outwardly express and embody this Gothic image. This was done through wearing dark colours, baggy jeans, hoodies and t-shirts emblazoned with the logos of heavy metal, punk and rock bands. The two residents had various body piercings, tattoos and they often wore dark eye liner. They frequently referred to themselves as ‘Goths’ with a fierce sense of pride and acknowledged that this was a distinct subcultural community. With respect to cultural and relational belonging (May, 2013), identifying as Goths enabled Liam and Jordan to feel connected to a specific subculture and form relationships with other people who they perceived as similar to them. Furthermore, as subcultures are strongly associated with youth (Widdicombe and Wooffitt, 1995) their embodiment of

being Goths was indicative of their young sense of self, although neither of them explicitly stated this. Their youthfulness was particularly apparent though when Liam and Jordan discussed their upcoming 'prom' at a nightclub that was known to attract members of the Gothic subculture:

Liam said that he's wearing a dress to the prom and Jordan said he's wearing his Spongebob Squarepants pyjamas...The boys had put the Kerrang channel on the TV and a song by the band Bullet for My Valentine came on. Jordan stood up and announced he was going to do the '[name of nightclub] dance'. This involved him mouthing the words to the song and making dramatic arm movements.

(Field Notes, June 2013, Lounge)

This extract strongly conveys the fun element of Jordan and Liam's worlds; where dressing up in pyjamas associated with a children's cartoon was a clear statement of being young. This symbolism of childhood was one way in which Liam and Jordan challenged adult norms of looking and acting in certain ways. Their emphasis on having fun, taking pleasure in music and statements such as "fuck being an adult" were suggestive of a distinctive non-adult sense of self and a perception of adulthood as representing the antipathy of having fun, subcultural belonging and being carefree.

In comparison, Matt was approaching his 18th birthday and expressed excitement in reaching this milestone as it would offer him legal rights and responsibilities associated with adulthood such as drinking alcohol and being able to vote. In contrast to Liam and Jordan who celebrated their youth position, Matt desired to enter the world of legal adulthood. His primary motive was to be able to drink alcohol in pubs and nightclubs, something which several of the over-18s did if they found themselves with money to spare⁴⁵. Turning 18 was therefore symbolic of a sense of freedom to engage in the drinking culture. The significance of being legally allowed to smoke and drink was also emphasised by Nathan:

⁴⁵ Although some of the older residents sometimes went to the pub, the higher cost of buying a drink in licensed businesses (in comparison to off-licences and supermarkets) meant that this was a rarity. Instead, their alcohol use was predominantly comprised of cheap alcohol purchased from local shops.

If I smoke I'll smoke, if I want a drink I'll drink, nobody's going to stop me, I'm 18, I'm legal. (Nathan)

(Interview, August 2013, Lounge)

Although turning 18 enabled the residents to drink alcohol legally, the majority had been drinking from a younger age. The following conversation between Liam and Jordan (both aged 17) and Danielle, Chloe and Garry (all aged 21) revealed some of the complexities of youth leisure, legality and identity:

Liam and Jordan told us that they're going to the nightclub tonight for the prom. Danielle and Chloe overheard this and asked if they could go too. The boys said yes but Jordan pointed out that it's an under-18s night.

Danielle: *Oh we'll get done for being big paedos!*

Garry asked if that meant there wouldn't be any alcohol. Liam said yes but that everyone just gets "mad wi' it" before they get there.

(Field Notes, June 2013, Lounge)

From this conversation it appeared that some of the residents shared an interest in attending nightclubs as a form of leisure. Drinking alcohol was associated with clubbing but the legal drinking limit meant that Liam and Jordan had to find other, illegal, ways of becoming intoxicated. The older residents had full access to this form of leisure in comparison to the younger residents whose access was only partial. Danielle's comment about the older residents being 'paedos' (paedophiles) suggested that she viewed the older residents as adults and the younger residents as children. Given that paedophilia is illegal and highly defamatory in the UK, the implication of Danielle's comment was that the older residents would be viewed suspiciously and unfavourably by the 'generalised other' (Mead, 1934) if they were visibly seen to be socialising with under-18s. Danielle was expressing an understanding of the social rules of nightclub leisure. Nightclubs are sites in which young people can rehearse adult identities as a stage in their transitional

movement towards adulthood (Northcote, 2006). Although it is not uncommon for under-18s to drink alcohol and attend nightclubs, full access to adult leisure is only legally permitted and internally felt when someone turns 18 (Johnson, 2013). The conversation between the residents above indicated how these social sanctions were internalised into the self as each person seemed to know the ‘rules of the game’ (May, 2013). Therefore, despite the residents’ shared interests in nightclubs and drinking, age served as a powerful structure in constructing the boundaries of ‘child/young person’ and ‘adult/young person’ identities.

The staff also engaged in this ‘child versus adult’ discourse in relation to the two age groups that was usually manifest in conversations about alcohol:

If they’ve had a few drinks then that’s fine. I mean they’re adults after all and not doing anything that other adults wouldn’t do. (Gillian, staff)

(Field Notes, May 2013, Main Office)

The older residents were expected to take a greater level of responsibility for themselves compared to the 16-17 year olds. This was apparent when contrasting the experiences of Jack (aged 20) and Stacy (aged 17) when they moved out of Kelldale. Both residents had been forced to leave the hostel because of their involvement with the police and the staff had attempted to find somewhere for them to go:

Jack found himself out on the street without his belongings. The staff packed up his belongings into bin bags but weren’t going to give them all to Jack until he found somewhere new to stay. I asked what he would do and they explained that he needs to present himself at the Nell Centre⁴⁶. If they have a bed free then he will get it but if they can’t accommodate him or find someone else who will, then the most they can do is give him a sleeping bag for him to sleep on the streets.

⁴⁶ The Nell Centre was an emergency homeless shelter that provided a limited number of beds and sleeping bags for rough sleepers.

(Field Notes, June 2013, Main Office)

.....

Cathy (staff) then called the Nell Centre and was told that Stacy could go there but they couldn't guarantee her a bed, only a sleeping bag:

Cathy: No! Absolutely not! She is 17 and vulnerable. You have a duty of care to find her somewhere to live, even if it's a B&B.

(Field Notes, May 2013, Main Office)

Although Cathy told the Nell Centre that they had a "duty of care" to place Stacy in accommodation, this was also the case for Jack as both young people were homeless. However, Stacy was constructed as more vulnerable than Jack, which meant that the staff felt a greater need to ensure she had somewhere safe to sleep. Although gender may have played a part, Cathy argued for Stacy's vulnerability on the grounds of age.

Similarly, a few of the older residents constructed the under-18 residents as being more vulnerable. On one occasion, Danielle and Tom had heard a rumour that Matt was going to be evicted from the hostel for not paying his rent:

That's shite though. He's a 17-year old boy who's been used to living with his maw and yous are kicking him out for not paying rent to somewhere where he needs to pay for his leckie⁴⁷ too! (Tom)

(Field Notes, October 2013, Main Office)

By contrast, though, sometimes their age was taken as an indication that these residents were more likely to cause trouble:

⁴⁷ 'Leckie' is a slang term for electricity

There's gonna be riots in here man with so many young ones in here just now. (Danielle)

(Field Notes, November 2013, Main Office)

While the staff and older residents viewed the 16-17 year olds as a distinctive group that were characterised as vulnerable but also potential troublemakers, the younger residents expressed frustration at being unable to engage in the same activities as the over-18s. Those younger residents who smoked and drank alcohol frequently asked the older residents to purchase these items for them: an act which is against the law. Alternatively, the younger residents sometimes took their chances and attempted to buy these substances themselves knowing that they would fail if they were asked to produce a form of identification.

Similarly, the Kelldale staff were not allowed to show any films with an 18-rating in the hostel. Not only did the older residents find this annoying, the younger residents found it ridiculous as they had all been watching 18-rated films for several years. The residents tried to take advantage of the fact that I was not a member of staff and they assumed I was not as clued up on some of the rules:

I said that I have some DVDs at home that I could bring in but I mentioned that they would need to be certificate 15 or under. Amanda became annoyed and argued that this isn't true. Katie (staff) came into the lounge and I started to ask her about this rule but Amanda caught my eye and said "ssssh" to tell me to keep my mouth shut.

(Field Notes, June 2013, Lounge)

These two examples of the younger residents being legally age-restricted from buying cigarettes and watching 18-rated films were further indications of the incompatible relationship between their sense of self and structural boundaries. For Amanda and the other under-18 residents, the freedom to smoke, drink alcohol and watch movies were regular features of their lives. These were activities that they shared with the older residents and from this perspective the 18-year old demarcation was nonsensical.

The Racial Other

Arguably, being labelled as ‘young’ was one feature that was common to all of the Kelldale residents self-identities although, as indicated above, this label was perceived and handled in different ways. Ethnicity was also a salient feature for everyone, but especially for the small number of minority ethnic residents. In addition to difficulties faced by homeless young people in the UK, those from minority ethnic groups face further marginality. As McNaughton and Quilgars (2009) noted, cultural differences, language barriers and racial discrimination can be features of the lives of minority ethnic groups facing homelessness and poverty. Furthermore, in the same way that research highlights the gendered experiences of homelessness (May, Cloke and Johnsen, 2007), it is likely that the experiences of minority ethnic groups who are homeless in the UK qualitatively differ from British-born white people. Four of the Kelldale residents were born outside the UK; two were from China and did not provide consent to participate in the study⁴⁸. The other two were Rob from Slovakia and Dinesh from Sri Lanka. The only other non-white resident was Vince who was a second-generation settled immigrant from Pakistan meaning he was born in the UK. Rob, Dinesh and Vince all provided consent to participate in the study although, of the three, Vince was the most engaged.

Vince was the only non-white resident to partake in drug use as he regularly smoked cannabis and so the remaining four minority ethnic residents were further differentiated from the majority of white residents on this basis. Rob did not drink alcohol or take drugs but he did smoke tobacco and he would frequently go to one of the other residents to ask for rolling papers. At the time the residents would share their papers but they subsequently mocked him for it in private:

Tom and Stephanie laughed and said that the only time Rob ever spoke to them was to ask for tobacco skins. They began doing impressions of him by mimicking his accent and saying “papers? papers?”.

(Field Notes, July 2013, Lounge)

⁴⁸ This was a result of language barriers and also because they spent little time in the hostel (see Chapter 4)

While the residents expressed openness to socialising with those from minority ethnic backgrounds, evidenced through sharing cigarette papers with Rob, they simultaneously constructed them as dissimilar ‘others’ who they mocked or discriminated against. This was clearly seen in their use of racist language when describing people from different ethnic backgrounds:

At one point, from outside, we heard a noisy conversation in a foreign language. Ryan went to the window to see who it was:

Liam: *Was it nigglets?*

Ryan: *Aye, it was monkey men*

(Field Notes, July 2013, Ryan’s Bedsit)

.....

At the table Jordan started ‘ranting’ about immigrants:

Those Paki bastards come into our country and are on higher benefits than we are! Yes I know I get racist when I’m on a rant but it’s true.
(Jordan)

He continued with his racist “rant” about ‘Pakis’ and how it’s awful that they don’t speak English and they target white girls for sexual assault.

(Field Notes, August 2013, Lounge)

Although most of this derogatory language was not used in front of the minority ethnic residents, I experienced one uncomfortable situation that involved ostracising Rob and Vince on the basis of race. During a group meal in the lounge, everyone, including me, had been sitting around the kitchen table. Rob, Vince and Nathan had arrived late and they sat on the couches as there were no seats left around the table. I stood up to offer my seat to one of them but the others quickly told me to sit down. It became apparent

that they did not want either Rob or Vince to join them at the table. When a staff member said she would need to find more chairs I told the residents that I would need to move and they all whispered loudly to tell me to make sure that Nathan took my seat. During this encounter they frequently used the words ‘Paki’ and ‘Ali Baba’ to indicate their racial discrimination against Rob and Vince. Rob’s English was quite fragmented and it appeared that he had not understood what had happened, but Vince had understood perfectly:

Despite them being nasty, Vince tried his best to join in with their chat. In a bid to fit in he said that he doesn’t like “Pakis” (even though he is British-Pakistani) and he has more white friends than Pakistani friends. Ryan said that Vince was being racist.

(Field Notes, May 2013, Lounge)

Vince’s racial identity was unique compared to any of the other residents in that his British-Pakistani ethnicity meant he straddled both British and Pakistani cultures. In comparison, Dinesh was rarely in the hostel as he attended the Hindu Temple every day and had formed friendships with people he had met there. Likewise, Rob socialised with members of the Eastern European community in the same part of the city as Kelldale. The two Chinese residents lived in Kelldale at the same time as each other and seemed to form a close friendship. Vince had family members both in Britain and Pakistan and he appeared to spend the majority of his social life with his British-Pakistani cousins and their friendship networks. However, as the extract above indicates, he regularly tried to engage in conversations with his fellow residents and informed me that he did not understand why he was viewed as being different from them:

Vince explained that when people say things like “go back to your own country” he responds in a puzzled manner saying:

How can I do that when I’m already in my own country?

(Field Notes, May 2013, Lounge)

Vince's attempt at developing friendships with the other residents by trying to distance himself from the 'Paki' label (and by extension the 'Muslim' label) could be contextualised by a later conversation concerning the highly publicised murder of Lee Rigby – a British-white soldier who was killed by two British-Nigerian Muslim men in May 2013. News of the event had just broken and Vince arrived back at Kelldale feeling very angry:

Vince went into detail about his hatred of racists and explained that even though he condemns the murder, people shouldn't tar all Muslims with the same brush:

Vince: *Racists are just ignorant and arrogant.*

(Field Notes, May 2013, Reception)

Despite having previously said that he dislikes 'Pakis', Vince's strong condemnation of racism indicated that he did not consider himself to be racist and indeed he was often the target of racism from other people. His sense of self seemed to be in a state of flux as he was regularly challenged by navigating the social space between his British and Pakistani identities. While Vince felt a sense of belonging to both cultures, the white Kelldale residents would constantly remind him that he was different and therefore did not fully belong as his different skin colour and Islamic faith constituted both 'discredited' and 'discreditable' attributes that were stigmatised (Goffman, 1963). This resulted in Vince displaying both racist and anti-racist sentiments at different times and in different circumstances. Being in a minority ethnic group has been connected to the concept of 'hierarchies of belonging' (May, 2013). For example, Phoenix (2011) demonstrated that Somali-Muslim women living in London claimed to be unaffected by Islamophobia, yet they simultaneously attempted to forge new identities which the author took as an indicator of their low position on a belonging hierarchy. The same could be said for Vince who tried to distance himself from the 'Paki' label in order to fit in with the other residents. However, despite the commonalities between Vince and the others (such as being young, homeless and a cannabis user), his ethnicity remained a barrier to full acceptance.

“Fucked Up” Mothers and ‘Uninvolved’ Fathers

Just as ethnicity was a salient feature of the self-identities of a small number of the Kelldale residents, so too was being a parent. In addition to the entanglement of substance use in family relationships discussed in Chapter 6, for some of the young people one of the most devastating consequences of their substance use was that they no longer looked after their own children. Chloe, Danielle, Garry and Ryan were all parents to children under the age of 4 but none of them had legal rights to care for their children and only Chloe was allowed to see her daughter at the time of fieldwork. However, as the fieldwork progressed, Chloe missed several of these appointments which resulted in her visits being stopped altogether. Danielle had also lost her visiting rights to her son as a result of missing appointments and for the two young women, the problem was the same: the appointments were scheduled to take place in the mornings which was not compatible with getting drunk the night before or their usual routines of sleeping late. Both Danielle and Chloe described themselves as “alcoholics”; they had attended treatment for their alcohol problems on and off and both believed that alcohol was a large reason for them not being able to see their children:

I just wish I didnae fuck up man. If it wasn't for the drink I'd probably still have my own flat and my boy know what I mean? [Visiting rights] got stopped. I did have, I had him every Saturday to myself and all that. I picked him up and went to my nan's wi' him. But I ended up being drunk every Friday night and didn't turn up one week and that was it. One chance and I fucked it. I should have been fuckin' fightin' tooth and nail for him, I shouldnae miss it, it's my own fault. (Danielle)

(Focus Group, October 2013, Lounge)

Danielle's assertion that she should have fought “tooth and nail” to keep seeing her son suggests that she thought of herself as failing at motherhood. May (2008) has argued that, even when mothers make decisions that could jeopardise their child's wellbeing, such as divorce, they continue to present themselves as ‘morally good mothers’ in that they always prioritise their children's needs, even in adversity. In the most desperate circumstances, mothers with substance use problems sometimes relinquish their custody

rights to their children by placing them into kinship or foster care in the belief that they are doing it for the good of the child (Kearney, Murphy and Rosenbaum, 1994). Danielle did not provide detail about how she originally lost access to her son but her narrative, in contrast to being a ‘good mother’, suggested that she felt a sense of failure as she prioritised her drinking over her son. Indeed, Danielle often claimed that she “fucked up” in different areas of her life including, for example, her involvement in crime which delayed the allocation of a council house. Not only was “fucked up” used as an adverb to describe her actions, Danielle used the phrase as an adjective to describe herself:

In Jenny’s book it will say “turn to the back if you want to read about a fucked up wee lassie”. (Danielle)

(Field Notes, June 2013, Reception)

Failure, immaturity and a sense of chaos appeared to be an internalised component of Danielle’s self-identity.

Garry and Ryan’s parenting situations were similar although when they were asked about their children, they described how the mothers of the children looked after them and would not let the fathers have access to their own children. Garry explained that he was planning to go through the court system to gain legal access but pointed out that this might not be possible until he had his alcohol problems sorted out for which he was currently receiving treatment. Ryan on the other hand, did not disclose any details about seeking legal support, although he frequently spoke about his son whose photographs he had pinned to his bedsit wall. When his current girlfriend announced that she was pregnant, Ryan’s focus turned to making plans to set up a new home with her and their baby. While a ‘good mother’ has been conceived of as putting the child’s needs above all else (May, 2008), an ‘involved father’ self-identity has been characterised in terms of self-perceptions of one’s ability to meet the child’s financial needs, the ability to overcome multiple barriers when one is not living with the child (e.g. having a difficult relationship with the mother) and beliefs about how much a father should be involved in a child’s life and in what way (Troilo and Coleman, 2012). Given Garry and Ryan’s poor financial positions, the barriers they faced in terms of access and substance use, and value undertones of fathers taking secondary parenting positions to mothers, it may have been

the case that neither resident had internalised his role as an ‘involved father’ leading them to have little involvement in their sons’ lives.

These data of ‘fucked up mothers’ and ‘uninvolved fathers’ are consistent with accounts of individualised self-identities and gendered expectations of parenting. Farrugia (2011) has argued that an inability to meet normative expectations is often perceived as indicative of a personal failure rather than as a product of changing or difficult structural conditions. Danielle and Chloe blamed themselves for their inability to access their children, just as Stacy, Jordan and Vince blamed themselves for not being engaged with education. Consistent with Farrugia’s (2011) argument, such individualised interpretations were manifest through feelings of low self-worth and being “fucked up”. The examples of Garry and Ryan, on the other hand, suggested that they were perhaps more capable of being reflexive with their self-identities. They both reframed their identities so as to present themselves favourably with Garry claiming he would ‘fight’ for his child and Ryan attempting to construct a ‘do-over’ with his second child. Given that the mothers of their children were the main carers, this was possibly perceived as a legitimate structural barrier to access, meaning that Garry and Ryan were less likely to view their parenting situations as personal failures. Furthermore, the gender differences apparent between Danielle and Chloe on the one hand, and Garry and Ryan on the other, are reflective of persisting norms around gender and parenting in which mothers are still expected to take a larger parenting role than fathers (Featherstone, 2006; Lister, 2006). This perhaps further explains why Garry and Ryan were more able to resist internalising a sense of failure as the young men’s situations can be viewed as more aligned with social expectation than the situations of the young women.

The Gendered Body

Feminist theory has been particularly influential in raising the concept of self-identity as an issue for sociological research and consequently gender has been one of the most heavily researched areas in relation to identity (see Butler 1990 for example). While gender differences were seen among the young mothers and fathers, literature further points to the ways in which males and females experience homelessness and substance use differently, and the impacts of these positions on their self-identities (May, Cloke and

Johnsen, 2007; Lavery, Robinson and Holdsworth, 2015). However, within Kelldale, gender differences appeared to be minimal. This is consistent with some substance use literature which argues that it is important to pay attention to both gender differences and similarities (Neale, Nettleton and Pickering, 2014). In this thesis, much of the data did not appear to vary by gender but one way in which gender did differentiate the young people was in relation to the self-perceived condition of their bodies.

For most residents, life in Kelldale was characterised by activities that are considered to be ‘unhealthy’ by the ‘generalised other’. Diets that consisted of fatty and sugary food and drink, combined with low levels of exercise and high levels of substance use, meant that the young men complained about being either overweight or underweight in that they had lost muscle definition. In one conversation, Andy explained that he had recently visited the doctor who had informed him he was overweight:

I said half-jokingly “so you’re addicted to junk food” and he laughed and said yes. He agreed with the doctor that he needs to lose weight because he is overweight for his height. However, he didn’t seem to think he would actually be able to stop eating junk food and said that he gets bored being on a diet.

(Field Notes, May 2013, Reception)

.....

Callum: *I’ve lost a stone since I came in here man*

Matt: *I’ve lost five mate!*

(Focus Group, October 2013, Lounge)

The young men who had lost weight and muscle occasionally made statements about their perceived need to begin weight-training at the gym whereas those who had gained weight felt the need to engage in cardiovascular exercise. Ryan, for example, enjoyed playing football but when his relationship with his girlfriend became more serious, he

started skipping football training to spend more time with her. Consequently, he gained weight and this affected the way he felt about himself as he would frequently make jokes or self-deprecating comments about his “fat belly”. Exercise, however, proved to be a challenging activity to engage in for the young people. Although many local gyms offer free trials or discounts for those reliant on welfare benefits, the young people did not have appropriate clothing or shoes to wear to the gym resulting in their desires for exercise being unfulfilled. Similarly, although football, tennis and cycling were activities sometimes organised by the staff, their continuation depended on regular attendance and the young people struggled to maintain pre-established routines. Consequently, exercise activities were often cancelled at short notice if there were insufficient numbers. It also appeared that some of the young people felt embarrassed to be seen exercising in public with the staff:

Tom asked Kyle (staff) how the bike ride had gone and explained that he wants to go but only if he isn't made to wear a “high-vis” vest and only if they don't cycle in a big group.

(Field Notes, October 2013, Reception)

In contrast to the male residents, the young women made very few comments about their bodies in relation to having a poor diet and lacking exercise. Given the problems that women can experience in relation to negative body image (Frost, 2005; Afful and Ricciardelli, 2015), the residents' silence on this matter was rather surprising, although it may have been the case that the young women were more reluctant than the men to voice their feelings on these matters. Rather than complaining about their diets, the young women were more likely to express the toll that substance use took on their bodies through both verbal and non-verbal means. This ranged from Cara and Amanda – relatively light substance users – commenting that certain drinks or drugs made them sick, to Chloe, Danielle and Stephanie whose bodily problems were more substantial.

For Danielle and Stephanie, heavy periods of drinking and drug-taking had a noticeable impact on their skin and hair. This was emphasised during periods of sobriety:

Danielle arrived at the lounge carrying a basket of washing for the laundry. She looked like she was in a productive mood and had just washed and dried her hair. I commented on her hair saying it was looking nice and we chatted about both needing to get our hair cut. I asked her what she had been up to and she told me she had stayed in all weekend which she found difficult to do:

Danielle: It's been hard but I done it...I stayed in because I need to get myself sorted out.

(Field Notes, June 2013, Lounge)

.....

Stephanie had made a point of doing her hair up nicely...Her hair had been washed and styled and looked healthy. Her face was bright, she was wearing make-up and she seemed alert and not sleepy like she often does when she has taken something.

(Field Notes, July 2013, Reception)

Although, verbally, neither of them made the connection between their appearances and substance use, it seemed that acts such as hair-washing and putting on make-up were more likely to occur during periods of sobriety.

In addition, the young women were more likely than the men to become injured when intoxicated. They were typically more vocal about this and often showed me their cuts and bruises. Sometimes their injuries were the result of being involved in physical fights, but they were more frequently caused by accidents that were difficult to recall because the young person had been too drunk or high. Upon telling me that she had been at a house party the previous weekend in which she had consumed large quantities of alcohol, Chloe exclaimed:

Look at my eye!

She had a black eye and cuts and bruises all over her body. I asked her how she got them.

Chloe: *I KO'd⁴⁹ like seven times. I literally fell over in the street!*

(Field Notes, August 2013, Lounge)

Whereas some accidents were caused by the young person's own actions, sometimes injuries were inflicted by other people:

Stephanie told me that the bruises had been caused by the "polis". A few nights ago she had been at her mum's house and was drunk. For some reason (which she didn't explain) she had refused to leave her mum's house so her mum called the police. Stephanie described a struggle between her and the police resulting in the police having to physically grab her and put her into their van. The bruises were a result of the police grabbing her forcefully. She also hit her jaw on the door of the van in the process and has been suffering from toothache ever since.

(Field Notes, July 2013, Stephanie's Bedsit)

It is difficult to comment on the appropriateness of the police actions in this instance but it was Stephanie's comments about it that were most revealing of her self-identity. Stephanie was involved with a drugs worker during her time in Kelldale but was reluctant to speak to me in any detail about her substance use beyond specific incidents like the one above. Her actions indicated that she understood problematic substance use to form a part of her self-identity (an issue which is discussed further in the next section) which was embodied through physical injuries caused by herself and others. Strongly connected to this was Stephanie's tendency to accept responsibility for injuries acquired while she was intoxicated rather than feeling as though she had been mistreated by others. This

⁴⁹ 'KO' means to 'knock out': a slang phrase to denote passing out from being too drunk

resonates with debates over ‘victim blaming’ which involves taking the stance that a victim is responsible for being attacked if she is intoxicated at the time (Sims, Noel and Maisto, 2007). Stephanie’s submissive attitude towards what had happened was largely caused by her intoxicated state affecting her memory of the events. Moreover, this was not the first time she had incurred injuries when intoxicated. Together, these experiences added to the ‘drug user’ dimension of Stephanie’s self in that she passively accepted that injuries and being attacked were an inevitable part of her substance use and she placed the responsibility for these injuries squarely on herself even when they had been inflicted by other people. Therefore, coupled with the ‘drug user’ identity (discussed further in the next section) there appeared to be an internalised, individualised perspective of self-blame which is consistent with the theoretical arguments of Beck (1992) and Farrugia (2011).

The ‘Drug User’ Self and the ‘Junkie’ Other

As discussed throughout Chapters 5 and 6, drug use was pervasive in the lives of many of the young people in Kelldale and the association between drug use and ‘deviance’ often has implications for the self-identities of those who engage in this activity (Becker, 1963). Very often, when a young homeless person is labelled as engaging in ‘substance misuse’, it is assumed that this is problematic and that treatment interventions are required to help the person to ‘sort his life out’ by conforming to normative ideas of what it means to be a morally ‘good’ or ‘healthy’ person (Barton, 2003). While only a small number of residents considered their substance use to be wholly problematic, others reported specific problems linked to their substance use while maintaining a belief that it was not problematic overall. Notably, Andy was the only resident to try to avoid the substance (alcohol) that he felt was problematic for him, while the other residents continued with their substance use despite the difficulties they encountered.

Alcohol was the substance most associated with residents’ claims of being “addicted”. Danielle and Chloe, in particular, openly referred to themselves as “alcoholics” as they were both involved in treatment for their alcohol use. Both young women had lost access to their children as a result of their alcohol use, they had experienced alcohol-induced seizures, they had been involved in violence while drunk which sometimes ended in

criminal charges and they had both put themselves in risky situations when intoxicated. They therefore had histories of alcohol-related problems which preceded their time in Kelldale as well as continuing during their time there.

In relation to cannabis, some members of the ‘core group’ of users (see Chapter 6) including Danielle, Chloe, Tom and Matt claimed that they were “addicted” to the drug on the basis that sourcing and consuming the drug took up a substantial amount of their time and money. However unlike Danielle and Chloe’s experiences with alcohol, there was no evidence that they felt cannabis had negative effects on their health or job prospects or led to involvement in crime. Jordan seemed to be the only young person whose cannabis use had directly taken its toll on his relationship with his parents although he did not perceive himself to have a problem with the drug. Ryan, however, admitted that his use of cannabis negatively impacted on his mental health. He was a heavy user of the drug, consuming cannabis every day, and he explained that he had once been sectioned under mental health legislation because his cannabis use had led to severe paranoia and he had locked himself away in his flat as he was too scared to leave. His heavy use continued throughout his time in Kelldale although occasionally he would take a ‘day off’ from the drug which resulted in experiencing a form of withdrawal:

Ryan: *I shouldnae be feeling like this, my head shouldnae be like this* [Ryan said this as he tapped on the side of his head]

Me: *What you mean “normal”?* [I used my fingers to denote air quotation marks as I said the word ‘normal’]

Ryan: *Aye!* [Ryan laughed and nodded in agreement]

I realised that Ryan looked distinctly sober and not stoned and he was feeling agitated by this.

(Field Notes, September 2013, Lounge)

Despite these issues, some residents (including Ryan) often boasted about their drug use

I can smoke four joints and it's not obvious that I'm stoned because I can act normal (Jordan)

Jordan compared himself to Liam and teased him for being a “lightweight”. Liam shrugged and agreed that it doesn’t take a lot of cannabis to make him really stoned. He said it’s a good thing because it means he doesn’t spend as much money on drugs.

(Field Notes, June 2013, Lounge)

The residents’ actions and narratives indicated that (apart from money issues) they generally did not view their cannabis use as problematic and, indeed, it was something to brag about. This suggested that some young people readily internalised a ‘cannabis user’ or ‘drug user’ self-identity. Boasting or celebrating their drug use was further evidenced when some of the young people changed the lyrics of a pop song by Daft Punk from “we’re up all night to get some” to “we’re up all night to get stoned” and took pleasure in wandering around the hostel singing it at the top of their voices.

The change in a resident’s appearance through the use of alcohol and drugs could prove problematic for some if they were trying to conceal their substance use from the staff. Cannabis in particular often affected a person’s facial appearance as it resulted in very pale skin, dilated pupils and red puffy eyes:

Chloe didn’t say much. She stood leaning on Craig’s shoulder with her head slumped forward. Her eyes were red and puffy and I thought she had been crying but then realised she was stoned. She started giggling.

(Field Notes, October 2013, Reception)

Usually there was little the residents could do to disguise the effects of cannabis on their appearance and if they had consumed cannabis outside of the building, they did not feel as though they had to deny their intoxication when questioned by staff upon their return. However, if they had consumed cannabis within the building, their main strategy was to

remain in their bedsits and out of sight of the staff to avoid being caught. For the most part, though, the resident's embraced the physical effects that cannabis took on their bodies. This was further evident through their reactions when a staff member commented on their intoxicated appearance:

[Jordan's] eyes were still puffy and bleary. Gillian (staff) asked him if he had been "partaking" in cannabis smoking...Jordan said he had been smoking cannabis when he was out earlier and he was currently on his way out to smoke some more.

(Field Notes, July 2013, Reception)

Further evidence of the residents' acceptance of the 'drug user' embodied identity was their conversations about who looked more intoxicated in comparison to others:

Tom commented that it's funny how some people can smoke weed and not look stoned whereas other people are really obviously stoned. I said that it's obvious when Matt's been smoking because his eyes go all puffy:

Danielle: Aye and Chloe and Craig's eyes used to go dead bloodshot.

Tom: We wouldnae let them come down to the office when they were stoned because we would get caught.

Tom said that the staff always tells him and Danielle that they know the two residents have a higher tolerance than others which makes harder for the staff to know for sure if they've been smoking.

(Field Notes, November 2013, Main Office)

However, sometimes a resident would be falsely accused of smoking cannabis because of her appearance. According to Jordan and Amanda, they were asked on separate occasions if they were intoxicated when actually their puffy eyes were the result of being tired. These incidents highlighted that the conveyance of a 'drug user' self via the young

people's narratives and physical appearances had become the norm in Kelldale which, in turn, influenced the ways in which the staff framed and interacted with the residents.

While those residents who engaged in substance use typically embraced and embodied the drug user dimension of their selves, this had its limits. Notably, they made clear distinctions between their own substance use and that of 'junkies'. As discussed in Chapter 3, the word 'junkie' is a particularly stigmatising term as it not only refers to the use of heroin but heroin users' associations with criminality and perceived degraded morality (Radcliffe and Stevens, 2008). It is common for users of certain drugs to distance themselves from those who use other drugs (Palamer, 2014; Furst and Evans, 2015) – a process referred to as 'othering' (Rødner, 2005). In doing so, they can minimise their 'spoiled identity' by diverting attention to others who are viewed as worse (Goffman, 1963; Neale, Nettleton and Pickering, 2011). In Kelldale, the residents were adamant that their substance use was substantially different from that of 'junkies':

Andy explained he had once lived in a hostel which was full of "old junkies":

Andy: It's basically a five storey building full of junkies.

The other boys nodded in agreement. Andy said that one time he was leaving his room at the hostel when a guy asked him if he wanted to buy a bag of "smack". Andy replied to the guy saying:

Naw, do I look like a junkie?

He seemed insulted and annoyed by being offered a bag of heroin. The three residents generally talked about junkies in a derogatory and disdainful manner.

(Field Notes, June 2013, Lounge)

Because of the stigma associated with heroin, it was common for the residents to tease each other and make jokes about being heroin users. For example, Stacy pretended to be a heroin user and claimed that she needed to get her "green juice", referring to methadone,

and Craig joked that he takes “smack” all the time. One of the longest running jokes concerning heroin involved Chloe. She had lost some of her teeth prior to living in Kelldale after getting into a fight; but her friends in the hostel found it funnier to claim that she had lost her teeth because of heroin use. They began calling Chloe “TT” which stood for ‘Tootin⁵⁰ Teeth’ and over the course of several months this nickname continued with Chloe often joining in with the joke by making claims about her heroin addiction. Sometimes their statements about being heroin users were quite convincing but every time I asked the residents to provide clarity they all explained that they had never taken the drug and never would.

Consistent with the embodied aspect of drug use and their playfulness, residents would sometimes mimic a ‘junkie’ and this always involved changing their voice in a distinctive manner. The tone they used was a particularly strong Scottish accent that was nasal-sounding and involved elongating certain words. Furthermore, these impressions always involved asking for money or drugs which was in line with the notion that ‘junkies’ are also ‘scroungers’ (Radcliffe and Stevens, 2008):

Jordan did an impression of a junkie which involved putting on a whiny voice that sounded like he was holding his nose:

Jordan: *Awriiiiite, you got any spare change pal?*

(Field Notes, June 2013, Lounge)

During a separate conversation about the topic, Andy clarified that if someone approached him and spoke to him in this distinctive voice and if the person was unwashed and skinny, then he would assume the person was a ‘junkie’. However, if he later found out that the person did not use heroin, then he would not consider him to be a ‘junkie’. Thus, the embodied ‘junkie’ image was specific to heroin users.

Despite the young people holding specific ideas about the ‘junkie’ label and their insistence that their substance use and ‘drug user’ selves were very different, during the

⁵⁰ ‘Tooting’ is the word used to describe the act of smoking heroin

focus group the grey areas concerning this topic came to light. In particular, some mentioned that they had friends and relatives who were heroin users and they highlighted some of the complexities of this:

Tom: *Everyone might slag them and hates them but I don't know about them, I've got one or two in the family*

Chloe: *So do I*

Tom: *It's a dirty drug that you get addicted to*

Danielle: *It's just another thing isn't it? Some of my pals maw's and all that, you can tell they're kit heids⁵¹ know what I mean? But my pals just wouldnae let you in [to their house] and when you get into arguments and all that, "shut it yer maw's a kit heid" and all that. It's just a dig tae fling at them know what I mean?*

Matt: *Aye*

Danielle: *Really, I still spoke to them and I don't walk by them in the street because...*

Chloe: *I talk tae druggies*

Danielle: *Because they'll talk to me 'cause they're my pals maws and that*

(Focus Group, October 2013, Lounge)

In this conversation, the residents conveyed sympathy for 'junkies' and blamed the drug for their situations rather than the morality of the individual, which is in line with disease

⁵¹ 'Kit' is a slang word for heroin and a 'kit heid' refers to a heroin users

models of addiction (Yates, 2015). Danielle and Chloe appeared to take pride in the fact that they would stop and talk to ‘junkies’ on the street usually because they were the relatives of their friends. Yet, as Danielle pointed out, being related to a ‘junkie’ could be used as an insult against someone in an argument. They went on to discuss the difference between ‘junkies’ and acknowledged that not everyone fitted with their stereotyped ideas of being dirty and stealing from old ladies. Tom explained that he had been in “immaculate” houses belonging to heroin users and no one would guess that they were ‘junkies’ because of the cleanliness of their homes. Therefore, although heroin use was viewed as unacceptable, those who embodied the stereotype of a ‘junkie’ were framed as being worse than those whose appearances did not give away their use of the drug. In other words, the residents distinguished between the ‘discredited’ (those whose heroin use was visible) and the ‘discreditable’ (those whose heroin use was hidden: Goffman, 1959).

Temporarily Homeless or Temporarily at Home?

There is a substantial body of literature that has explored the ‘homeless’ identity with regards to how it is imposed on people; whether or not those without a home believe they are homeless and how people negotiate this ascribed identity (e.g. Perry, 2013). In particular, Parsell (2011) provided an analysis of enacted homeless identities among a group of rough sleepers in which he demonstrated that homeless people accept or reject the ‘homeless’ label depending on the specific set of circumstances they find themselves in. Given such literature and the propensity for those without a stable and secure home to be referred to by wider society as ‘the homeless’, it was important to understand whether, and how, the Kelldale residents incorporated this label into their sense of self. Furthermore, since the participants in this study were not rough sleepers and experienced a different form of homelessness, it was expected that their self-identities would reflect this different setting.

When asked directly about what being ‘homeless’ meant to them, some residents made a distinction between rough sleeping and their own situation:

Nathan: *Homelessness to me is you're asked to leave the family home and having nowhere else to go and being put in here. Not like the jakes in the street that walk about with the cups trying to run up to you like that "geez money" wi' no shoes on!*

Me: *So d'you think that homelessness is if you're actually on the street?*

Nathan: *There's two different sorts of homelessness. You've got the people in the hostels like Springton Place and Tollforth, then you've got the people in the street that are basically roofless, so we are a low homeless, they're a higher risk, so they've got more chance of catching shit.*

Me: *What d'you mean 'catching shit'?*

Nathan: *A cold!* [Nathan laughed]

(Interview, August 2013, Lounge)

Elsewhere, Nathan referred to Kelldale as 'supported accommodation' and in the above extract he seemed to make a distinction between Kelldale and 'hostels'. However, he still considered him and his fellow residents to be 'low homeless' indicating that he identified a spectrum of high-low homelessness based on his perceptions of risk. Therefore, his association with the label of 'homeless' seemed to be weak as he recognised that he fell within a category of homelessness but that this was marginal. Furthermore, it is well-documented that the main causes of youth and adult homelessness are different and that the leading cause of the former is family breakdown (Johnsen and Quilgars, 2009). Therefore, Nathan's assertion that homelessness was caused by being asked to leave the family home and having nowhere else to go fits with his knowledge and experiences of *youth* homelessness and thus highlights the intersectionality between his youth and 'low homeless' self. His statement further indicated that he characterised those who were street homeless as being poor, partially clothed and begging which was

an image that was far removed from his own identity. This is consistent with a tendency amongst homeless people to engage in downward comparison as a coping strategy for their 'spoiled identity' (Boydell, Goering and Morrell-Bellai, 2000) which was similar to the resident's strong dissociation between their drug use and that of 'junkies'. Overall, Nathan's identification with the 'homeless' label was weak and he framed himself, and his fellow residents, as being in need of support in a way that differed from the type of help that rough sleepers require.

Consistent with Nathan's narrative was Jordan's explicit separation from the label of 'homeless'. Rather than this distinction being framed in comparison with other forms of homelessness, Jordan made the comparison between being 'homeless' and having a 'home':

Now it's like I don't really class myself as homeless now cause, like, even though this is a homeless unit that I'm in, in honesty it does feel sort of like home in a way because, like, the people that are in here, everyone's just like so friendly to you, like, everyone just gets on and, like, the staff are so funny and all that, plus they're always there, any time of day that you need them they're always going to be there. (Jordan).

(Interview, July 2013, Meeting Room)

Jordan related his feeling of being 'at home' with the relationships he had developed with his fellow residents and members of staff. This suggested that Jordan's perception of homelessness was partially connected to being isolated and not having these same types of relationships. Therefore, his assertion that he felt that Kelldale was a 'home' was consistent with literature that conceptualises a home as not only bricks and mortar but a place that provides ontological security and a place to develop socially and emotionally (Mallett, 2004). Furthermore, Jordan compared the homely feel of Kelldale to a "homeless unit" where the use of the word 'unit' was reminiscent of a medical institution such as a hospital or psychiatric unit (Dhillon et al., 2014; Jaeger et al., 2015) or a children's home which is sometimes referred to as a 'residential unit' (Audit Scotland, 2010). This implied that Jordan did not feel as though he was treated pathologically or like he was a child because of his homeless status and that Kelldale was different from

his ideas of what a 'homeless unit' would typically be like. He emphasised the friendliness of the residents and staff which, for him, made Kelldale feel like a home. This sense of feeling at home was consequently incorporated into Jordan's sense of self as he explained that living in a place that provided stability as well as a chance to form relationships helped him to feel as though he was actually living the life he wanted:

At least in here, like, you can actually learn and that, like, everyone helps you plus it can help you in the long run, like, if you've got trouble saving money and that, they can help you with that. It gives you a place to actually live as well, plus you'll meet a whole lot of new people, people will come and go from the unit but near enough everyone that you meet, they're always just going to be so friendly, so no matter what, you're always going to make quite a few friends. (Jordan).

(Interview, July 2013, Meeting Room)

Jordan's comments were based on his experiences of sofa surfing for a relatively long period of time before arriving at Kelldale. Thus, his feelings were set within a context of historical instability. Having to be constantly pre-occupied with finding somewhere to sleep for the night meant that Jordan's ability to achieve the things he wanted to achieve such as learning new skills, saving money and making new friends were pushed aside. Kelldale offered him a place to live out these goals which was perhaps why he distanced himself from the 'homeless' label which, for him, was symbolic of not having these opportunities.

While Nathan referred to Kelldale as "supported accommodation" and Jordan called it a "homeless unit", Garry did not provide a name for Kelldale but was very clear that it was not the same as a children's residential unit. This was expressed in relation to some of the residents teasing me in the early days of fieldwork:

Aye you thought you were coming into a children's home didn't you? (Garry).

(Field Notes, June 2013, Ryan's Bedsit)

Both Ryan and Garry found the idea of Kelldale being a children's home amusing and suggested that the hostel was an entirely different environment. This was possibly a reflection of age. Ryan and Garry were aged 20 and 21 respectively whereas Jordan was 17. Jordan may not have been as reluctant or embarrassed to draw comparisons between Kelldale and a children's home as he was closer in age to those who do live in such residential units.

Much has been written about the homeless identity and how people negotiate this status which is largely ascribed to them but which can sometimes become internalised to form a dimension of the self (Boydell, Goering and Morrell-Bellai, 2000; Parsell, 2011). It was expected that there would be apparent evidence of how the Kelldale residents felt about their homeless status and how they managed this. Instead, little was said about this label, with the data presented thus far representing the strongest insights. Nathan and Jordan's discussions of homelessness were derived from the interviews and therefore they had to be directly asked about this label because there were very few spontaneous conversations about the issue. Even then, both residents expressed ambivalence about the label: they recognised that they were technically homeless and living in homeless accommodation but beyond this, being labelled as 'homeless' was quite meaningless.

Rather than focusing on being 'homeless', several residents' actions and statements suggested that feelings of 'home' were more salient. Like Jordan, Cara also referred to the hostel as her "home". Cara was strict about letting other residents socialise in her bedsit and she enjoyed keeping her own bedsit as a separate space:

As well as not liking the mess, she said she prefers going to other people's rooms because she spends enough time as it is in her own room. For her it's like going to someone else's house. I asked her about overnight stays and she said it was the same thing. Sometimes if she's at a friend's house the friend will invite her to stay whereas other times she will BBM one of her friends saying "I need to get out of this house can I come and stay with you?".

(Field Notes, July 2013, Lounge)

Cara appeared to have deliberately constructed her bedsit as a private space that was similar to a kind of home. Her feelings of going to another person's house when she left her bedsit were akin to feeling as though Kelldale was a small community and she was going to visit her neighbours. However, her need to sometimes get away from the hostel acted as a reminder that her bedsit 'home' and the wider hostel could function as both a pleasant place to be in and an environment that could become stifling. This is similar to the literature which has explored how the meanings of home change over time as sometimes 'home' functions as a site of security and comfort whereas other times it is a site of oppression and loneliness: this is particularly the case for women (Gurney, 1997).

These feelings of being stifled were also expressed by many of the residents at various points throughout the fieldwork:

This place gets to you after a while. You don't know what day it is, what time it is, whether you're coming or going. (Stephanie)

(Field Notes, June 2013, Kitchen)

.....

I hate staying inside here, I find it really hard. (Andy)

(Field Notes, June 2013, Lounge)

.....

I can't wait another four weeks [to move out]; I'm going to kill myself in here! (Amanda)

(Field Notes, June 2013, Lounge)

These types of statements had a strong temporal dimension and were often stated when a resident had nothing to do and when there was no one else around (other than me) to

socialise with. Nonetheless, they highlighted the volatility of feeling at home in Kelldale as, within a short period of time, their actions and statements could fluctuate between expressing a sense of feeling settled and 'at home' and a need to 'get out'. Sometimes, the residents' statements about needing to leave Kelldale were accompanied by deliberate pacing around a room which mimicked the idea of an animal trapped in a cage. This was the case although there was nothing to stop them from physically walking out of the front door. The problem was that they had nowhere to go and therefore feelings of being stifled or trapped were indicative of a much larger barrier: that whether they liked it or not, Kelldale was their current home and this would remain the case until alternative accommodation was found.

Not all residents referred to Kelldale as their 'home' with many simply using the name 'Kelldale' when referring to the hostel. Arguably the biggest barrier to enabling the residents to feel fully 'at home' was that their stay in Kelldale was temporary and this was known from the outset of their arrival. In this sense, Kelldale could be viewed as a 'contradictory space'. On the one hand, the young people were encouraged to make themselves 'at home'. As discussed in the preceding chapters, this was done through the facilitation of place-making activities such as hanging pictures in their bedsits as well as interacting with fellow residents and staff members. On the other hand, they could not become too comfortable as they did not know how long they would be living there. Amanda and Danielle had ended up living in Kelldale for over a year and when the staff had problems trying to get Amanda to leave once she had been given the keys to her new flat, they claimed that the problem was caused by her being there for 'too long' and getting 'too comfortable'. Therefore, the message of Kelldale was 'make yourself at home, but do not get too settled'. This contradiction was recognised by Chloe and Danielle:

Chloe: *They're only trying to get us a gaff⁵² so they can break up this wee stupid gang...or whatever you call it; it's not even a stupid gang*

Danielle: *They tell us right when you first move in 'oh don't sit in your room'*

Chloe: *'Don't sit away fae people'*

Danielle: *'Don't isolate yourself' and all that and then we become pals, sit wi' each other and then it's 'oh there's too many of you, yous are all together too much' and all that*

Chloe: *Aye*

Danielle: *What do they fuckin expect us to dae? Cannae win*

(Focus Group, October 2013, Lounge)

It is argued that the temporary nature of living in Kelldale is likely to have played a substantial part in the residents' ambivalence about their homelessness. They were encouraged to make themselves at home but within a highly controlled setting and only for an unknown period of time. Therefore, rather than the 'homeless' label being incorporated into the self, living in Kelldale instilled an ambivalent, confused or transitional dimension to the young people's self-identities. In the same way that the residents expressed their youthful selves as fluctuating between childlike and adult-like identities, they similarly appeared to fluctuate between feelings of being at home and of being homeless. They were neither homeless nor at home but somewhere in the middle and this appeared to characterise a significant dimension of their enacted sense of self.

⁵² A 'gaff' refers to a house

Conclusion

In continuing to address the research objectives concerning how life in Kelldale was perceived and experienced by the young people, the meanings associated with substance use and the socio-spatial contexts of their substance use, this chapter has attempted to unpack some of the complex dimensions of the residents' self-identities. In doing so it prioritises the 'self' dimension of the socio-spatial-*self* relations which have framed this thesis. These dimensions included features of youth, ethnicity, parenting, gender, substance use and homelessness which were interwoven with the young people's verbal and non-verbal expressions. It has been argued that self-identity, behaviours and society all exist in a dialectical loop: a person's self and sense of belonging develop through her social interactions (with individuals and the 'generalised other') which influences her conduct (Mead, 1934; Blumer, 1969; May, 2013). Therefore, examining the young people's behaviours and narratives could reveal aspects of their selves and, likewise, examining their selves could assist in explaining their behaviours and narratives. While the use of labels to describe the young people is a contentious issue as it risks homogenising and flattening a holistic person into a set of discrete attributes, the categories that have been explored in this chapter are all those which the participants themselves recognised as being ascribed to them. Some of these labels, with their associated normative understandings, were internalised by the young people, whereas others were outwardly rejected or proved to be relatively meaningless. Labels in this chapter have, therefore, been understood as heuristic devices which represent societal attitudes. Through examining how the young people used and negotiated certain labels, as well as how they spoke about themselves and other people, it was possible to unpack some aspects of their self-identities.

Within the highly controlled context of Kelldale, the self-identities of the residents were expressed through their appearances, narratives and behaviours; all of which were closely intertwined. For example, appearances conveyed the youthfulness of Callum, Jordan and Liam's identities as each wore particular clothing and – in Jordan and Liam's cases – had piercings, tattoos and make-up. For these residents, their appearances reflected their sense of cultural belonging to college (Callum), and the Gothic subculture (Jordan and Liam). Self-identities were further unpacked through the physicality of Vince's ethnicity and the physical injuries incurred through the young women's intoxication. Clearly

Vince could not determine his own skin colour and this acted as a barrier to being fully accepted as a friend by the white-majority residents. Injuries, on the other hand, could have possibly been avoided but their existence symbolised the young women's substance use behaviours and it appeared connected to feelings of self-blame.

Unlike data derived from other qualitative methods such as interviews, narratives that were revealing of the young people's identities occurred spontaneously in the majority of cases. Their inclusion within everyday conversations spoke of the strength and significance of how wider social understandings influenced the residents' sense of self. For example, discussions about employment and parenting indicated the young people's awareness of normative values and beliefs. The dominant expectations for young people to enter Higher Education or employment and social norms that prescribe the criteria for being a 'good' mother were evident in the young people's narratives. As they largely did not conform to these ideals, their self-identities in these domains were characterised by perceptions of inadequacy and failure. Tellingly, none of the residents explicitly highlighted structural factors (such as being homeless) that disadvantaged them in these domains, suggesting that their 'failures' were understood as being caused by individualised shortcomings, which is consistent with the assertions made by youth researchers such as Farrugia (2011) and Woodman and Wyn (2015).

However, one notable way in which the young people constructed a sense of 'success', was by contrasting their substance use with that of 'junkies'. This downward comparison has been noted elsewhere in the literature (Palamer, 2014) as a strategy used to avoid a negatively ascribed self-identity while simultaneously legitimising one's current performance (Goffman, 1959). Interestingly, the same sort of downward comparison that was used by the residents in relation to their homelessness had a different meaning. Although they distanced themselves from rough sleepers, this did not appear to be an attempt to defend their self-identities. Rather, such 'othering' (Rødner, 2005) was underpinned by a recognition that the residents could easily have found themselves having to sleep rough (indeed, some had prior experience of this) had they not been accommodated in Kelldale. Rough sleeping, unlike heroin use, was constructed as circumstantial and outwith a person's control. In contrast, heroin use was attributed to individual, moral failings.

Aside from contrasting their own behaviours with those of ‘junkies’, when it came to the residents’ own substance use there were mixed accounts. With the exception of the ‘addicted’ narratives of Danielle and Chloe in relation to their alcohol use, the majority of the young people’s substance use was understood as only partially problematic. Indeed, there was evidence to indicate that some residents took pride in their cannabis use and their ability to become intoxicated without it affecting their outward appearances. As has been argued throughout the entire thesis, feelings of belonging and creating a pleasant place to live seemed to overshadow any thoughts about their substance use being problematic. Therefore, the internalisation of a substance user identity was regarded as partially positive because, within the context of Kelldale, it meant that the young person felt connected to his friends, the Kelldale and wider drug cultures, and the sensory environment. This finding is crucial as it supports the argument throughout this thesis that substance use literature needs to look beyond accounts of drug and alcohol use which frame it as ‘problematic’. Although interventions are often valuable for assisting people to overcome substance use-related problems, focusing on the need to ‘fix a problem’ can result in simplifying a highly complex issue. It is important, therefore, to understand the nuances of people’s substance use behaviours and how such behaviours (and society’s response) become interpreted and incorporated into a person’s sense of self. Such understandings can lead to a more sensitive discourse around substance use which can filter through to ensure more effective policies and practices which place the holistic person at the centre and do not construct substance use as an isolated phenomenon, detached from its wider context.

Interestingly, the label of ‘homeless’ was relatively meaningless for the young people in this study. This contrasts with existing literature which constructs the notion of a ‘homeless identity’ (Parsell, 2011; Perry, 2013). Instead, there was evidence to suggest that feelings of ‘home’ were more salient. However, the residents remained highly aware of the conditionality, restrictions and contradictions that characterised Kelldale. Nonetheless, this finding is significant because it suggests that hostels like Kelldale, which provide a high level of support, can prevent people from internalising their homeless status into their self-identities. Given that certain self-perceptions of homelessness can lead to individualised feelings of low self-worth and mental health problems (Kidd, 2007; Farrugia, 2011), this finding has substantial implications.

Bringing together the data presented in this chapter, it is argued that the resident's self-identities were predominantly characterised by ambivalence which had a temporal dimension. Their age and youthfulness put them 'in the middle' between childhood and adulthood. Their homelessness put them 'in the middle' of leaving the parental home and getting their own home, while living in temporary accommodation was viewed as a midpoint between rough sleeping and having their own home meaning they were 'low homeless' – to use Nathan's phrase. Moreover, their substance use was self-perceived as 'in the middle' of being harmless and amounting to 'addiction'. These were intersected by ethnicity, parental status and gender for some. Of each of these dimensions, the one which seemed most likely to change first was their homelessness status. Therefore, it is highly likely that moving on from Kelldale would not only alter the residents' self-identities in relation to housing, as Farrugia (2011) found in his study, but it could result in a knock-on effect for other aspects of their selves. The knowledge that their stay in Kelldale would come to an end could, therefore, have played an implicit, yet significant role in the embodied selves of the young people.

Chapter 8: Discussion – Youth Substance Use and Temporary Living

Introduction

Using an ethnographic approach to explore the substance use of young people living in temporary accommodation has provided insight into the complexities of their day-to-day lives. This has implications for the simplified manner in which drug and alcohol use is often portrayed. Furthermore, highlighting the lived experiences of homelessness in temporary accommodation provides an alternative lens to the policy-focused literature that dominates this area of research. Although Chapters 5, 6 and 7 have presented the data alongside the relevant literature, this final chapter reiterates the key contributions of the thesis and summarises the overarching conceptual narrative that has been developed. After summarising the main findings and highlighting their implications for theory, policy and practice, the chapter reflects on the research journey and the benefits and limitations of using ethnography in this context. While ethnography has its drawbacks, it is argued that this approach was invaluable for eliciting new insights. The thesis closes by indicating avenues for further research.

Socio-Spatial-Self Relations in a Temporary Context

This thesis has argued that self and society exist in a dialectical relationship whereby the self shapes, and is shaped by, society. (Mead, 1934; Blumer, 1969; May, 2013). This process influences action, as behaviours are seen to be a person's response to her knowledge about the 'generalised other' attitude, the specific audience and the social situation (Mead, 1934; Goffman, 1959). Similarly, behaviours influence a person's self-identity and therefore, the self and action also exist in a dialectical relationship. It follows that to understand a behaviour, such as substance use, it is necessary to understand the connections that it has with the people, situations and the self-identities of those involved. In addition, it has been argued that the physicality of the 'setting' (Zinberg, 1984) must also be considered, as literature pertaining to 'place' and 'home' highlights how place and the self are inextricably linked (Casey, 2001). Taken together, the phenomenon of substance use is embedded within a complex web of socio-spatial-self relations. These relations shape, and are shaped by, structural norms and practices, including legislation

which controls substance use in multiple ways. Emotions penetrate these relations as people's desires to belong with other people, cultures and sensory worlds strongly guide the ways in which they mediate between their self-identity and wider society (May, 2013). This constellation of sociality, spatiality, self-identity and emotional belonging has formed the conceptual narrative that has framed this study.

These interconnected theoretical lenses have assisted in examining the many ways in which substance use was interwoven with the lives of the Kelldale residents. Beginning by focusing on the spatial features of Kelldale, the numerous surveillance strategies implemented by the staff highlighted how the young residents were consistently monitored in the hostel. Literature has shown how homeless people, more than other groups, are subjected to a battery of measures designed to control their movements and actions in particular spaces (Smith, 1996; Cloke, May and Johnsen, 2010). However, to date, much of this focus has been on rough sleepers and their presence in outdoor, prime commercial spaces. The findings from this thesis, therefore, contribute to the literature by highlighting that even when homeless people are 'removed' from the streets, or other living environments, and placed in temporary accommodation, some continue to have their movements and behaviours monitored and controlled. In such circumstances, homeless people are not afforded the full level of privacy and autonomy that most housed people experience. Contrasting these experiences with the positive qualities that having one's own home can provide further contributes to human geography and psychological literature which has theorised 'home' and its benefits.

While the implementation of 'disciplinary mechanisms' in homeless accommodation (Foucault, 1975) can be detrimental to wellbeing – such as resulting in humiliation as was the case with some of the residents – historic criticisms of the conditions of many hostels suggest that surveillance may be necessary. Chapter 2 highlighted that hostels have been problematised as a result of prolific substance use, injecting drug use which risks blood contamination, noise levels, poor sleep conditions and people feeling unsafe (Cloke, May and Johnsen, 2010; McKeown, 2006; Neale and Stevenson, 2012; Nettleton, Neale and Stevenson, 2012). While there was evidence of *some* of these issues in Kelldale – especially substance use – such literature was not generally reflective of the experiences of the young people or staff. This may be as a result of the age-range and specific forms of the residents' substance use as existing research that has pointed to problems in hostels

has typically focused on older adults, some of whom were injecting heroin users (Neale and Stevenson, 2012; Nettleton, Neal and Stevenson, 2012). However, it may also have been the case that, in comparison to other hostels, the ability of the Kelldale staff to closely monitor and control the young people's behaviours and whereabouts created a much safer environment. The young age of the residents, the nature of their substance use and the strict monitoring of the hostel set Kelldale apart from other forms of temporary accommodation, thus highlighting the need to be attentive to contextual differences when researching these types of organisation.

One trade-off of this high level of spatial and behavioural monitoring was that in some cases, prioritising the safety of those inside the hostel increased the dangers for those outside who were temporarily barred from entering. Moreover, from the young people's perspectives, the surveillance and rules that governed their daily practices could hamper their abilities to carve out a subjectively pleasant, personal place within the hostel. Wilson, Houmøller and Bernays' (2012) concept of 'place-making' was a useful concept for framing many of the young people's activities. While some of these activities were approved by the staff, others involved breaking the rules. Not only were the specific actions involved in the latter (such as substance use, vandalism and entering prohibited spaces) forms of place-making, the act of rule-breaking in itself was symbolic of resistance and exerting control over their environment. This desire to personalise space is further explained through the idea of sensory belonging – the need to feel a connection between one's sense of self and the material world (May, 2013). Together, these findings and theoretical lenses have implications for the debate between 'treatment first' and 'Housing First' approaches to meeting the needs of homeless people with substance use and/or mental health problems. Chapter 2 noted that the Housing First model represents a challenge to the current approach of placing people in temporary accommodation until they are 'housing ready' (Busch-Geertsema, 2014). Based on the thesis findings, it is argued that providing people with housing quickly, and avoiding temporary accommodation where possible, would enable young people to 'place-make' in an unrestricted way whilst also circumventing the problems that hostels can incur when surveillance and control are minimal.

Conceiving substance use as an act of place-making, underpinned by a desire for belonging, is further significant because it represents a novel way of viewing the

behaviour. A relatively small body of literature has considered the influence of physical space on substance use (Duff, 2007; 2009; Dovey, Fitzgerald and Choi, 2001). When examining substance use through the lens of Lefebvre's (1991) 'representations of space', it becomes apparent that some spaces – such as pubs and nightclubs – are designed for particular forms of intoxication. Access to these spaces is usually contingent on being over the age of 18, having sufficient money to spend and conforming to the normative behaviours associated with these spaces (e.g. drinking alcohol in pubs). Given that many of the residents were under-age, did not have much money and preferred to smoke cannabis which is unacceptable in most pubs and nightclubs (not least because it is an illicit drug), they had to carve out their own spaces for engaging in their preferred forms of leisure. Therefore, they defied the dominant meanings of places inside the hostel (especially the bedsits) and infused them with their own substance use-related meanings. Furthermore, not only did their substance use alter the meanings of places, the places transformed their substance use. For example, the residents felt compelled to devise strategies for physically concealing their cannabis smoking from the staff. By unravelling the ways in which the uses and meanings of substance use are entangled with place, it is possible to explain drug and alcohol consumption as an attempt to enhance subjective wellbeing or sensory belonging (May, 2013). To reiterate the argument made in Chapter 5, theorising substance use as a means of belonging offers a new way of conceptualising the behaviour. Despite Zinberg (1984) and other researchers advocating for a sociological understanding of substance use, the majority of work remains dominated by medical and psychological accounts. Thus, the findings and arguments made in this thesis concerning the socio-spatial dimensions of substance use lay new ground for taking forward a stronger sociological understanding.

As noted, Chapter 5's findings also highlight the perceived need for having privacy and being able to exert control over one's living space. Such needs are discussed within the 'home' literature (Parsell, 2012; Neumark, 2013) and therefore the lack of privacy and control was indicative of the young people's home-less status. Therefore, attending to what the young people were lacking lends support to the Housing First model in which the privacy, control and other benefits of having one's own home-dwelling would be provided. However, this is not to say that living in temporary accommodation was wholly detrimental to the young people's wellbeing. Indeed, Chapter 6 explored the young people's relationships and highlighted the care, support and companionship which were

provided by fellow residents and Kelldale's staff. Cloke, May and Johnsen (2010) have argued that many services for homeless people can be conceived of as 'spaces of care' in which positive interactions and the provision of resources can help to combat the boredom, depression, loneliness and anger that often characterise the homelessness experience. Furthermore, given evidence that many homeless substance users have suicidal feelings and engage in risky behaviours (Neale, 2001), the caring relationships that were apparent in Kelldale were likely to have mitigated some of these risks.

Although Housing First offers to create a package of support on an outreach basis once someone has been housed, this is voluntary. Moreover, it is unclear how much support could feasibly be offered particularly within the current UK politico-economic climate which does not deliver a Housing First approach in the same way as other countries (Johnsen and Teixeira, 2012); indeed a climate which has seen cuts to homeless services in recent years (see Homeless Link, 2013 for example). When one considers the manifold ways in which the young residents depended on one another and the staff to meet their emotional needs, it is difficult to imagine that they would have had the same level of interaction had they been engaged with a Housing First service in its current, weak UK form. Thus, while some homeless people may do well by being provided with their own home and living alone without formal support, others are likely to benefit from the sociability and support that shared living in places such as Kelldale provide.

However, Chapter 6 also highlighted shortcomings in the level of care the residents received from the staff. The young people had high expectations of having their emotional care needs met, as well as their practical needs, by requiring the staff to listen, take an interest in their day-to-day lives and look after them when they were feeling low. There was evidence that the staff often provided this level of care as they frequently made time to talk and listen to the young people. In addition, food was used as a symbol of care both in its provision and the use of cooking sessions as an informal way of interacting with the residents. However, there was also evidence of the staff maintaining a 'professional' role, either by enforcing the rules, keeping their distance or prioritising other work duties at the expense of spending time with a young person. In these situations, the young people could become despondent or angry. Furthermore, the young people seemed to have different ideas about staff professionalism in that they conflated being a 'professional' with being able to separate their work-life from their home-life

and, in turn, not enforcing the rules because of being in a ‘bad mood’. Thus, from the residents’ perspectives, the level of care they received fluctuated and appeared to depend on what mood a staff member was in. The staff themselves seemed to struggle with these different roles on occasion and this was interwoven with the fact that Kelldale was their workplace but the young people’s (temporary) home-place. Such difficulties could explain the tensions that sometimes arose between residents and staff whilst also highlighting the importance of feeling a sense of relational belonging between the two parties for meeting the resident’s emotional needs. Despite these complexities, very little research has examined the relationships between people living in homeless accommodation and the staff who support them there. Therefore, these findings represent another contribution made to the homelessness literature by this thesis. Additionally, those interested in social care, institutions and relationships more broadly can learn from the messiness and emotions embedded in the relationships reported here.

Substance use was also interwoven with the residents’ family, friends and staff relationships. Their friends appeared to exert a particularly strong influence over their decisions to consume drugs and alcohol. Whereas Zinberg (1984) conceived of socially constructed sanctions and rituals, which exist among groups, to *control* substance use and limit its negative repercussions, the norms and rules that structured the young people’s substance use were designed to *maximise intoxication* within the confines of having limited money. Involvement in the tobacco and cannabis sharing systems meant that using these substances required a significant amount of investment and effort to ensure that there was enough to go around and that everyone contributed fairly. Involvement in these practices seemed to reinforce substance use and acted as a disincentive for stopping, since this may have compromised the resident’s feelings of cultural and relational belonging. This is consistent with the argument that social networks among homeless youth can serve to entrench ‘negative’ behaviours such as substance use (Barker, 2013). However, as discussed in Chapter 7, only a handful of the young people felt that their substance use was ‘problematic’ and only within specific domains. Weighing up the evidence, it is argued that, from the residents’ perspectives, the practices, relationships and positive emotions and sensations that often accompany substance use as a whole, outstripped their immediate concerns about the negative consequences of the behaviour; reinforcing the need to step away from narrow conceptions of substance use as being problematic or not.

To some extent, living in Kelldale is therefore likely to have reinforced the young people's substance use and its associated benefits, but further evidence of their family relationships indicated that their drug and alcohol use was also incentivised through engaging in shared consumption with relatives. Consistent with existing literature (Neale, 2001; Johnsen and Quilgars, 2009), there was evidence of both substance use and family breakdown playing a part in the young people's homelessness. Furthermore, in some cases, the young people found their parent's substance use difficult to deal with which may have weakened the bonds between them. However, others regularly drank alcohol and smoked cannabis with parents, siblings and cousins and this shared cultural practice appeared to strengthen their relational belonging. This was in spite of them being unable to live with their parents. Therefore, although Kelldale may have exacerbated substance use during that temporary living period, the familial relationships that existed before and during life in Kelldale possibly contributed to the introduction and continuation of these practices. Furthermore, arguing that, in some cases, substance use may actually enhance family relations draws attention to an area that has not been previously recognised or examined.

Of the three types of relationships examined, those with the staff were the weakest because they were the most likely to come to an end upon moving out of the hostel. Family relationships and the friendships between residents existed after Kelldale (particularly because the young people could keep in touch via social media). Therefore, the 'anti-drug' voices of the staff seemed to be no match for the 'pro-drug' voices of friends and relatives. This was interwoven with the fact that living in Kelldale was only on a temporary basis and therefore the young people appeared to place more value on investing in the relationships that would provide them with a sense of continual belonging after they had moved on.

In combination, these findings provide insights into how the socio-spatial contexts of the young people's lives shaped, and were shaped by, their substance use. They further draw attention to the lived experiences of temporary accommodation rather than focusing on policy and service-delivery which dominate the area of homelessness research as can be seen from the nature of existing literature presented in Chapter 2. In order to complete the picture of the socio-spatial-self relationships, Chapter 7 considered how these

experiences and interactions influenced the young people's self-perceptions of how they were labelled by the 'generalised other' and how these labels were handled with regards to their self-identities. Some aspects of the resident's self-identities were revealed through their physical appearances, narratives and actions. With regards to the subjects of education/employment, parenting and 'junkies', the young people all displayed understandings of normative conceptions and expectations as to how they should and should not act. Most residents endorsed the need to find a job but other than a few exceptions (Callum, Nathan and Danielle), they revealed feelings of personal inadequacy, while attempting to 'save face' (Goffman, 1967) by stating their preference for gaining employment and suggesting that this was a future goal of theirs. Personal failure also came across strongly from Danielle and Chloe in connection with their parenting, although the fathers amongst the group – Garry and Ryan – seemed to be more ambivalent, with Garry appearing to engage in a similar 'face saving' performance by stating he wanted to appeal his rights in the legal system. As Farrugia (2011) and other theorists who have drawn on Beck's (1992) concept of individualisation have contended, changing and insecure structures cause people to feel as though they are fully responsible for their lives and when things go wrong they are interpreted as personal failings leading to low self-worth. The findings here, therefore, fit with this theory as the young people's inability to conform to normative expectations were perceived as their own fault, rather than the consequence of external structures.

The concept of 'youth' appeared to be strongly internalised by many of the residents and this was manifest through their behaviours and narratives concerning the age limit of being 18 years old for engaging in adult forms of leisure. This was particularly salient in Kelldale because of the age-range of the residents who fell above and below this benchmark. In many ways, the residents' youthful self-identities were consistent with the literature concerning subcultures and transitions. It could be concluded that 'youth' transcended homelessness since many of the experiences and frustrations surrounding the benchmark were similar to non-homeless populations (MacDonald and Marsh, 2005; Northcote, 2006).

Discussions about health and injuries, while appearing to be gendered, were also embodied signs of negative aspects of living in Kelldale and engaging in substance use. Taking this into account, along with the other data examined in this thesis, it is suggested

that the internalisation of the combined social relationships, physical environments and their accompanying practices were intertwined with myriad emotions: both positive and negative. Since May's (2013) notion of belonging is underpinned by emotional needs and desires to feel connections between the self and society, it can be deduced that, although there was a wealth of evidence pointing to examples of cultural, relational and sensory belonging – at least for most of the white-majority residents who participated – the young people remained unfulfilled in these respects.

This is partially because of the temporary nature that characterised the residents' lives and which influenced their inability to feel fully connected or ontologically secure. Not only was there insecurity with regards to their temporary living conditions, they were likewise 'in-between' childhood and adulthood. Some were also a parent but not a full parent, while others were from minority ethnic backgrounds which precluded their full integration among the white-majority residents. Indeed, Kelldale as a whole could be conceived of as a 'contradictory space' in that the young people were encouraged to belong but such belonging was conditional and time-limited. Belonging is closely tied to self-identity as feeling connected to people, cultures and places helps someone to know who he is and influences his actions (May, 2013). If the socio-spatial setting in which belonging can potentially be fostered is characterised by social sanctions and rules about 'acceptable' behaviours and/or is known to be temporary, this has implications for people's wellbeing. In the case of Kelldale, the young people's lives were marked by uncertainty, insecurity and turbulence. Not only was this likely to influence their self-identities, it was also not surprising that they sought out alternative sources of belonging which did not always meet the standards expected by Kelldale's staff. These findings have significant implications for homelessness literature as well as adding to recent work in youth studies which highlight the impacts of precarious living circumstances on young people (Hoolachan et al., 2016).

Finally, being 'in-between' was also a fitting description for the young people's substance use. As has been argued throughout this thesis, portraying substance use as *either* recreational *or* problematic is an over-simplification and the residents' experiences indicated that the meanings of their drug and alcohol consumption were just as fluid and complex as other parts of their lives. While substance use was tightly interwoven with the young people's socio-spatial-self relations, it by no means could be reduced to the

single cause or consequence of their situations. Similarly, it was not the only behaviour that the young people engaged in to cope with their difficulties or to improve the quality of their immediate surroundings. It was, nonetheless, a central feature of the young people's day-to-day lives but efforts to try and prevent, reduce or control their substance use in the legislation and the policies and practices of the hostel were narrowly conceived. For young people living in temporary accommodation, substance use needs to be understood within the insecure and temporary nature of their lives.

Reflections on Taking an Ethnographic Approach

Initially, the proposed methodology for this project involved conducting semi-structured interviews with young homeless people to question them about their substance use and service provision. While refining the proposal, it became apparent that this was problematic as the question was raised as to why young people should be asked to sit with a stranger, for a period of time, discussing the intimate details of their lives, especially when the topic involved disclosure of illegal activities. Furthermore, even if recruitment had been successful, there were serious doubts that the young people would be willing to discuss their substance use in any great detail or that they would be able to. The likelihood that many of the young people had navigated public institutions – social services, homeless services, the criminal justice system, health services, welfare support services – for lengthy periods of time, and would have had to ‘tell their story’ repeatedly, raised further concerns. I did not want to add to the story-telling or ‘assessment’ procedures they may have become accustomed to, particularly as I was unable to offer them anything tangible in return. Such familiarity with these procedures may have resulted in the young people simply repeating their rehearsed presentations and there were doubts over the level of insight that these scripts would have provided.

Using ethnography overcame many of these challenges as being around the young people in their ‘natural’ environments, for prolonged amounts of time, opened up access to their social worlds in ways that would not have been captured using semi-structured interviews alone. This point was strongly reinforced when I did conduct interviews with some of the residents. Because I had got to know these young people's self-presentations when they were interacting with their friends and the staff, or with me in a more casual context,

the changes in these presentations during the interviews were stark. The young people presented themselves more formally, often omitting emotion in favour of talking in a 'matter of fact' manner and some appeared to struggle with certain questions. Overall, the interviews felt uncomfortable and forced. This was reiterated by some residents constantly checking their phones which suggested they would prefer to be elsewhere. It is not to say that the performances given in their interviews were less 'authentic' or meaningful than those I had witnessed in the everyday context of their lives. They were simply different, and while they did add to the overall insights gained in this study, the relationships I had developed with the interviewees guided my instincts that they were not fully at ease in the situation. Further confirmation of my suspicions came during the focus group which had an entirely different feel to it. The young people appeared excited and engaged, with emotions of pleasure and sadness becoming evident at different points. Not only did this experience highlight the limitations of one-to-one interviews in this context, it also reinforced the importance of the young people's relational belonging to each other as the presence of their friends appeared to act as sources of comfort and reassurance when discussing their opinions and experiences. Ethnography, therefore, provided a much broader and deeper array of information in comparison to interviews. Collecting data in situations that were sociable and familiar to the young people was less obtrusive and more enjoyable for everyone concerned.

In addition, compared to other approaches, ethnography facilitates interactions in a way that can lessen the 'power gap' between researcher and participants. According to Karnieli-Miller, Strier and Pessach (2009), in quantitative studies the researcher is viewed as having the authoritative voice and the participants are those who assist in reproducing this authority through answering their questions or acting in prescribed ways. By contrast, qualitative researchers – particularly ethnographers – attempt to rebalance the power in the researcher-participant relationship and focus on marginalised perspectives. This connects to the insider/outsider challenge discussed in Chapter 4 whereby the ethnographer approaches the field from an outsider position and attempts to become an insider through developing close relationships with participants (Harris, 1990).

I have already outlined some of the ways in which my appearances and actions facilitated an insider status but also how I was never fully accepted as such. Over time, the residents allowed me increased entry into their lives by sharing previously concealed information

or inviting me to socialise in the bedsits. They did not treat the staff in the same way and, from this perspective, I was more of an insider than the staff were. However, there were many instances in which I was not invited to join them, and observations that they always offered me the armchair in the bedsits and sometimes apologised for their ‘bad language’ were reminders that I was not fully seen as an insider. These dynamics can be characterised as lessening the distance between us over time but never fully closing the gap. I likewise tried to integrate into the group where possible, through copying their language, not ‘grassing’ them up to the staff, and disclosing personal details. However, I was always aware of my outsider traits as I dressed differently, had different leisure interests, was educated to a higher level and had experienced a very different upbringing. Although I was constantly aware of these differences, taking an honest approach with the young people and sometimes discussing our differences – rather than pretending they did not exist – was a relatively successful means of fostering trust and relational belonging.

It could be argued that some trade-offs had to be made in order to reach a point of trust and to collect a deeper level of data. The ontological and epistemological underpinnings of ethnography, coupled with its small sample size, mean that the findings derived from the data may not be representative of all young homeless substance users. Had the fieldwork been conducted with a different group of twenty-two young people and/or twenty-seven staff members, or in a different context, there is no guarantee that similar themes would have emerged. However, as Mason (2002) has argued, while qualitative research cannot generalise from a small sample to a wider population, valuable theoretical generalisations can be made. Specifically, generalisations can be made from this study in the form of ‘*lessons for other settings*’ (Mason, 2002: 196, original emphasis) and future research. Such lessons have been noted throughout the empirical chapters and summarised in the section prior to this one. There are messages for practitioners in homeless services and alcohol and drug treatment settings to reflect on the consequences of their policies and actions, and to avoid making assumptions about substance use as being inherently problematic. Policies, practices and assumptions are symbolic of ‘generalised other’ attitudes meaning that they directly and indirectly affect people’s interpretations of the social world, their movements and actions, and their self-identities. There are also numerous contributions to be made from this thesis to literature involving substance use, homelessness and youth, as well as broader sociological work concerned

with symbolic interactionism, deviance, everyday life, belonging, power, place, relationships, identity, emotions and insecurity.

The parameters of this project could arguably present a limitation. The vast majority of the data were derived from twenty-two young people and even then, some of these young people were more highly engaged in the project than others. Every effort was made to interact with as many people who passed through Kelldale during the fieldwork as possible. However, my ability to collect more data than I did was constrained in several ways. First, I could not be in more than one place at one time and while it was rare that multiple opportunities to talk to more than one resident arose simultaneously, this did occasionally happen. In these situations I prioritised the resident(s) with whom I was talking to as I did not want to make that person feel unappreciated by cutting our conversation short to speak to someone else. Secondly, I was unable to engage with every young person who passed through Kelldale and a proportion of residents were unable to participate because of language barriers, as discussed in Chapters 4 and 7. Thirdly, I made the decision only to collect data from within the hostel with a handful of interactions taking place outside. This placed a substantial constraint on getting to know the young people in other areas of their lives. Limiting the space within which I collected data means that the findings are inevitably skewed towards Kelldale but very often the young people spent time away from the hostel with their family, non-resident friends and partners. While other ethnographic studies have not limited themselves in this way, the decision was taken primarily to protect my own safety but also to enable the young people to live their lives in other contexts without feeling obliged to ask me to accompany them.

Finally, my knowledge of the young people's personal histories and ongoing support needs was patchy and this was partly as a result of making the decision not to read their care plans which included personal information passed to the staff by social workers or the young people themselves. As noted in Chapter 4, document analysis is often included within ethnographic studies but, in this situation, learning about the young people second-hand would have undermined the goal of learning about their lives directly from them, even if they had given me permission to view these care plans. Furthermore, being ignorant of their histories enabled me to approach the residents with fewer pre-judgements which possibly enhanced our relationships.

Despite these limitations, the themes highlighted in this thesis produce an understanding of substance use behaviours that are novel and important when critiquing the oversimplified ways in which these issues are often addressed. Although literature has considered the ways in which substance use is influenced by the social environment, the vast majority of research in this field remains weighted towards medical or psychological understandings of ‘addiction’. In homelessness research, much attention has been paid to the additional difficulties that face homeless people if they also drink alcohol or take drugs, and a smaller body of work has considered the public health implications of living in temporary accommodation with injecting drug users. However, to my knowledge, this is the first time that the categories of substance use, youth and homelessness have been brought together and considered through the lenses of symbolic interactionism, belonging, home, place-making and ‘setting’. Therefore, although there are limitations in using ethnography, the larger contribution of this thesis is its examination of substance use and its interconnectedness with youth and homelessness, from a socio-spatial-self perspective.

Implications and Future Enquiries

The argument that substance use is embedded within a complex web of socio-spatial-self relations has the potential to be applied to any context within which the use of drugs and alcohol is present. Doing this would lead to a more nuanced understanding of these behaviours as well as refining and extending theories pertaining to belonging, place-making and the self. Indeed, May’s (2013) theory of belonging emerged from her work concerning lone mothers and this thesis has demonstrated how her ideas can be applied to other areas. The level of substance use within a particular context does not necessarily need to be high or deemed ‘problematic’, as increasing the current knowledge base about the full spectrum of drug and alcohol use behaviours will assist in gaining a more holistic picture. Indeed, some research has concentrated on ‘recreational’ drug use within the context of pubs and nightclubs. Such work has tended to focus on ways in which harm reduction measures can be integrated into these contexts by highlighting common practices that are shaped by the socio-spatiality of these settings (e.g. Bellis, Hughes and Lowey, 2002). From a public health perspective, this is a crucial line of enquiry because it recognises that many people will continue to engage in potentially risky forms of

substance use and thus harm reduction measures have the capacity to decrease risk. There may be ways in which the findings in this thesis can inform harm reduction principles. For example, the implementation of a curfew in Kelldale inadvertently incentivised some residents to drink their alcohol quickly, as otherwise they would have had to throw it away as they were not allowed to bring it inside. In the case of Chloe, this had serious consequences as she took a seizure from this fast influx of alcohol into her body. Thus, paying attention to the indirect consequences of implementing strict rules and regulations within contexts such as homeless hostels may assist service providers in recognising where they can make changes to promote harm reduction.

To a large extent though, Kelldale management were restricted in what they could and could not permit inside the hostel as a result of legal structures. The prohibition of drugs in Scotland and preventing the residents from consuming alcohol in the hostel meant that substance use practices either took place in secret or were moved outside of the hostel. This issue draws attention to one of the most fundamental consequences of drug laws and preventative measures: that rather than acting as deterrents, such practices are often moved from one space to another. For those who do not have spaces over which they can exercise complete control – those without a home-place or a ‘backstage’ area – the task of finding somewhere to consume drugs and alcohol away from the gaze of the law and the public can be substantial and potentially dangerous. This was highlighted by Dovey, Fitzgerald and Choi (2001) in relation to heroin users injecting in isolated car parks, alleyways and alcoves in which they were susceptible to attack or to not being discovered if they overdosed. If current prohibitive laws are to remain, then it is necessary to devise ways to reduce the potential harms for those who have nowhere safe to drink alcohol or take drugs. This has been recognised in some European countries and in Canada which have introduced (legal and illegal) ‘safe injecting facilities’ for heroin users. Evidence suggests that these facilities have reduced the risks of contracting HIV and being the victim of violence by enabling heroin users to inject in an enclosed environment, monitored by trained staff (McNeil et al., 2014). Although none of the Kelldale residents were heroin users, such facilities demonstrate the importance of the spatial environment in which substances are consumed. This thesis, therefore, adds support to the need for safe spaces for substance use but in the context of homeless people, whose risks are exacerbated precisely because they have no home in which to engage in these practices.

Furthermore, these issues highlight people's desires for 'place-making' which suggests that they seek out safe spaces to become intoxicated but also which are meaningful or enhance their pleasure. Therefore, this argument has further implications for the Housing First model. On the premise that one's home-dwelling has the greatest capacity for enabling place-making and safety, placing a homeless person directly into their own dwelling is likely to be the optimal action for enhancing wellbeing. Evaluative research into the Housing First model in non-UK countries is ongoing and preliminary findings have been positive. However, further research into this approach with regards to the socio-spatial-self themes highlighted in this thesis would provide valuable insight into the day-to-day experiences of the service-users. For example, it would be important to examine the impact that this has on their substance use behaviours, social networks and self-identities. Moreover, further insights would be revealed concerning the motives and emotions associated with this approach if the lens of belonging were to be used.

On a similar note, ethnographic research that focuses on the period of time whereby a young person is moved from temporary accommodation into her own home would also be valuable. Focusing on this movement will have implications for understanding youth transitions and how feelings of belonging, practices and self-identities change over time. Given that Housing First is specifically used for people with co-morbid substance use and mental health problems, research that considers the more common 'temporary accommodation to own-dwelling' route in Scotland would be able to explore forms of substance use which are more variable. Similarly, such research could also consider different age groups as socio-spatial-self relations are likely to differ depending on the particular life-course stage one is in.

Overall, this thesis endorses future research and practice that takes a holistic view of substance use, which prioritises the socio-spatial-self dimensions of the behaviour, but which remains open to medical and psychological inputs, as recommended by Zinberg (1984). Understanding the experiences of homeless people is likely to become more important as the country struggles to provide sufficient housing and support for disadvantaged groups. The interconnectedness of substance use and homelessness suggests that considering both of these features together is pertinent. However, it is equally important to pay attention to those who face homelessness but do not engage in

substance use. This thesis was unable to fully incorporate the voices of the handful of non-British young people living in Kelldale and it is likely that their socio-spatial-self experiences were very different from the study's main participants. Similarly, those who are homeless but not engaged with services will also be experiencing hardships that are relatively hidden. It is necessary, therefore, to continue highlighting the voices and experiences of disadvantaged groups who are excluded from mainstream society and who may feel the worst effects of non-belonging.

Appendix 1: Participant Information Sheet

Jenny Hoolachan

School of Applied Social Science, University of Stirling, Stirling, FK9 4LA

07784 502 176

j.e.hoolachan@stir.ac.uk

What I am asking from you:

- To let me hang around, observe and chat to you
- To talk to me about your lives, experiences and particularly alcohol and drug use
- If you say yes, you can still change your mind at any time

What I can and can't offer:

- Participation is voluntary so I cannot offer you any payment
- What you tell me will be kept between us – I won't tell members of staff or anyone else
- The only time I might not be able to keep things a secret is if you tell me information that indicates significant and imminent risk to either yourself or another person or if I find out there is drug dealing happening within the Kelldale building – in these cases I will need to tell a member of staff.
- I can offer you a chance to talk about your experiences and opinions
- My research will hopefully add to people's understanding of substance use amongst young people with complex housing situations.

Appendix 2: Interview Schedule – Substance Use

1. If I say the words ‘substance use’ what kind of things spring to mind?
2. Tell me about your substance use
 - What substances?
 - Method of ingestion
 - How often?
 - Where?
 - When?
 - With who?
 - Who do you tend to get illegal substance from?
3. What do you enjoy most about substance use? (mention each drug that they use)
4. What do you not enjoy about substance use? (mention each drug that they use)
5. How does substance use positively impact on your life?
6. How does it negatively impact on your life?
7. What are your reasons for drinking/smoking/taking drugs?
8. Have you ever received any sort of treatment for your substance use or has anyone ever told you that they think your substance use is problematic?
9. What do you think about your smoking/drinking/drug use?
10. Can you describe to me what a typical drinking/smoking/drug taking occasion is like when you use these substances in the Kelldale building?
11. How about when you drink/smoke/take drugs in places other than Kelldale? Where do you go? Who are you with? What happens?
12. If it was allowed, would you prefer to smoke/drink/take drugs in Kelldale or would you prefer to go elsewhere?
13. How has your substance use influenced your homelessness and vice versa?
14. When you get your own place, how do you think your substance use would change?
15. In relation to substance use in Kelldale, can you tell me if there’s anything obvious that goes on that you think I’m missing? Are there any blanks to be filled in or do you have any insights into it?

Appendix 3: Interview Schedule – Housing and Homelessness

1. Tell me what you understand by the word ‘homelessness’
2. To what extent do you think you are homeless?
3. Can you tell me about your history with regards to your past housing situations?
For example have you stayed in homeless accommodation before?
4. How did you end up coming to Kelldale?
5. What do you think about the fact you are here at Kelldale at this point in your life?
6. What are your housing plans for when you leave Kelldale?

Appendix 4: Interview Schedule – Life in Kelldale

1. What is it like living in here?
2. What do you think about the other residents?
3. What do you think about the staff?
4. What do you think about the rules that the staff have in place?
 - a. No drink or drugs in the building
 - b. Barred from tea & toast and cooked breakfasts for not paying rent
 - c. Not allowed into the lounge until after 5pm on weekdays and at weekends
 - d. Not allowed to use the staff toilet
 - e. Not allowed to smoke in the garden
 - f. 12am curfew
 - g. Not allowed to remain in each other's rooms after lights out
 - h. Are there any other rules that I'm forgetting?
5. Have you broken any of these rules? Tell more about that
6. Can you tell me where in the building you prefer to spend your time and why?
 - What do you like and dislike about spending time in the lounge?
 - What do you like and dislike about spending time in your bedsit?
 - What do you like and dislike about spending time in other people's bedsits?
7. I want you to think about all of the current residents and staff that are here at Kelldale
 - a. Who has the greatest influence on you and in what way?
 - b. Who has the greatest influence on your substance use and in what way?

Appendix 5: Interview Schedule – Relationships

General

1. Tell me about the people in your life that you are closest to e.g. friends, family, partners, key workers etc. (Might be necessary to write them all down)
2. Take each person in turn (mentioned in Q1) and ask them to describe their relationships
3. What do you value about these relationships? (Discuss each in turn)

Family

I want to ask you a bit about your family but I realise that for some people this can be a difficult subject. If you don't want to talk about your family at all then just let me know. If we proceed I just want to remind you that you can refuse to answer any question without giving me a reason.

8. Tell me a bit about your family? (Who is in immediate family, extended family etc.?)
9. Can you tell me which family members you are currently in touch with and how often you speak to them or see them?
 - a. Ask about absent family members if appropriate
10. When you see these family members what do you normally do? (What are the purposes of your visits?)
11. How do you feel about your relationships with your family members? (Discuss each in turn)
12. Can you explain why it is that you don't live with your family?

Fellow Residents

1. If you think about the residents at Kelldale, who would you say are your friends and why?
2. What kind of things do you enjoy doing with them?
3. Tell me about times when they annoy you or upset you
4. Can you tell me why you don't consider the other residents (ones that were not named in Q4) to be your friends?
5. When you leave Kelldale who would you like to stay in touch with? How realistic do you think this is?

Staff

1. Who is your keyworker here at Kelldale? What is your relationship like with that person?
2. What do you think about the staff here in general?
3. Tell me about who you like and your reasons
4. Tell me about who you don't like and your reasons

Friends & Partners Outside

1. Can you tell me about the friends/partners you have who don't live at Kelldale?
2. What kind of things do you do together?
3. How are these activities different or similar to the ones you do with your friends at Kelldale?
4. What do you value most about your relationships with these people?
5. I want you to think about your friends outside of Kelldale and your friends inside Kelldale. What do you see as being the main differences between these friendship groups?
6. Does your substance use differ with these friends compared with your Kelldale friends – in what ways?

Appendix 6: Young People’s Consent Form

“Exploring the meanings and context of substance use amongst homeless youth in Scotland”

- I understand the information Jenny has given me and have had opportunities to ask questions
- I know that my participation is voluntary
- I know that I can stop helping Jenny with her study at any time with no consequences to myself. I just need to let Jenny know
- I understand that most things that I tell Jenny or that Jenny observes will be kept confidential. However if Jenny finds out there is risk of harm to myself or another person or if there is drug dealing happening in the building then Jenny will need to tell a member of staff.
- I accept that the information collected about my may be published and my identifying details will be anonymised
- Information held about me is subject to the Data Protection Act 1998

PLEASE PUT A TICK IN THIS BOX IF YOU AGREE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY AND THEN SIGN UNDERNEATH.

Signature.....

Date.....

Appendix 7: Staff Members' Consent Form

“Exploring the meanings and contexts of substance use amongst homeless youth in Scotland”

Researcher: Jenny Hoolachan (University of Stirling)

This form describes the conditions of participating in the study. Please read carefully and do not hesitate to ask Jenny if you have any questions. It is very important you understand everything written here so you can make an informed decision about participating. It is important to emphasise that you can withdraw from this study at any point without personal consequence, all you need to do is let Jenny know you no longer want to participate. If you are happy with the conditions set out below, please place a tick in the right hand box.

Tick

- I confirm that I have read, discussed and understand the information supplied for the above study and have had the opportunity to ask for more information.
- I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I can withdraw from the study at any time without giving an explanation.
- I understand that Jenny will do everything in her power to ensure confidentiality. This includes the following:
- My identifying details will be anonymised in any written or verbal data collected from me
- One-to-one interviews will be conducted in a location that minimises the likelihood of someone else overhearing

- Jenny will not report to members of management/authorities what she has observed or spoken to me about without my permission

- The above statement will not apply if I tell Jenny any information which she feels indicates that there is a risk of imminent and significant harm either to myself or another individual. In such cases, Jenny will report the disclosed information to the relevant authority such as a manager or the police

- Any data held about me will be stored in a secure location

- Data held on me is subject to the Data Protection Act 1998

- I accept that the final thesis, which may include my anonymised data, may be published

- I understand that Jenny may use a tape recorder to record conversations and interviews but that she will always seek my permission before she does this. I have the right to refuse to be tape recorded and will tell Jenny if I do not want her to use the recorder

If you agree to participate in this research then please print and sign your name along with the date below. Please note that this consent form will be stored separately from any data held on you so that it will not be possible to match your identifying details with what you have said or done.

Name of participant (print):

Signed:

Date:

Bibliography

- Afful, A.A. and Ricciardelli, R., (2015) Shaping the online fat acceptance movement: talking about body image and beauty standards. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 24 (4), pp. 453-472.
- Alexander, B.K., (1978) Effect of housing and gender on morphine self-administration in rats. *Psychopharmacology*, 58 (2), pp. 175-79.
- Allen, D., (2004) Ethnomethodological insights into insider-outsider relationships in nursing ethnographies of healthcare settings. *Nursing Inquiry*, 11 (1), pp. 14-24.
- Allen, J., (2008) *The secret disease of addiction*. London: Affinity Lodge.
- Andersen, D., (2014) Giving clients a backstage experience: a case of dramaturgical trouble in the professional performance of drug treatment. *Symbolic Interaction*, 37 (4), pp. 483-499.
- Anderson, I., (2007) Tackling street homelessness in Scotland: the evolution and impact of the Rough Sleepers Initiative. *Journal of Social Issues*, 63 (3), pp. 623-640.
- Anderson, I., (2009) Homelessness policy in Scotland: a complete state safety net by 2012? In S. Fitzpatrick, D. Quilgars and N. Pleace eds. *Homelessness in the UK: problems and solutions*. Coventry: Chartered Institute of Housing. Ch. 7.
- Andreou, A., (2014) Spikes keep the homeless away, pushing them further out of sight. *The Guardian*, 9 June. London: Guardian News and Media Limited. Available: <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/jun/09/spikes-homeless-london-metal-alcove-defensive-architecture-poverty> [Accessed 30 August 2015].
- Andres, L., and Adamuti-Trache, M., (2008) Life-course transitions, social class, and gender: a 15-year perspective of the lived lives of Canadian young adults. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 11 (2), pp. 115-145.
- Antalíková, R., Hansen, T.G.B., Gulbrandsen, K.A., Mata, M.D.L. and Santamaría, A., (2011) Adolescents' meaningful memories reflect a trajectory of self-development from family over school to friends. *Nordic Psychology*, 63 (3), pp. 4-24.
- Apter, D.E., Gans, H.J., Horowitz, R., Jaynes, G.D., Kornblum, W., Short jr, J.F., Suttles, G.D., and Washington, R.E., (2009) The Chicago School and the roots of urban ethnography: an intergenerational conversation with Gerald D. Jaynes, David E. Apter, Herbert J. Gans, William Kornblum, Ruth Horowitz, James F. Short, Jr, Gerald D. Suttles and Robert E. Washington. *Ethnography*, 10 (4), 375-396.
- Arnett, J.J., (2000) Emerging adulthood: a theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, 55 (5), 469-480.
- Arnett, J.J., (2015) *Emerging adulthood: the winding road from the late teens through the twenties*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Atherton, I. and McNaughton, C., (2008) 'Housing First' as a means of addressing multiple needs and homelessness. *European Journal of Homelessness*, 2, pp. 289-303.

Audit Scotland, (2010) *Getting it right for children in residential care*. Edinburgh: Audit Scotland. Available:

http://www.audit-scotland.gov.uk/docs/local/2010/nr_100902_children_residential.pdf
[Accessed 26 June 2015].

Bantchevska, D., Bartle-Haring, S., Dashora, P., Glebova, T., and Slesnick, N., (2008) Problem behaviours of homeless youth: a social capital perspective. *Journal of Human Ecology*, 23 (4), pp. 285-293.

Barker, J.D., (2012) Social capital, homeless young people and the family. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 15 (6), pp. 730-743.

Barker, J.D., (2013) Negative cultural capital and young homeless people. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 16 (3), pp. 358-374.

Barker, J.D., (2014) Alone together: the strategies of autonomy and relatedness in the lives of homeless youth. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 17 (6), pp. 763-777.

Barton, A., (2003) *Illicit drugs*. London: Routledge.

Bassani, C., (2007) Five dimensions of social capital theory as they pertain to youth studies. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 10 (1), pp. 17-34.

Batty, G.D., Bhaskar, A., Emslie, C., Benzeval, M., Der, G., Lewars, H., and Hunt, K., (2012) Association of life course socioeconomic disadvantage with future problem drinking and heavy drinking: gender differentials in the West of Scotland. *International Journal of Public Health*, 57 (1), pp. 119-126.

Beck, U., (1992) *Risk society: towards a new modernity*. Translated from German by M. Ritter. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Becker, H.S., (1963) *Outsiders: studies in the sociology of deviance*. New York: The Free Press.

Becker, H.S., (1970) *Sociological work: method and substance*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.

Becker, H.S., Gans, H.J., Newman, K.S. and Vaughan, D., (2004) On the value of ethnography: sociology and public policy: a dialogue. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 595 (1), pp. 264-276.

Bellis, M.A., Hughes, K. and Lowey, H., (2002) Healthy nightclubs and recreational substance use: from a harm minimisation to a healthy settings approach. *Addictive Behaviors*, 27 (6), pp. 1025-1035.

- Bennett, J., (2015) 'Snowed in!': offbeat rhythms and belonging as everyday practices. *Sociology*, 49 (5), pp. 955-969.
- Berridge, V., (1999) *Opium and the people*. London: Free Association Books Ltd.
- Biehal, N., (2014) A sense of belonging: meanings of family and home in long-term foster care. *British Journal of Social Work*, 44 (4), pp. 955-971.
- Blackman, S.J., (2004) *Chilling out: the cultural politics of substance consumption, youth and drug policy*. Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Blumer, H., (1969) *Symbolic interactionism: perspective and method*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Blunt, A. and Dowling, R., (2006) *Home*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Boydell, K.M., Goering, P. and Morrell-Bellai, T.L., (2000) Narratives of identity: representation of self in people who are homeless. *Qualitative Health Research*, 10 (1), pp. 26-38.
- Busch-Geertsema, V., (2014) Housing First Europe – results of a European social experimentation project. *European Journal of Homelessness*, 8 (1), pp. 13-28.
- Busch-Geertsema, V. and Sahlin, I., (2007) The role of hostels and temporary accommodation. *European Journal of Homelessness*, 1, pp. 67 – 93.
- Butler, J., (1990) *Gender trouble*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Casey, E.S., (2001) Body, self and landscape. In. P.C. Adams, S. Hoelscher and K.E. Till eds. *Textures of place: exploring humanist geographies*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. Ch. 25.
- Centrepoint, (n.d.) *Opportunity lost? Experiences of homeless young people in accessing education, training and employment*. London: Centrepoint. Available: http://centrepoint.org.uk/media/244384/eet_full_report_final.pdf [Accessed 8th July 2015]
- Chaplin, E., Gilvarry, C., and Tsakanikos, E., (2011) Recreational substance use patterns and co-morbid psychopathology in adults with intellectual disability. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*, 32 (6), pp. 2981-2986.
- Clapham, D., (2011) The embodied use of the material home: an affordance approach. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 28 (4), pp. 360-376.
- Clapham, D., Mackie, P., Orford, S., Thomas, I. and Buckley, K., (2014) The housing pathways of young people in the UK. *Environment and Planning A*, 46 (8), pp. 2016-2013.

- Clayton, R.B., Nagurney, A. and Smith, J.R., (2013) Cheating, breakup, and divorce: is Facebook use to blame. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 16 (10), pp. 717-720.
- Cloke, P., May, J., and Johnsen, S., (2010) *Swept up lives? Re-envisioning the homeless city*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Coffey, A., (1999) *The ethnographic self: fieldwork and the representation of identity*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Cohen, S., (2002) *Folk devils and moral panics*, 3rd ed. London: Routledge.
- Collins, P., (1998) Negotiating selves: reflections on 'unstructured' interviewing. *Sociological Research Online*, 3 (3). Available: <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/3/3/2.html> [Accessed 11 December 2015].
- Commission on Housing and Wellbeing, (2015) *A blueprint for Scotland's future*. Edinburgh: Commission Housing and Wellbeing 2015. Available: <http://housingandwellbeing.org/> [Accessed 30 August 2015].
- Cooper, J.E., (1987) Shaping meaning: women's diaries, journals and letters – the old and the new. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 10 (1), pp. 95-99.
- Corbin, J. and Morse, J.M., (2003) The unstructured interactive interview: issues of reciprocity and risks when dealing with sensitive topics. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 9 (3), pp. 335-354.
- Crawley, J., Kane, D., Atkinson-Plato, L., Hamilton, M., Dobson, K. and Watson, J., (2013) Needs of the hidden homeless – no longer hidden: a pilot study. *Public Health*, 127 (7), pp. 674-680.
- Cross, J.E., (2015) Processes of place attachment: an interactional framework. *Symbolic Interaction*, 38 (4), pp. 493-520.
- Curran, D., (2013) Risk society and the distribution of bads: theorizing class in the risk society. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 64 (1), pp. 44-62.
- Davidson, C., Neighbors, C., Hall, G., Hogue, A., Cho, R., Kutner, B. and Morgenstern, J., (2014) Association of Housing First implementation and key outcomes among homeless persons with problematic substance use. *Psychiatric Services*, 65 (11), pp. 1318-1324.
- Davies, J.B., (1997) *The myth of addiction*, 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- Demant, J., (2013) Affected in the nightclub. A case study of regular clubbers' conflictual practices in nightclubs. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 24 (3), pp. 196-202.
- Derelega, V.J. and Chaikin, A.L., (1977) Privacy and self-disclosure in social relationships. *Journal of Social Issues*, 33 (3), pp. 102-115.

- Dhillon, A., Tardini, F., Bittner, E., Schmidt, U., Allain, R. and Bigatello, L., (2014) Benefit of using a “bundled” consent for intensive care unit procedures as part of an early family meeting. *Journal of Critical Care*, 29 (6), pp. 919-922.
- Donmoyer, R., (2000) Generalizability and the single case study. In. R. Gomm, M. Hammersley and P. Foster eds. *Case study method*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Dorrer, N., McIntosh, I., Punch, S. and Emond, R., (2010) Children and food practices in residential care: ambivalence in the ‘institutional’ home. *Children’s Geographies*, 8 (3), pp. 247-259.
- Dovey, K., Fitzgerald, J. and Choi, Y., (2001) Safety becomes danger: dilemmas of drug use in public space. *Health and Place*, 7 (4), pp. 319-331.
- Duff, C., (2007) Towards a theory of drug use contexts: space, embodiment and practice. *Addiction, Research and Theory*, 15 (5), pp. 503-519.
- Duff, C., (2009) The drifting city: the role of affect and repair in the development of “enabling environments”. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 20 (3), pp. 202-208.
- Dunning, E., Murphy, P. and Williams, J., (1986) Spectator violence at football matches: towards a sociological explanation. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 37 (2), 221-244.
- Dwyer, P., and Somerville, P., (2011) Introduction: themed section on exploring multiple exclusion homelessness. *Social Policy and Society*, 10 (4), pp. 495-500.
- Dyck, I., Kontos, P., Angus, J. and McKeever, P., (2005) The home as a site for long-term care: meanings and management of bodies and spaces. *Health and Place*, 11 (2), pp. 173-185.
- Easthope, H., (2004) A place called home. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 21 (3), pp. 128-138.
- Easthope, H., (2014) Making a rental property home. *Housing Studies*, 29 (5), pp. 579-596.
- Edgar, B., Harrison, M., Watson, P. and Busch-Geertsema, V., (2007) *Measurement of homelessness at European Union level*. Dundee: Joint Centre for Scottish Housing Research.
- Edgar, B. and Meert, H., (2005) *Fourth review of statistics on homelessness in Europe: the ETHOS definition of homelessness*. Brussels: FEANTSA.
- Eliason, M.J. and Schope, R., (2007) Shifting sands or solid foundation? Lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender identity formation. In. I.H. Meyer and M.E. Northridge, eds. *The Health of Sexual Minorities*. New York: Springer. Ch.1.

- Elley, S., (2011) Young women, class and gendered heterosexuality: the implication of educational aspirations and social networks for sex education messages. *Sociology*, 45 (3), pp. 413-429.
- Elliott, A., (2014) *Concepts of the self*, 3rd ed. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Emond, H.R., (2000) *Survival of the skilful: an ethnographic study of two groups of young people in residential care*. PhD. University of Stirling.
- Emond, R., (2003) Putting the care into residential care. *Journal of Social Work*, 3 (3), pp. 321-337.
- Emond, R., (2014) Longing to belong: children in residential care and their experiences of peer relationships at school and in the children's home. *Child and Family Social Work*, 19 (2), pp. 194-202.
- Emond, R., McIntosh, I. and Punch, S., (2014) Food and feelings in residential childcare. *British Journal of Social Work*, 44 (7), pp. 1840-1856.
- Ennett, S.T., Bailey, S.L., and Federman, E.B., (1999) Social network characteristics associated with risky behaviours among runaway and homeless youth. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 40 (1), pp. 63-78.
- ESRC, (2012) *Framework for research ethics (FRE) 2010 updated September 2012*. Swindon: ESRC.
- European Group for Integrated Social Research, (2001) Misleading trajectories: transition dilemmas of young adults in Europe. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 4 (1), pp. 101-118.
- Fadjukoff, P., Pulkkinen, L. and Kokko, K., (2016) Identity formation in adulthood: a longitudinal study from age 27 to 50. *Identity: An International Journal of Theory and Research*, 16 (1), pp. 8-23.
- Farrugia, D., (2011) Youth homelessness and individualised subjectivity. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 14 (7), pp. 761-775.
- Featherstone, B., (2006) Why gender matters in child welfare and protection. *Critical Social Policy*, 26 (2), pp. 294-314.
- Fitzpatrick, S., Johnsen, S., and White, M., (2011) Multiple exclusion homelessness in the UK: key patterns and intersections. *Social Policy and Society*, 10 (4), pp. 501-512.
- Fitzpatrick, S., Quilgars, D. and Pleace, N., (2009) Introduction: an overview of homelessness in the UK. In S. Fitzpatrick, D. Quilgars and N. Pleace eds. *Homelessness in the UK: problems and solutions*. Coventry: Chartered Institute of Housing. Ch. 1.
- Flint, J., (2002) Social housing agencies and the governance of anti-social behaviour. *Housing Studies*, 17 (4), pp. 619-637.

- Foucault, M., (1975) *Discipline and punish: the birth of the prison*. Translated from French by Allen Lane, 1977. London: Penguin Books.
- Fricker, M., (2007) *Epistemic injustice: power and the ethics of knowing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Frith, S., (1984) *The sociology of youth*. Lancashire: Causeway Press Ltd.
- Frost, L., (2005) Theorizing the young woman in the body. *Body and Society*, 11 (1), pp. 63-85.
- Furlong, A., Cartmel, F., Biggart, A., Sweeting, H., and West, P., (2003) *Youth transitions: patterns of vulnerability and processes of social inclusion*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive Social Research.
- Furst, R.T., and Evans, D.N., (2015) An exploration of stigma in the lives of sex offenders and heroin abusers. *Deviant Behavior*, 36 (2), pp. 130-145.
- Giddens, A., (1991) *The consequences of modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gibson, K.E., (2011) *Street kids: homeless youth, outreach, and policing New York's streets*. New York: New York University Press.
- Gieryn, T.F., (2000) A space for place in sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, pp. 463-496.
- Goffman, E., (1959) *The presentation of self in everyday life*. London: Penguin Books.
- Goffman, E., (1961) *Asylums: essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates*. London: Penguin Books.
- Goffman, E., (1963) *Stigma: notes on the management of spoiled identity*. London: Penguin Books.
- Goffman, E., (1967) *Interaction ritual*. New York: Random House.
- Goffman, E., (1976) *Gender advertisements*. London: The Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Gold, R.L., (1958) Roles in sociological field observations. *Social Forces*, 36 (3), pp. 217-223.
- Gossop, M., Neto, D., Radovanovic, M., Batra, A., Toteva, S., Musalek, M., Skutle, A. and Goos, C., (2007) Physical health problems among patients seeking treatment for alcohol use disorders: a study in six European cities. *Addiction Biology*, 12 (2), pp. 190-196.
- Green, R., Mitchell, P. and Bruun, A., (2013) Bonds and bridges: perspectives of service-engaged young people on the value of relationships in addressing alcohol and other drug issues. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 16 (4), pp. 421-440.

- Greene, J.M., Ennett, S.T., and Ringwalt, C.L., (1997) Substance use among runaway and homeless youth in three national samples. *American Journal of Public Health*, 87 (2), pp. 229-235.
- Gurney, C.M., (1997) "...Half of me was satisfied": making sense of home through episodic ethnographies. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 20 (3), pp. 373-386.
- Haenfler, R., (2004) Rethinking subcultural resistance: core values of the straight edge movement. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 33 (4), pp. 406-436.
- Hall, T. (2003) *Better times than this: youth homelessness in Britain*. London: Pluto Press.
- Hamilton-Smith, N., Malloch, M. and Ashe, S., (2015) Public processions and social context: challenges in the search for community impact. *Scottish Affairs*, 24 (3), pp. 308-327.
- Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, P., (2007) *Ethnography: principles in practice*, 3rd ed. London: Routledge.
- Hammersely, M. and Gomm, R., (2000) Introduction. In. R. Gomm, M. Hammersley and P. Foster eds. *Case study method*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Harris, M., (1990) Emics and etics revisited. In. T.N. Headland, K.L. Pike and M. Harris, eds. (1990) *Emics and etics: the insider/outsider debate*. California: SAGE Publications.
- Heather, N. and Robertson, I. (1997) *Problem drinking*, 3rd ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heerde, J.A. and Hemphill, S.A., (2015) Is substance use associated with perpetration and victimization of physically violent behavior and property offences among homeless youth? A systematic review of international studies. *Child Youth Care Forum*, 44 (2), pp. 277-307.
- Henkel, D., (2011) Unemployment and substance use: a review of the literature (1990-2010). *Current Drug Abuse Reviews*, 4 (1), pp. 4-27.
- Hill, J.M., Lalji, M., Rossum, G. van, Geest, V.R. van der and Blokland, A.A.J., (2015) Experiencing emerging adulthood in the Netherlands. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 18 (8): 1035-1056.
- Himsworth, C.M.G., (1994) *Housing law in Scotland*, 4th ed. Edinburgh: Butterworths/The Planning Exchange.
- HM Government, (2010) *Drug strategy 2010 reducing demand, restricting supply, building recovery: supporting people live a drug free life*. London: HM Government. Available: <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/alcohol-drugs/drugs/drug-strategy/drug-strategy-2010?view=Binary> [Accessed 11th April 2012].

HM Government (2012) *The government's alcohol strategy*. London: HM Government. Available: <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/publications/alcohol-drugs/alcohol/alcohol-strategy?view=Binary> [Accessed 11th April 2012]

Hodkinson, P., (2002) *Goth: identity, style and subculture*. Oxford: Berg.

Hodkinson, P., (2012) Beyond spectacular specifics in the study of youth (sub)cultures. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 15 (5), pp. 557-572.

Hollingworth, S., (2015) Performances of social class, race and gender through youth subculture: putting structure back in to youth subcultural studies. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 18 (1), pp. 1237-1256.

Homeless Link, (2013) *Who is supporting people now? Experiences of local authority commissioning after Supporting People*. London: Homeless Link. Available: http://www.homeless.org.uk/sites/default/files/site-attachments/Who%20is%20supporting%20people%20now%20Report%20Jan13_0.pdf [Accessed 24th October 2015].

Hoolachan, J., McKee, K., Moore, T. and Soaita, A.M., (2016) 'Generation Rent' and the ability to 'settle down': economic and geographical variation in young people's housing transitions. *Journal of Youth Studies*, early online, DOI: 10.1080/13676261.2016.1184241

Hoye, G.V. and Lootens, H., (2013) Coping with unemployment: personality, role demands and time structure. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 82 (2), pp. 85-95.

Imrie, R., (2004) Housing quality, disability and domesticity. *Housing Studies*, 19 (5), pp. 685-690.

Jacobs, K. and Malpas, J., (2013) Material objects, identity and the home: towards a relational housing research agenda. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 30 (3), pp. 281-292.

Jaeger, M., Konrad, A., Rueegg, S. and Rabenschlag, F., (2015) Patients' subjective perspective on recovery orientation on an acute psychiatric unit. *Nordic Journal of Psychiatry*, 69 (3), pp. 188-195.

James, J., (1977) Ethnography and social problems. In R.S. Weppner, ed. (1977), *Street ethnography: selected studies of crime and drug use in natural settings*. London: SAGE Publication. Ch. 8.

Jeyasingham, D., (2014) The production of space in children's social work: insights from Henri Lefebvre's spatial dialectics. *British Journal of Social Work*, 44 (7), pp. 1879-1894.

Johnsen, S., Cloke, P. and May, J., (2005) Transitory spaces of care: serving homeless people on the street. *Health and Place*, 11 (4), pp. 323-336.

- Johnsen, S. and Fitzpatrick, S., (2010) Revanchist sanitisation or coercive care? The use of enforcement to combat begging, street drinking and rough sleeping in England. *Urban Studies*, 47 (8), pp. 1703-1723.
- Johnsen, S., and Quilgars, D., (2009) Youth homelessness: In Fitzpatrick, S., Quilgars, D., and Pleace, N., eds. (2009) *Homelessness in the UK: problems and solutions*. Coventry: Chartered Institute of Housing. Ch. 4.
- Johnsen, S. and Teixeira, L., (2012) 'Doing it already?': stakeholder perceptions of Housing First in the UK. *International Journal of Housing Policy*, 12 (2), pp. 183-203.
- Johnson, P., (2013) 'You think you're a rebel on a big bottle': teenage drinking, peers and performance authenticity. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 16 (6), pp. 747-758.
- Jones, S.C., Magee, C. and Andrews, K., (2015) 'I think other parents might...': using a projective technique to explore parental supply of alcohol. *Drug and Alcohol Review*, 34 (5), pp. 531-539.
- Junker, B., (1960) *Field work*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Karnieli-Miller, O., Strier, R., and Pessach, L., (2009) Power relations in qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 19 (2), pp. 279-289.
- Katz, J., (2002) From how to why: on luminous description and causal inference in ethnography (part 2). *Ethnography*, 3 (1), pp. 63-90.
- Kearney, M.H., Murphy, S. and Rosenbaum, M., (1994) Mothering on crack cocaine: a grounded theory analysis. *Social Science and Medicine*, 38 (2), pp. 351-361.
- Kehily, M.J., (2007) *Understanding youth: perspectives, identities and practices*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Kemp, P.A., Neale, J., and Robertson, M., (2006) Homelessness among problem drug users: prevalence, risk factors and trigger events. *Health and Social Care in the Community*, 14 (4), pp. 319-328.
- Keurhorst, M., Glind, I.V.D., Amaral-Sabadini, M.B.D., Anderson, P., Kaner, E., Newbury-Birch, D., Braspenning, J., Wensing, M., Heinen, M. and Laurant, M., (2015) Implementation strategies to enhance management of heavy alcohol consumption in primary health care: a meta-analysis. *Addiction*, 110 (12), pp. 1877-1900.
- Kidd, S.A., (2007) Youth homelessness and social stigma. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 36 (3), pp. 291-299.
- King, R. and Mai, N., (2009) Italophilia meets Albanophobia: paradoxes of asymmetric assimilation and identity processes among Albanian immigrants in Italy. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 32 (1), pp. 117-138.
- Klis, M. van der and Karsten, L., (2009) Commuting partners, dual residences and the meaning of home. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 29 (2), pp. 235-245.

- Korhonen, M., Komulainen, K. and Rätty, H., (2011) Bringing up global or local citizens? Pupils' narratives of spatial selves in Finnish entrepreneurship education. *Young*, 19 (1), pp. 45-67.
- Laitinen, A., (2012) *Misrecognition, misrecognition, and fallibility*. *Res Publica*, 18 (1), pp. 25-38.
- Lambert, V., Glacken, M., and McCarron, M., (2011) Employing an ethnographic approach: key characteristics. *Nurse Researcher*, 19 (1), pp. 17-23.
- Larkin, M. (2009) *Vulnerable groups in health and social care*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Laverty, L., Robinson, J. and Holdsworth, C., (2015) Gendered forms of responsibility and control in teenagers' views of alcohol. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 18 (6), pp. 794-808.
- Lawler, S., (2014) *Identity: sociological perspectives*, 2nd ed. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- LeCompte, M.D., and Goetz, J.P., (1982) Problems of reliability and validity in ethnographic research. *Review of Educational Research*, 52 (1), pp. 31-60.
- Lee-Treweek, G. and Linkogle, S., (2000) *Danger in the field: risk and ethics in social research*. London: Routledge.
- Lefebvre, H., (1991) *The production of space*. Translated from French by D. Nicholson-Smith. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Leonard, M., (2006) Teenagers telling sectarian stories. *Sociology*, 40 (6), pp. 1117-1133.
- Lincoln, Y.S., and Guba, E.G., (1985) *Naturalistic inquiry*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Lister, R., (2006) Children (but not women) first: New Labour, child welfare and gender. *Critical Social Policy*, 26 (2), pp. 315-355.
- Livingston, J.D., Milne, T., Fang, M.L. and Amari, E., (2012) The effectiveness of interventions for reducing stigma related to substance use disorders: a systematic review. *Addiction*, 107 (1), pp. 39-50.
- Lumsden, K., (2009) 'Don't ask a woman to do another woman's job': gendered interactions and the emotional ethnographer. *Sociology*, 43 (3), pp. 497-513.
- MacAndrew, C., and Edgerton, R.B., (2003) *Drunken comportment: a social explanation*. New York: Percheron Press.
- MacDonald, R., and Marsh, J., (2005) *Disconnected youth? Growing up in Britain's poor neighbourhoods*. Palgrave MacMillan: Hampshire.

- Mackie, P. and Thomas, I., (2014) *Nations apart? Experiences of single homeless people across Great Britain*. London: Crisis.
- Maffesoli, M., (1996) *The time of the tribes: the decline of individualism in mass society*. London: Sage.
- Mallett, S., (2004) Understanding home: a critical review of the literature. *Sociological Review*, 52 (1), pp. 62-89.
- Mallett, S., Rosenthal, D., Keys, D. and Averill, R., (2010) *Moving out, moving on: young people's pathways through homelessness*. New York: Routledge.
- Malloch, M., (1999) Drug use, prison, and the social construction of femininity. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 22 (3), pp. 349-358.
- Marcus, C.C., (1995) *House as a mirror of the self: exploring the deeper meaning of home*. Berkley: Conari Press.
- Marel, C., Mills, K., Darke, S., Ross, J., Burns, L. and Teesson, M., (2015) Can we predict retention in longitudinal studies of substance use? Findings from the Australian treatment outcome study. *Addictive Behaviors*, 51 (1), pp. 38-43.
- Marsh, I., and Keating, M., (2006) *Sociology: making sense of society*, 3rd ed. Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Martin, M.J., Conger, R.D., Sitnick, S.L., Masarik, A.S., Forbes, E.E. and Shaw, D.S., (2015) Reducing risk for substance use by economically disadvantaged young men: positive family environments and pathways to educational attainment. *Child Development*, 86 (6), pp. 1719-1737.
- Marwick, A. and Boyd, D., (2014) 'It's just drama': teen perspectives on conflict and aggression in a networked era. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 17 (9), pp. 1187-1204.
- Mason, J. (2002) *Qualitative researching*. 2nd ed. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Matthews, H. and Limb, M., (1999) Defining an agenda for the geography of children: review and prospect. *Progress in Human Geography*, 23 (1), pp. 61-90.
- Mauthner, N. and Doucet, A., (2003) Reflexive accounts and accounts of reflexivity in qualitative data analysis. *Sociology*, 37 (3), pp. 413-431.
- May, J., (2000) Housing histories and homeless careers: a biographical approach. *Housing Studies*, 15 (4), pp. 613-638.
- May, J., Cloke, P. and Johnsen, S., (2007) Alternative cartographies of homelessness: rendering visible British women's experiences of 'visible' homelessness. *Gender, Place and Culture*, 14 (2), pp. 121-140.
- May, V., (2008) On being a good mother: the moral presentation of self in written life stories. *Sociology*, 42 (3), pp. 470-486.

- May, V., (2010) Lone motherhood as a category of practice. *Sociological Review*, 58 (3), pp. 429-443.
- May, V., (2011) Self, belonging and social change. *Sociology*, 45 (3), pp. 363-378.
- May, V., (2013) *Connecting self to society: belonging in a changing world*. Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.
- May, V., (2015) When recognition fails: mass observation project accounts of not belonging. *Sociology*, DOI:10.1177/0038038515578991.
- McCormack, M., (2014) Children and Young People (Scotland) Act: reflections on the passage of the Act. *Scottish Journal of Residential Child Care*, 13 (1), pp. 15-22.
- McGrath, L., and Pistrang, N., (2007) Policeman or friend? Dilemmas in working with homeless young people in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Social Issues*, 63 (3), pp. 589-606.
- McIntosh, J. and McKeganey, N., (2001) Identity and recovery from dependent drug use: the addict's perspective. *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy*, 8 (1), pp. 47-59.
- McKee-Ryan, F.M., Song, Z.L., Wanberg, C.R. and Kinicki, A.J., (2005) Psychological and physical well-being during unemployment: a meta-analytic study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90 (1), pp. 53-76.
- McKendrick, J., Scott, G. and Sinclair, S., (2007) Dismissing disaffection: young people's attitudes towards education, employment and participation in a deprived community. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 10 (2), pp. 139-160.
- McKeown, S., (2006) *Safe as houses: an inclusive approach for housing drug users*. Liverpool: Shelter.
- McKetin, R., Kelly, E., McLaren, J., and Proudfoot, H., (2008) Impaired physical health among methamphetamine users in comparison with the general population: the role of methamphetamine dependence and opioid use. *Drug and Alcohol Review*, 27 (5), pp. 482-489.
- McNaughton, C. and Atherton, I., (2011) Housing First: considering components for successful resettlement of homeless people with multiple needs. *Housing Studies*, 26 (5), pp. 767-777.
- McNaughton, C. and Quilgars, D., (2009) Homelessness amongst minority ethnic groups. In S. Fitzpatrick, D. Quilgars and N. Pleace eds. *Homelessness in the UK: problems and solutions*. Coventry: Chartered Institute of Housing. Ch. 5.
- McNeil, R., Small, W., Lampkin, H., Shannon, K. and Kerr, T., (2014) "People knew they could come here to get help": an ethnographic study of assisted injection practices at a peer-run 'unsanctioned' supervised drug consumption room in a Canadian setting. *AIDS Behavior*, 18 (3), pp. 473-485.

- McPhee, I., (2013) *The intentionally unseen: illicit and illegal drug use in Scotland*. Germany: Lambert Academic Publishing.
- McVicar, D., Moschion, J. and Ours, J.C.V., (2015) From substance use to homelessness or vice versa? *Social Science and Medicine*, 136-137, pp. 89-98.
- Mead, G.H., (1934) *Mind, self and society: from the standpoint of a social behaviorist*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Meanwell, E., (2013) Profaning the past to salvage the present: the symbolically reconstructed pasts of homeless shelter residents. *Symbolic Interaction*, 36 (4), pp. 439-456.
- Measham, F. and Brain, K., (2005) 'Binge' drinking, British alcohol policy and the new culture of intoxication. *Crime, Media, Culture*, 1 (3), pp. 262-283.
- Measham, F. and Shiner, M., (2009) The legacy of 'normalisation': the role of classical and contemporary criminological theory in understanding young people's drug use. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 20 (6), pp. 502-508.
- Miller, P.G. and Sønderslund, A.L., (2010) Using the internet to research hidden populations of illicit drug users: a review. *Addiction*, 105 (9), pp. 1557-1567.
- Miller, T.R., Levy, D.T., Cohen, M.A., and Cox, K.L.C., (2006) Costs of alcohol and drug – involved crime. *Prevention Science*, 7 (4), pp. 333-342.
- Mitchell, D., (1997) The annihilation of space by law: the roots and implications of anti-homeless laws in the United States. *Antipode*, 29 (3), pp. 303-336.
- Molgat, M., (2007) Do transitions and social structures matter? How 'emerging adults' define themselves as adults. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 10(5), pp. 495-516
- Morimoto, S.A. and Friedland, L.A., (2011) The lifeworld of youth in the information society. *Youth and Society*, 43 (2), pp. 549-567.
- Moss, D. and Richter, I., (2010) Understanding young people's transitions in university halls through space and time. *Young*, 18 (2), pp. 157-176.
- Muggleton, D., (2000) *Inside subculture: the postmodern meaning of style*. London: Berg Publishers.
- Murphy, E. and Dingwall, R., (2001) The ethics of ethnography. In P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J., Lofland and L. Lofland, eds. *Handbook of ethnography*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. Ch. 23.
- Mythen, G., (2005) Employment, individualization and insecurity: rethinking the risk perspective. *Sociological Review*, 53 (1), pp. 129-149.

Neale, J., (2001) Homelessness amongst drug users: a double jeopardy explored. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 12 (4), pp. 353-369.

Neale, J., Nettleton, S. and Pickering, L., (2011) Recovery from problem drug use: what can we learn from the sociologist Erving Goffman? *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy*, 18 (1), pp. 3-9.

Neale, J., Nettleton, S. and Pickering, L., (2014) Gender sameness and difference in recovery from heroin dependence: a qualitative exploration. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 25 (1), pp. 3-12.

Neale, J. and Stevenson, C., (2012) Routine exposure to blood within hostel environments might help to explain elevated levels of Hepatitis C amongst homeless drug users: insights from a qualitative study. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 23 (3), pp. 248-250.

Neale, J. and Stevenson, C., (2014) Homeless drug users and information technology: a qualitative study with potential implications for recovery from drug dependence. *Substance Use and Misuse*, 49 (11), pp. 1465-1472.

Nettleton, S., Neale, J. and Stevenson, C., (2012) Sleeping at the margins: a qualitative study of homeless drug users who stay in emergency hostels and shelters. *Critical Public Health*, 22 (3), pp. 319-328.

Neumark, D., (2013) Drawn to beauty: the practice of house-beautification as homemaking amongst the forcibly displaced. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 30 (3), pp. 237-261.

Newcombe, R., (2009) *The use of mephedrone (m-cat, meow) in Middlesburgh*. Manchester: Lifeline Publications and Research.

Northcote, J., (2006) Nightclubbing and the search for identity: making the transition from childhood to adulthood in an urban milieu. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 9 (1), pp. 1-16.

Oliver, V. and Cheff, R., (2014) The social network: homeless young women, social capital, and the health implications of belonging outside the nuclear family. *Youth and Society*, 46 (5), pp. 642-662.

Orosz, G., Szekeres, A., Kiss, Z.G., Farkas, P. and Roland-Lévy, C., (2015) Elevated romantic love and jealousy if relationship status is declared on Facebook. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 6, (214), pp. 1-6.

Padgett, D.K., (2007) There's no place like (a) home: ontological security among persons with serious mental illness in the United States. *Social Science and Medicine*, 64 (9), pp. 1925-1936.

Padgett, D.K., Gulcur, L. and Tsemberis, S., (2006) Housing First services for people who are homeless with co-occurring serious mental illness and substance abuse. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 16 (1), pp. 74-83.

- Palamer, J.J., (2014) Predictors of disapproval toward “hard drug” use among high school seniors in the US. *Prevention Science*, 15 (5), pp. 725-735.
- Parker, H., Aldridge, J., and Measham, F., (1998) *Illegal leisure: the normalization of adolescent recreational drug use*. London: Routledge.
- Parsell, C., (2011) Homeless identities: enacted and ascribed. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 62 (3), pp. 442-461.
- Parsell, C., (2012) Home is where the house is: the meaning of home for people sleeping rough. *Housing Studies*, 27 (2), pp. 159-173.
- Perry, S.L., (2013) Urban hybrid space and the homeless. *Ethnography*, 14 (4), pp. 431-451.
- Phillips, D. and Harrison, M., (2010) Constructing an integrated society: historical lessons for tackling black and minority ethnic housing segregation in Britain. *Housing Studies*, 25 (2), pp. 221-235.
- Phoenix, A., (2011) Somali young women and hierarchies of belonging. *Young*, 19 (3), pp. 313-331.
- Pleace, N., (2008) *Effective services for substance misuse and homelessness in Scotland: evidence from an international review*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government Social Research.
- Pleace, N., (2011) Homelessness and inequality. In I. Anderson, and D. Sim, eds. *Housing and inequality*. Coventry: Chartered Institute of Housing. Ch. 11.
- Plug, W., Zeijl, E., and Du-Bois Reymond, M., (2003) Young people’s perceptions on youth and adulthood: a longitudinal study from the Netherlands. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 6 (2), pp. 127-144.
- Prochaska, J.O., Norcross, J.C., and DiClemente, C.C., (1994) *Changing for good*. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Prus, R., (1996) *Symbolic interactionism and ethnographic research*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Punch, S., (2012) Hidden struggles of fieldwork: exploring the role and use of field diaries. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 5 (2), pp. 86-93.
- Radcliffe, P. and Stevens, A., (2008) Are drug treatment services only for ‘thieving junkie scumbags’? Drug users and the management of stigmatised identities. *Social Science and Medicine*, 67 (7), pp. 1065-1073.
- Ratcliffe, P., (2004) *‘Race’, ethnicity and difference: imagining the inclusive society*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

- Rayburn, R.L. and Guittar, N.A., (2013) "This is where you are supposed to be": how homeless individuals cope with stigma. *Sociological Spectrum*, 33 (2), pp. 159-174.
- Redhead, S., (1997) *Subculture to clubcultures: an introduction to popular cultural studies*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Reger, J., (2015) The story of a slut walk: sexuality, race, and generational divisions in contemporary feminist activism. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 44 (1), pp. 84-112.
- Reiter, H. and Schlimbach, T., (2015) NEET in disguise? Rival narratives in troubled youth transitions. *Educational Research*, 57 (2), pp. 133-150.
- Roberts, J.M. and Sanders, T., (2005) Before, during and after: realism, reflexivity and ethnography. *Sociological Review*, 53 (2), pp. 294-313.
- Robertson, D. and Serpa, R., (2014) Social housing in Scotland. In. K. Scanlon, C. Whitehead, and M. Fernandez-Arrigoitia, eds. *Social housing in Europe*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Robinson, C., (2009) 'Nightsapes and leisure spaces': an ethnographic study of young people's use of free space. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 12 (5), pp. 501-514.
- Robinson, P., (2008) *Working with young homeless people*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Rødner, S., (2005) "I am not a drug abuser, I am a drug user": a discourse analysis of 44 drug users' construction of identity. *Addiction, Research and Theory*, 13 (4), pp. 333-346.
- Ronald, R. (2011). Ethnography and comparative housing research. *International Journal of Housing Policy*, 11 (4), 415-437.
- Room, R., (2003) The cultural framing of addiction. *Janus Head*, vol. 6 (2), pp. 221-234.
- Room, R., (2005) Stigma, social inequality and alcohol and drug use. *Drug and Alcohol Review*, 24 (2), pp. 143-155.
- Savage, M., Bagnall, G. and Longhurst, B., (2005) *Globalization and belonging*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Savelsberg, H.J. and Martin-Giles, B.M., (2008) Young people on the margins: Australian studies of social exclusion. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 11 (1), pp. 17-31.
- Scottish Executive (2005) *Code of guidance on homelessness: guidance on legislation, policies and practices to prevent and resolve homelessness*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.
- Scottish Government, (2008) *The road to recovery: a new approach to tackling Scotland's drug problem*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.

Scottish Government, (2009) *Changing Scotland's relationship with alcohol: a framework for action*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government.

Scottish Government, (2012) *Tackling homelessness*. Edinburgh: Scottish Government. Available: <http://www.gov.scot/News/Releases/2012/11/tackling-homelessness21112012> [Accessed 30 August 2015].

Seidman, S.N. and Rieder, R.O., (1994) A review of sexual behaviour in the United States. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 151 (3), 330-341.

Shannon, K., Kerr, T., Marshall, B., Li, K., Zhang, R., Strathdee, S.A., Tyndall, M.W., Montaner, J.G.S., and Wood, E., (2010) Survival sex work involvement as a primary risk factor for Hepatitis C virus acquisition in drug-using youths in a Canadian setting. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*, 164 (1), pp. 61-65.

Shelter Scotland, (2005) *The task force agenda: abolishing priority need is the most radical step yet*. Edinburgh: Shelter. Available: http://scotland.shelter.org.uk/professional_resources/practice_solutions/sharing_practice/practitioner_articles/the_task_force_agenda/3 [Accessed 10th April 2012].

Shelter Scotland, (2015a) *Homelessness in Scotland 2014: getting behind the statistics*. Edinburgh: Shelter. Available: http://scotland.shelter.org.uk/data/assets/pdf_file/0017/1050272/Homelessness_in_Scotland_2014_Getting_behind_the_statistics_FINAL_V2.pdf [Accessed 30 August 2015].

Shelter Scotland, (2015b) *Temporary accommodation when you're homeless*. Edinburgh: Shelter. Available: http://scotland.shelter.org.uk/get_advice/advice_topics/homelessness/help_from_the_councils_housing_department/what_happens_after_ive_made [Accessed 30 August 2015]

Shields, S.A., (2008) Gender: an intersectionality perspective. *Sex Roles*, 59 (5-6), pp. 301-311.

Shildrick, T. and MacDonald, R., (2006) In defence of subculture: young people, leisure and social divisions. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 9 (2), pp. 125-140.

Shipley, J.W., (2015) Selfie love: public lives in an era of celebrity pleasure, violence, and social media. *American Anthropologist*, 117 (2), pp. 403-413.

Siegal, H.A., (1977) Gettin' it together: some theoretical considerations on urban ethnography among underclass people. In R.S. Weppner, ed. *Street ethnography: selected studies of crime and drug use in natural settings*. London: Sage Publications. Ch. 3.

Sims, C.M., Noel, N.E. and Maisto, S.A., (2007) Rape blame as a function of alcohol presence and resistance type. *Addictive Behaviors*, 32 (12), pp. 2766-2775.

Skeggs, B., (1997) *Formations of class and gender*. London: SAGE Publications.

Skeggs, B., (2001) Feminist ethnography. In. P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland and L. Lofland, eds. *Handbook of ethnography*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd. Ch. 29.

Smart, C., (2007) *Personal life*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Smith, G.W.H., (2005) Enacted others: specifying Goffman's phenomenological omissions and sociological accomplishments. *Human Studies*, 28 (4), pp. 397-415.

Smith, J., (1999) Youth homelessness in the UK. A European perspective. *Habitat International*, 23 (1), pp. 63-77.

Smith, N., (1996) *The new urban frontier: gentrification and the revanchist city*. London: Routledge.

Smith, M., Albanese, F. and Truder, J., (2014) *A roof over my head: the final report of the Sustain project*. London: Shelter and Crisis.

Snow, D.A., Morrill, C. and Anderson, L., (2003) Elaborating analytic ethnography: linking fieldwork and theory. *Ethnography*, 4 (2), pp. 181-200.

Soaita, A.M., (2015) The meaning of home in Romania: views from urban owner-occupiers. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 30 (1), pp. 69-85.

Social Exclusion Unit, (2004) *The social exclusion unit*. London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister. Available: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/http://www.cabinetoffice.gov.uk/media/cabinetoffice/social_exclusion_task_force/assets/publications_1997_to_2006/seu_leaflet.pdf [Accessed 11th June 2012].

Soenen, B., D'Oosterlinck, F. and Broekaert, E., (2013) The voice of troubled youth: children's and adolescent's ideas on helpful elements of care. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 35 (9), pp. 1297-1304.

Soloway, I., and Walters, J., (1977) Workin' the corner: the ethics and legality of ethnographic fieldwork among active heroin addicts. In. R.S. Weppner, ed. (1977), *Street ethnography: selected studies of crime and drug use in natural settings*. London: SAGE Publication. Ch.7.

Somerville, P., Brown, P., Morris, G. and Scullion, L., (2011) Young people living in the YMCA. *Social Policy and Society*, 10 (4), pp. 559-570.

Squires, A., (2008) Language barriers and qualitative nursing research: methodological considerations. *International Nursing Review*, 55 (3), pp. 265-273.

Stablein, T., (2011) Helping friends and the homeless milieu: social capital and the utility of street peers. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 40 (3), pp. 290-317.

Staton, M., Leukefeld, C., Logan, T.K., Zimmerman, R., Lynam, D., Milich, R., Martin, C., McClanahan, K., and Clayton, R., (1999) Risk sex behaviour and substance use among young adults. *Health and Social Work*, 24 (2), pp. 147-154.

Stevenson, C., (2014) A qualitative exploration of relations and interactions between people who are homeless and use drugs and staff in homeless hostel accommodation. *Journal of Substance Use*, 19 (1-2), pp. 134-140.

Stevenson, C. and Neale, J., (2012) 'We did more rough sleeping just so we could be together' – homeless drug users' romantic relationships in hostel accommodation. *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy*, 19 (3), pp. 234-243.

Taylor, A., (1993) *Women drug users: an ethnography of a female injecting community*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Taylor, Y., (2004) Negotiation and navigation – an exploration of the spaces/places of working-class lesbians. *Sociological Research Online*, 9 (1). Available: <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/9/1/taylor.html> [Accessed 11 December 2015].

Teesson, M., Hall, W., Slade, T., Mills, K., Grove, R., Mewton, L., Baillie, A., and Haber, P., (2010) Prevalence and correlates of DSM-IV alcohol abuse and dependence in Australia: findings of the 2007 National Survey of Mental Health and Wellbeing. *Addiction*. 105 (12), pp. 2085-2094.

Thompson, R., Russell, L. and Simmons, R., (2014) Space, place and social exclusion: an ethnographic study of young people outside education and employment. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 17 (1), pp. 63-78.

Thomson, R., Bell, R., Holland, J., Henderson, S., McGrellis, S. and Sharpe, S., (2002) Critical moments: choice, chance and opportunity in young people's narratives of transition. *Sociology*, 36 (2), pp. 335-354.

Torkelson, J., (2015) Seeing (transitions to) adulthood in youth (sub)cultural studies through the eyes of former straightedge adherents. *Symbolic Interaction*, 38 (3), pp. 352-370.

Troilo, J. and Coleman, M., (2012) Full-time, part-time full-time, and part-time fathers: father identities following divorce. *Family Relations*, 61 (4), pp. 601-614.

Tsemberis, S., (2010) *Housing First: the Pathways Model to end homelessness for people with mental illness and addiction*. Minnesota: Hazelden Information and Educational Services.

Turner-Bowker, D.M., (2001) How can you pull yourself up by your bootstraps if you don't have boots? Work-appropriate clothing for poor women. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57 (2), pp. 311-322.

Wacquant, L., (2008) *Urban outcasts: a comparative sociology of advanced marginality*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Warr, D.J., (2005) "It was fun...but we don't usually talk about these things": analyzing sociable interaction in focus groups. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 11 (2), pp. 200-225.
- Wasielewski, P.L., (2015) The magic of Oaxaca: an emotional geography of age, gender and nation. *Symbolic Interaction*, 38 (4), pp. 557-574.
- Werb, D., Kerr, T., Fast, D., Qi, J., Montaner, J.S.G., and Wood, E., (2010) Drug-related risks among street youth in two neighbourhoods. *Health and Place*, 16 (5), pp. 1061-1067.
- Werb, D., Kerr, T., Li, K., Montaner, J. and Wood, E., (2008) Risks surrounding drug trade involvement among street-involved youth. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse*, 34 (6), pp. 810-820.
- West, R., (2006) *Theory of addiction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- West, R. and Brown, J., (2013) *Theory of addiction*, 2nd ed. West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell.
- Whyte, W.F., (1943) *Street corner society: the social structure of an Italian slum*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Widdicombe, S., and Wooffitt (1995) *The language of youth subcultures: social identity in action*. Hertfordshire: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Wilkinson, S., (1998) Focus groups in feminist research: power, interaction, and the co-construction of meaning. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 21 (1), pp. 111-125.
- Wilkinson, R., and Pickett, K., (2009) *The spirit level: why equality is better for everyone*. Penguin Books: London.
- Wilson, S., Houmøller, K. and Bernays, S., (2012) 'Home, and not some house': young people's sensory construction of family relationships in domestic spaces. *Children's Geographies*, 10 (1), pp. 95-107.
- Winstock, A., (2011) The 2011 drugs survey. *MixMag*, March, pp. 49 – 59.
- Witteveen, E., Ameijden, E.J.C.V., and Schippers, G.M., (2006) Motives for and against injecting drug use among young adults in Amsterdam: qualitative findings and considerations for disease prevention. *Substance Use and Misuse*, 41 (6-7), pp. 1001-1016.
- Woodman, D. and Wyn, J., (2015) *Youth and generation: rethinking change and inequality in the lives of young people*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Yates, P.R., (2002) A brief history of British drug policy 1950-2001. *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy*, 9 (2), pp. 113-124.

Yates, R., (2015) Recovery capital, addiction theory, and the development of recovery communities. *Addicta*, 1 (2), pp. 96-112.

Yin, R.K., (2012) *Applications of case study research*. 3rd ed. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Young, J., (1971) *The drugtakers: the social meaning of drug use*. London: MacGibbon and Kee.

Zinberg, N., (1984) *Drug, set and setting: the basis for controlled intoxicant use*. London: Yale University Press.

Legislative Acts

Children (Scotland) Act 1995

Children and Young Person (Scotland) Act 2014

Homelessness etc. (Scotland) Act 2003

Housing (Homeless Persons) Act 1977

Housing (Scotland) Act 1984

Housing (Scotland) Act 2001

Misuse of Drugs Act 1971

Smoking Health and Social Care (Scotland) Act 2005