



Stewart, A. B.R. (2019) Housing rites: young people's experience of conditional pathways out of homelessness. *Housing Studies*, 34(7), pp. 1117-1139. (doi: [10.1080/02673037.2018.1520818](https://doi.org/10.1080/02673037.2018.1520818))

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/167787/>

Deposited on: 30 November 2018

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

Housing Rites: Young People's Experience of Conditional Pathways Out of Homelessness

Abstract

Since devolution, Scotland has been perceived as an international trailblazer in homelessness policy. This is principally due to The Homelessness Etc. (Scotland) Act 2003 which led to the 'priority need' category being abolished in 2012, thus placing a statutory duty upon local authorities to provide settled accommodation to nearly all homeless households. This has been widely praised for extending citizenship rights to those experiencing homelessness. In contrast to this, this paper examines the experiences of young people (aged 16-24) where judgements on whether they were 'housing ready' delayed them being provided settled accommodation. Drawing on Bourdieu's writing on rites of institution, it is shown how the symbolic categories deployed by support services and landlords operated as a means of "vision and division" (Bourdieu 2000: 96), creating new social positions that lengthened the pathway out of homelessness. In a complimentary move, there was a fusion of support with control mechanisms to determine a person's readiness for settled accommodation.

Keywords: homelessness, housing policy, social housing, housing pathways, rites of institution, Bourdieu

Introduction

Within international debates on the best response to homelessness there has been increasing attention given to both rights-based and housing-led approaches (Anderson, *et al.* 2016; ECCH, 2010; FEANTSA, 2011 and 2012; Fitzpatrick and Watts, 2010). Each has been promoted for increasing access to housing and empowering homeless people (Kenna, 2005; Ridgway and Zippel, 1990; Watts, 2013 and 2014). On the rights front, Scotland has received international acclaim for its legislative framework which has extended entitlement to settled accommodation to nearly all homeless households since 2012. This effectively creates a legally enforceable right to housing, going against the grain of welfare retrenchment and increased behavioural conditionality, where rights to welfare are linked to the conduct of welfare recipients (Clasen and Clegg, 2007; Dwyer, 2004; Pawson and Davidson, 2008; Watts and Fitzpatrick, 2018). The international uniqueness of this framework has resulted in Scotland being acclaimed as an "exemplar for the rest of the European Union" (Anderson, 2009: 108).

Moreover, Scotland's new framework has relevance for the debate on the benefits of housing-led approaches compared to Housing Ready support models (Tsai *et al.*, 2010; Pleace, 2011). Indeed, Scotland's legal rights-based approach may align with this by "crowding out" (Watts, 2013: 54) considerations such as a person's 'readiness' for settled accommodation. Despite this, space remains for deciding when and how the duty to provide settled accommodation is carried out, where Housing Ready support models could continue to operate. With Housing Ready models criticised for placing conditions on access to housing and disempowering service users (Busch-Geertsema and Sahlin, 2007; Dordick, 2002; Sahlin, 2005), there is potential for this to undermine the overall spirit of the legislation. With young homeless people considered as requiring intensive support to provide them with the

necessary skills to live independently (Hutson, 1999; Third *et al.*, 2001), they make an apt group to explore this issue further.

This article, therefore, brings these two debates together to explore the experiences of formerly homeless young people (16-24) in Scotland. Firstly, it elaborates on these debates and Scotland's rights-based framework. Secondly, Bourdieu's (1992) underappreciated writings on rites of institution will be introduced for its potential to explain how Housing Ready support models structure the pathway out of homelessness. The qualitative methods used in the research will then be outlined, including the abductive approach taken to the analysis. The findings will then be presented, developing rites of institution to conceptualise the *conditional pathways* young people experienced as a result of considerations made about their readiness for settled accommodation. To conclude, the article will return to the question of what impact a Housing Ready ethos amongst support providers has on a rights-based legislative framework, the contribution of the theory developed in the analysis, and its potential application to other areas.

Scotland's Right to Housing

Legal rights-based approaches to homelessness are intriguing, as Watts (2014: 6) notes despite their rarity and "a paucity of empirical evidence" as to their effectiveness there is a growing body of support for them (Anderson, 2012; FEANTSA, 2012; Fitzpatrick and Watts, 2010; Kenna, 2005; Loison-Leruste and Quilgars, 2009). Kenna (2005), for example, has argued that rights can empower homeless people by providing them with a form of protection against welfare retrenchment and the marketisation of housing provision. Though as opposed to a legally enforceable individual right, as in Scotland, adoption of rights to housing have often been 'programmatic' rights within international legislation and conventions that commit governments to endeavour towards reducing homelessness and providing adequate housing (Fitzpatrick *et al.*, 2014; Kenna, 2005). Similarly, a few European countries have a right to housing in their constitution, but without a means for "homeless individuals to enforce that right" (Fitzpatrick and Watts, 2010: 113).

Enforceable rights to accommodation are rare and often restricted to provision of emergency accommodation, with rights to settled accommodation arguably limited only to Scotland, the rest of the UK, and France (Fitzpatrick and Stephens, 2007; Fitzpatrick and Watts, 2010). Even here there are significant caveats for the latter two countries. France's legislation commits it to providing a home to all in need but has faced many obstacles and only been gradually implemented (Houard, 2011; Houard and Lévy-Vroelant, 2013; Lévy-Vroelant, 2014; Loison-Leruste and Quilgars, 2009). The UK framework is strong internationally in combining a broad statutory definition of homelessness, including those in inadequate housing and at risk of homelessness, with an entitlement to settled accommodation (Fitzpatrick, 2009). However, this entitlement is restricted to those deemed to be in 'priority need' (families with dependent children, pregnant women, and specified 'vulnerable' adults) effectively excluding many single homeless people (Anderson *et al.*, 1993).

Devolution, though, has given Scotland the opportunity to become "radically different" from the rest of the UK (Fitzpatrick, 2004: 197). In comparison to France, where an enforceable right to housing arose after sustained media pressure (Lorison, 2007), there was broad political support in Scotland for change (Fitzpatrick, 2004). Housing featured heavily during the devolution referendum (Lowe, 2004) and, building on this impetus, the setting up of the Homelessness Task Force (HTF) was amongst the

initial actions of the first Scottish Executive. Members were drawn from across government, academia, and the voluntary sector. The HTF was also given a broad remit to provide recommendations towards preventing homelessness “and, where it does occur, [ensure it is] tackled effectively” (Homelessness Task Force, 2002: 1), with its recommendations (Homelessness Task Force, 2000; 2002) feeding into the policy design.

The resulting “modernised Scottish homelessness framework” (Anderson, 2009: 108) consists of two key pieces of legislation, the Housing (Scotland) Act 2001 and the Homelessness etc. (Scotland) Act 2003. A key part of the latter was the gradual extension of the ‘priority need’ homelessness category, inherited from the UK legislation, so that it would apply to all households accepted as statutorily homeless by 2012. As the Housing Minister said in a press release following the abolition of the priority need test in 2012, it “enshrines in law the clear principle that anyone who loses their home through no fault of their own is entitled to settled accommodation” (Scottish Government, 2012). Historically this entitlement was through an offer of local authority housing but was extended to include referrals to Registered Social Landlords by the 2001 Act (Scott 2004).

The new legislative framework received international praise within a progressive rights-based narrative, including being acclaimed as “the most progressive homeless legislation in Western Europe” (Homelessness Monitoring Group, 2004: 6), with calls for similar moves to be made in Europe and the USA (Anderson 2009; Tars and Egleson 2009). Furthermore, in November 2003, the Scottish Executive received the Housing Rights Protector Award from the Centre on Housing Rights and Evictions for “its contribution to protecting human rights and safe-guarding human dignity” (Goodlad, 2005: 86). Additionally, a United Nation’s Committee (Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 2009: 8) recommended that, to improve their own housing policy, the rest of the UK should view the new Scottish legislation “as best practice, especially its provision relating to the right to housing as an enforceable right”.

A concurrent, though often separate, debate in the homelessness literature is the benefits of adopting ‘housing-led’ approaches (ECCH, 2010; FEANTSA, 2011). Housing-led designates a broad range of policies and services that prioritise the provision of stable housing to homeless households as the first action to take (Anderson *et al.*, 2016; EECH, 2010; O’Sullivan, 2008). While this can be through enforceable rights, it encompasses all approaches that “treat housing as a fundamental right and a prerequisite to solving [any] other problems” (EECH, 2010: 14) experienced by homeless households. Due to this, it has been contrasted with Housing Ready models of support that have been predominant in developed nations (ECCH, 2010; FEANTSA, 2011; Johnsen and Teixeira, 2012). Such models require tenants in supported accommodation to engage with support and prove that they are ‘ready’ to live independently before being allocated independent accommodation (Johnsen and Teixeira, 2010). Having service users move through a hierarchised series of stages towards independence it thus resembles a staircase (Shelter, 2008), sometimes also referred to as a continuum of care (Couzens 1997). Dordick (2002) found that these determinations of readiness often lacked objective measures (e.g. time spent sober) and instead relied on staff’s subjective judgement. In reviewing the evidence on the ‘staircase of transition’ model in Sweden, Sahlin (2005) found that it contributed to the ongoing social exclusion of homeless people and lengthened the time before they were in independent housing. With service users also at risk of losing their accommodation for failing to adhere to strict abstinence rules, it is perhaps unsurprising that many never reach independent accommodation (Busch-Geertsema and Sahlin, 2007; Person *et al.*, 2009).

In contrast, Housing First, which is often seen as emblematic of a housing-led approach, has been hailed as a *paradigm shift* (Kresky-Wolff *et al.*, 2010; Ridgway and Zippel, 1990). First developed within New York for those with complex support needs, it has become popular across the USA and gained attention internationally (Balogi and Fehér, 2014; Busch-Geertsema, 2014; Kennedy *et al.*, 2016). Removing considerations of deservingness or readiness for housing it “gives homeless people ‘Housing First’ before it does anything else” (Pleace, 2012: 3). The provision of stable housing is carried out with no behavioural requirements or need to accept support beyond, at most, a short weekly meeting (Johnsen and Teixeira, 2012). By the immediate provision of stable housing it seeks to encourage a sense of home and let homeless people themselves make the choices of “where, with whom, and how he or she will live” (Ridgway and Zippel, 1990: 18). However, there have been concerns regarding the lack of evidence about its effectiveness for other groups and difficulties that occur when transferring the model to countries with different policy and structural contexts (Johnson, 2012; Löfstrand, 2012; Pleace, 2011; Tsemberis, 2012). Housing First programmes also tend to be targeted interventions. For example, services run in USA have included amongst their eligibility criteria that a person must have been homeless for over a year. In light of this significant limitation, Tars and Egleson (2009: 215) recommended that the USA should broaden its ambitions and look to emulate Scotland and its “right to immediate housing”.

Whether Scotland’s effective right to housing translates into an ‘immediacy’ for the provision of stable housing has been less explored. Indeed, there was some divergence in the final policy framework from the original vision set out in the HTF recommendations, including retaining the intentionality and local connection tests (Anderson and Serpa, 2013). There were also concerns in the lead up to the 2012 target about the lack of available social housing, contributing to an increase in time spent in temporary accommodation by homeless households. Recently Shelter Scotland (2017) confirmed that this trend had continued to worsen. Furthermore, although Housing Ready models are less strictly applied in the UK, support providers have expressed caution about the prospect of Housing First models (Johnsen and Teixeira, 2010 and 2012). O’Sullivan (2008) has also suggested that legal rights risk taking an unnecessarily adversarial approach in promoting change, with the ‘social partnership’ model in the Republic of Ireland being held up as an alternative. Watts (2013; 2014), though, in comparing Scotland and Ireland, concluded that considerations of ‘readiness’ persisted in the latter despite the national push for a housing-led approach. Scotland’s rights-based approach was instead seen to have effectively reduced the discretion available to service providers.

However, two crucial areas still remain where discretion can be used to determine how and when the duty to provide settled accommodation is fulfilled. The first involves the option to use ‘interim accommodation’. As the Scottish Executive’s (2005: 61) Code of Guidance on Homelessness notes the ultimate aim of the legislation is the provision of settled accommodation and avoid placing people “in temporary accommodation unnecessarily”. However, a clarification quickly follows, that this should be done “at a time when the household is able to sustain [settled] accommodation” (Scottish Government, 2005: 61) allowing considerations of readiness to determine whether interim accommodation is used. The main limitation to this discretion is a requirement to have a review at least every six months.

The second area of discretion involves the use of Scottish Short Secure Tenancies (SSSTs). As with introductory/probationary tenancies in England (Smith and George, 1997), the main concern of SSSTs is dealing with anti-social behaviour through enabling the use of fixed period tenancy agreements within the social rented sector. Powell and Flint (2009) note that these fixed period tenancies

symbolise a governing of behaviour by ensuring that the maintenance of the tenancy is dependent on behavioural conditionality. This contributes to a civilising offensive (van Krieken, 1999; Vaughan, 2000), where a group or class seeks to exert its standards of behaviour on a less powerful group. There are two criteria for when a SSST can be used for households exiting homelessness that may result in a similar governance of behaviour (see Scottish Executive, 2002: 32). As SSSTs are a form of temporary social tenancy they are not included in the definition of settled accommodation and the discharge of duty cannot take place until the tenancy is converted to a Scottish Secure Tenancy (SST). There is further a potential impact from SSSTs on the sense of the tenancy being a home. Ontological security, a sense of stability and being at home, was found to increase with the provision of stable housing by Housing First service providers (Padgett, 2007). Conversely, the use of fixed-term tenancies in England was found to decrease it (Fitzpatrick and Watts, 2017).

Brueckner *et al.* (2011) also found a sense of home and stability provided by permanent accommodation to be important for young people exiting homelessness. Young homeless people, however, may be amongst those impacted by the discretion to use interim accommodation and SSSTs. Multiple studies across the UK have found young people at a disproportionate risk of tenancy non-sustainment, defined as ending a tenancy within six months to two years (Crane *et al.*, 2011; Pawson *et al.*, 2006; SCSH, 2007; Third *et al.*, 2001). Housing and support workers have expressed concern that how quickly young people can be allocated independent accommodation is “part of the problem” (Third *et al.*, 2001: 69). Instead, due to their assumed “inexperience or immaturity” (Harding, 2004: 108) it has been suggested they require additional support to provide them with the necessary independent living skills to sustain their own tenancy (Centrepoint, 2010: 27-28; Hutson, 1999: 216).

Whilst then Scotland's new legislative framework has been seen as an effective right to housing, discretion remains that potentially undermines its effectiveness. The ability to use interim accommodation and SSSTs for homeless households can place conditions on and delay the provision of settled accommodation. Both these areas of discretion are susceptible to being used for young people where concerns have been voiced over their independent living skills, and for whom Housing Ready style approaches have been preferred. However, whether such discretion has been utilized, and the effect this has on the ‘housing pathways’ (Clapham, 2002) of homeless households, particularly young homeless people, has not been explored.

Rites of Institution

Bourdieu's (1992) writings on rites of institution provide a body of work that can be further developed to aid explanations of how Housing Ready support models structure the pathway out of homelessness. Existing outside the standardised repertoire of concepts from Bourdieu, these writings exist primarily as a lecture transcript (Bourdieu, 1992) and within short passages clarifying larger arguments (Bourdieu, 2000, 2001, 2008 and 2014). A principle concern of rites of institution is how values and categories are ascribed to people, granting access to particular social positions. Elaborating on Van Gennep's (1960) well-known phrase ‘rites of passage’, Bourdieu (1992) chose to substitute the final word for institution to add emphasis to the creation of social boundaries through rites. This may seem at some distance from the world of deciding whether a person is ready for independent accommodation. However, by generalising the concept, Bourdieu (1992: 118) wanted to capture the similarity of what takes place in the rites of traditional societies that mark, for example, a member coming of age to other societal ascriptions of a person's status. For instance, how elite school systems

distinguish their members as elite (Bourdieu, 2014), or, indeed, how support services select those deemed 'ready' for progression towards independent accommodation.

In a modern context, Bourdieu (2014) saw the state and its "mandated agents" (Bourdieu 2000: 187), to whom it delegates power, as prime contributors to social hierarchies and cognitive schema that correspond with them. This is due to the historical concentration of symbolic power by the state, i.e. power that allows it to define categories and their relative value (Bourdieu, 1994). As with a rite stating that a boy is now to be publicly recognised as a man, the categories deployed by the state assign and legitimate social identities that create or accentuate social differences (Bourdieu, 1992 and 2001). 'Statutorily homeless', for example, marks out a subgroup from the arbitrariness of all who might under various definitions be considered homeless, as those who can have their status recognised by the state. Where the line is drawn is salient (Bourdieu, 1992), as defining statutorily homeless in effect creates the category and position of non-statutorily homeless as well. Or, in the same vein, by instituting 'housing ready' as a criterion for being allocated a tenancy, the category and position of 'not housing ready' is also created.

There is thus a conformity between "vision and social division" (Bourdieu 2014: 168). The vision that categorises social space (elite / non-elite, ready / not ready) actively contributes to the act of structuring it through practices such as rites of institutions. 'Vision and division' has rarely been treated as a concept in itself (see Marom, 2014 for an example) but serves as a fundamental motif in how Bourdieu constructs and puts the rest of his concepts to work. Of note, is that Bourdieu (2005) does not see mandated agents as simple executioners of policy. Similar to street-level bureaucrats (Lipsky, 1980) the exercise of discretion is inherent to their role. There is always an indeterminacy in the application of rules, filled by the vision of the agent entrusted to enforce it (Bourdieu, 2005). In being given the symbolic power to recognise, mandated agents also have the power for their own vision to enter into the determinate form given to policy.

This is not to deny that support for young homeless people can transfer real knowledge and skills helping cross "the transitional gap between childhood and adulthood" (Robinson, 2011: 120). Bourdieu (2014) makes a similar acknowledgement with the school system. It is crucial though not to lose sight that through their role in distributing qualifications schools facilitate the constitution of social divisions. As Marx (1975: 51) remarked about examinations that existed for entering the bureaucracy, they are "but the bureaucratic baptism of knowledge, the official recognition of the transubstantiation of profane knowledge into sacred knowledge". This is because any competence a person has is not treated as existing until the examination rite blesses it with official recognition in the form of a qualification.

Examinations therefore act as control mechanisms, specifying which knowledge can and cannot become sacred and worthy of a qualification. In turn, this forces those wishing to receive recognition to conform to the standards of knowledge set by the examiners. The school system still provides education, but the form it takes is influenced by the exam. There is gatekeeping, but not solely, as often seen in housing, as control over who accesses scarce resources (Alden 2015). This border control is also matched with a second type of gatekeeping, previously identified by Sahlin (1995), where control is used to discipline. Nor are considerations of readiness necessarily trying to deal with a lack of resources (Evans, 1999; Lidstone, 1994), but a concern with not providing a resource a person is at risk of losing (Johnsen and Teixeira, 2012; Third *et al.*, 2001). The example of the examination instead shows how these two forms of control can become part of Housing Ready support models. Those not

ready are supported to become ready, but as defined by the support provider's vision, with progress towards independent accommodation conditional on the service user conforming to it.

Whilst never explicitly stated, there is a strong influence from Marx in how Bourdieu describes rites of institution. The above quote was used by Bourdieu and Passeron (1990) when detailing the effects of examinations within schools, a topic Bourdieu (2014) later returns to as a rite of institution. This can be further seen in the shared religious phraseology and the importance given to recognition. Bourdieu, however, elaborates on Marx's insight by seeing the recognition granted in the rite as a form of symbolic capital that confers distinction upon a person. This is a result of the rite instituting hierarchised social positions that can only be accessed by achieving recognition. There is, therefore, two sides to recognition. There are those who grant it, such as the mandated agents of the state who have the power to distribute identities that "legitimate access" (Bourdieu, 2000: 187) to particular social positions. On the other side, is the person who is recognised as having a new identity. This takes place through a baptism, or consecration as Bourdieu (1992) calls it, making official the transformation of a person's identity, announcing that a person has crossed a boundary drawn by the rite and is to be treated differently. Recognition though is not perpetually guaranteed. Being given "an identity is also to impose boundaries" (Bourdieu, 1992: 120) with standards of conduct for what is expected of people to maintain that identity. Bourdieu (1992: 120-121) uses the example of the nobility, who whilst being part of the elite, were still bound to act *noble* to maintain their status. Thus, the relationship between the recogniser and recognised does not necessarily cease to exist with the bestowing of recognition.

This can help explain Housing Ready services, where a person despite their progress always remains vulnerable to being moved back down a position (Busch-Geertsema and Shalin, 2007). In contrast, 'housing pathways' (Clapham, 2002 and 2005; Mackie, 2012; Rosengard *et al.*, 2002) has become a key concept in the literature to describe movements between housing positions over time. The pathways metaphor sought to remove notions of necessary progress found in previous metaphors such as 'housing trajectory' or 'housing career' (Clapham, 2002). However, it has been criticised itself for romanticising "options and opportunities" (Fopp, 2009: 289) which those undertaking them might not share. When considering the applicability of housing pathways to homelessness, Clapham (2003) acknowledged the need to consider the power of state actors and support services. Yet, in the same article, while praising their empirical contributions, he lamented what he saw as the under-theorisation of prior homelessness research that applied the pathways metaphor (Anderson and Tulloch, 2000; Fitzpatrick, 1999).

Rites of institution, though, by integrating into a coherent theory issues of conditionality, power relations, and hierarchized social positions offers a way to incorporate the power of state actors and support services within the pathways metaphor. With particular relevance to explaining the effects of Housing Ready support models through how considerations of readiness demarcate the staging of positions along the pathway out of homelessness towards, as in the school system, a "final consecration" (Bourdieu, 2014: 183) of being recognised as ready and the duty to provide settled accommodation can be discharged.

Methods

This article draws on research that examined formerly homeless young people's experiences of moving into and sustaining an independent tenancy. The criteria for participants to be included in the

research was 'young people', aged 16-24, who had previously been accepted as statutorily homeless and were now in their own tenancy. The research took a qualitative longitudinal design with two waves of interviews with each participant. 25 young people were interviewed at the first wave of interviews, and 18 participants were successfully tracked and took part in the second wave. In total, there were forty-three interviews conducted between January 2011 and January 2012. 17 of the participants had experience of conditional pathways in the form of interim accommodation and / or a SSST.

Participants were recruited with the help of 11 organisations including social housing landlords, support organisations, and employers (both paid and voluntary). In a couple of cases, there was overlap where the support service was also the landlord of the tenancy. Ten local authority regions were represented, just under a third of Scotland's total of 32, including Scotland's larger and smaller cities as well as semi-rural and rural areas. At the first interview, 12 of the participants were in council housing, 12 were with a housing association, and one was in a private tenancy through a private sector lease.

Care was taken throughout to ensure the highest standards of ethical conduct in line with the Social Research Association's (2003) Ethical Guidelines. Ethical approval was sought from the University of Stirling's Ethics Panel. Due to the age of the participants, and the possibility they may be considered vulnerable, an application was also made for an enhanced background check. Though, with most participants recruited being over the age of 18 (the time spent in temporary accommodation meant it was rare to be allocated a tenancy before this age) few local authorities and support services requested a copy of the background check.

All interviews were transcribed and imported into a QSR NVivo 9 project file for coding and analysis. The analysis strategy took an abductive approach (Schwartz-Shea and Yanow, 2012; Timmermans and Tavory, 2012). Abduction rejects "following a step-wise linear, 'first this, then that' logic" (Schwartz-Shea and Yanow, 2012: 2) focusing instead on the dialogue between theory and research. While it may contain moments of deduction and induction, it resists their prescriptive logic (Schwartz-Shea and Yanow, 2012). It advocates taking a theoretically informed approach but remaining sensitive to gaps or misfits between theory and empirical analysis (Timmermans and Tavory, 2012; Wacquant, 2002). These then provide opportunities to refine, replace, or synthesise the concepts being used to improve their explanatory power (Wodak, 2004).

This fits with Bourdieu's (1988) own advice to treat theory as a set of thinking tools in need of refinement and modification, which cautions against sterile formularised interpretations and the act of making concepts lifeless through an over eagerness to give fixed definitions in advance of research. Doing so affects a denegation of thought, restricting research only to confirm or contradict concepts, instead of furthering conceptualisation by putting them to work. Bourdieu and Wacquant (1992) stressed the importance of this even to Bourdieu's own theory. This is something Lahire (2011: 4) has repeated in response to the tendency towards veneration or outright rejection of Bourdieu's thought, alternatively emphasising the need for researchers to "authorize oneself to [...] complete or inflect". The analysis sought to do this through realising the latent potential of rites of institution to study the consecration of non-elite groups, and accentuating vision and division as a tool for conceptualisation.

Conditional Pathways

Contrary to what may be expected from there being a 'right to housing', seventeen of the participants experienced conditions at some point on their housing pathway from homelessness to settled accommodation. This occurred through support services and landlord organisations using conditions of access and behavioural conditionality to structure the participants' housing pathways. The term 'conditional pathways' is introduced as a concept for the analysis to bring under the same analytical lens the diversity in how these conditions existed in practice. Critically, this concept draws and builds upon rites of institution to provide theoretical strength to the use of the pathways metaphor.

Of importance is that conditional pathways, as rites of institution, operated through a common schema of "vision and social division" (Bourdieu, 2014: 168). This unifying logic was that young people had to be 'housing ready' before they could be allocated settled accommodation. The phrase itself found its way into one of the interviews:

"Just when you're ready for a flat [... the support workers] do a sort of assessment with ye to see if you're housing ready." **Lesley**

Variations of this phrase were used across the interviews. All centered upon a notion of readiness: such as 'ready for housing' or 'ready for their own tenancy'. As seen in the quote from Lesley, the phrasing was often mentioned at the same time as making reference to the types of assessments or conditions that young people experienced:

"It was like a get ready for your own house type of thing." **Zoe**

"[If you] stay in a hostel for long enough, get good reviews and you'll get a house." **Daniel**

This linkage between the judgement of being ready and the process to undertake to gain recognition concurs with how Bourdieu describes a rite of institution. Treating young people as unready until they have proven themselves otherwise in the eyes of the support service or landlord "consists of sanctioning and sanctifying a difference (pre-existent or not) by making it *known* and *recognized*" (Bourdieu, 1992, 119). It separates young people out from other homeless households and communicates to them what is required, such as getting 'good reviews', to be consecrated as ready, and able to 'get a house'. Speaking of a rite of institution is more apt than speaking only of conditions of access and behavioural conditionality through the way the rite joins the two together. Young people were expected to adhere to behavioural conditionality that served as conditions of access to progress with their pathway.

Two aspects relating to discretion will help clarify the different types of conditional pathways to be discussed. Firstly, rites of institution "legitimate an *arbitrary boundary*" (Bourdieu, 1992: 118) that through a "social magic manages to produce discontinuity out of continuity" (Bourdieu, 1992: 119). As there is no single conclusive way to define when someone is housing ready, support services and landlords had to set their own boundary lines through their practices with little consistency between them. In particular, as will be explained in the following sections, the degree of formalisation was the principle aspect that explained the variation between the conditional pathways experienced. Secondly, as symbolic capital of recognition depends on both a person recognised and a recogniser, who the recogniser is and the moments when they are mandated to bestow symbolic capital on the recognised are important.

Conditions in Temporary Accommodation

The first place conditional pathways could be experienced was in supported or temporary accommodation. Often this was supported accommodation in the form of being placed in a building with support on-site consisting of self-contained flats or with shared facilities. Support services empowered by the homelessness guidance (Scottish Executive, 2005) treated these units as 'interim accommodation'. To prevent young people being allocated settled accommodation before they were recognised as 'ready', the duty towards them was put on hold through suspending their place on the local authority housing waiting list, or by holding back on their Section 5 referral to a housing association:

"They had actually freezed me." **Zoe**

"[The support service] won't let you take an offer of a house unless you done certain courses with them." **Graeme**

Zoe further clarified that it had been the support organisation that used the term 'freezing' when explaining her situation. Whilst 'frozen' she would not be considered for any tenancies that became available nor accrue any points, which in many Scottish local authorities are used in making allocation decisions (Tamsin and Robert, 2003).

In a small rural local authority where supported accommodation was not feasible, young people were instead allocated temporary flats that were used for homeless households. Whether the young person was 'ready' for a tenancy was decided jointly by the support service and the local housing officers. Being the most informal conditional pathway found in the research, it was also the only location where reference to maturity was explicitly used alongside readiness rather than being implicit as elsewhere:

"I've been told that because [my friend is] obviously mentally younger [whereas] I didn't need as much support [... because I] got a more mature attitude [...] that's why they gave me [a tenancy before him. My support worker] said that and so did the homeless officer." **John**

In both formal and informal pathways, though, what can be seen is the operation of symbolic capital in that the young people need to be recognised as 'ready' in order to be allowed to progress towards settled accommodation. A symbolic capital which, if not possessed, 'froze' the duty to find them settled accommodation for an indefinite period. Indeed, participants noted that they were given no indication about how long they could expect to be in supported / temporary accommodation. In formalised pathways there would be semi-regular review meetings, as in accordance with the Code of Guidance on Homelessness (Scottish Executive, 2005), but there was no fixed end date. Instead, their pathway depended on being recognised as ready:

"After I done the first couple of cooking lessons they were like 'We think you're able enough to look after yourself in the cooking stage part, so like they were starting budgeting my money with me and that, and then I went from there and they was like 'We think you're ready'." **Garry**

"I could be in here [temporary flat] for 2 weeks maybe, I could be in here for 2 or 3 years, and I've been in here now a year." **Simon**

Creating conditions of access for each step of the pathway out of homelessness shows how categories of 'housing ready' work as a principle of "vision and division" (Bourdieu, 2000, 96) in the formation of a rite of institution. In distinguishing service users as ready or not, recognition of readiness, with its associated symbolic capital that must be accrued, also hierarchically differentiated them by whether they were allowed to progress to the next step towards settled accommodation. Whilst support

services stated that all young people would eventually be considered ready, it clearly differentiated and discriminated which young people would access settled accommodation before others, predicating any right to housing as a right to housing for those who are ready.

The degree of formalisation in how judgements of housing ready were made was evident in the extent to which support services utilized scoring systems and / or mandatory support plans:

"They do a matrix score an I think when ye, when ye get yer matrix score down tae about ten or nine, they put you back on the housing list and it's called reactivation." **Zoe**

"They had to do so many cooking with you, cleaning with you, shopping with you, all that." **Graeme**

Within the small rural local authority there was an informal reliance on personal opinions of a person's maturity, similar to the subjective determinations of sobriety Dordick (2002) found for Housing Ready services for adults. In contrast, scoring systems and mandatory support plans functioned as 'objective' means by which to assess service users and formalise housing ready criteria. The use of scoring systems and support plans to organise support and at the same time make judgements on readiness also saw a fusion of support with control mechanisms. This is clearest to see with mandatory support plans. As with the school system, although "it does transmit [...] skills [...] it] is also a site of consecration" (Bourdieu, 2014: 168) since 'they had to do so many [courses] with you' to allow young people to accrue symbolic capital towards the recognition of being ready. Formalisation of such judgements, while giving young people an idea of what they need to achieve, also makes the support service the one who determines what is scored, how it is scored, and what courses young people are required to do.

The degree of formalisation, with its fusion of support and control mechanisms, was complemented by a fission of the pathway out of homelessness. Rather than a simple two-position pathway of support / temporary accommodation to settled accommodation, as might be expected with a right to housing, multiple interim positions extended the pathway. This further stratifying of services users in the correspondence of access to each position was tied to their recognised level of readiness:

"There were six bedrooms in the actual building itself but they also had two bedsits on the outside which were for people that were [...] ready [...] but it was just so they know what it was like having their own bedsit." **Graeme**

This set-up was the most commonly experienced in supported accommodation with formalised Housing Ready criteria. When deemed to have the requisite level of preparedness service users would progress from the supported accommodation building to bedsits or flats outside, but which remained close to the main building. Further to this, after being recognised as ready and having their position on the waiting list reactivated, service users could be moved onto a temporary flat where they would live until they were allocated or successfully bid for a tenancy. Forming a rite of institution where each of the positions "could ultimately be viewed as steps in the process of initiation, in which the initiate, as in legends of initiation myths, is consecrated in stages to reach a final consecration" (Bourdieu, 2014: 182), regaining the duty of the local authority to provide them settled accommodation.

Conditions in the tenancy

Being allocated a tenancy, however, was not always the final consecration. Moreover, whether a conditional pathway was experienced during temporary accommodation was no guarantee that the same would be true on entering a tenancy. In contrast to temporary accommodation where support services were the principle recogniser of a person's readiness, in the tenancy it was the landlord who deemed whether young people were ready. Similarly, rather than interim accommodation, the power mandating landlord organisations with this ability was the discretion in Schedule 6 of the Housing (Scotland) Act 2001 for when SSSTs can be used. This meant that participants were denied a SST, that would constitute settled accommodation, until recognised as ready by the landlord:

"Like the first year's contract is a temporary contract which is on the basis of, there's no complaints about you, and there's no issues with your tenancy which I assume is in terms of payment of rent." **Fraser**

As a SSST does not constitute settled accommodation, this also meant that the duty of the local authority would not be discharged until it was later converted to a SST. Again, the fissuring and extension of the pathway between homelessness and settled accommodation occurred alongside the fusion of support and control. As with interim accommodation, it was through first having a SSST with behavioural conditions attached that acted as a condition of access to gaining settled accommodation.

The most simple setup was with basic behavioural conditions, involving the requirement not to fall behind with rent and to avoid complaints being raised by neighbours but could additionally include requirements to engage with a support service. Although SSSTs have time limits of six months to a year, young people would be given another SSST instead of converting to a SST at the end of the original agreement if the landlord organisation deemed there to be any problems.

During the research, only John experienced being given another SSST at the end of his first. This happened a week before the tenancy agreement would have naturally come to an end, and he would have been offered a SST. The reason for giving him a SSST for a further six months was because the police had been called out by neighbours due to noise made by guests:

"So now I've got to wait a couple of more months until I can actually sign [a SST tenancy agreement], just to prove to them that I am actually [...] well behaved and things for the tenancy." **John**

The physical property a young person was initially allocated with a SSST would become the one they would keep when converted to a SST. Despite this, the extending of the pathway into settled accommodation also delayed there being a sense that the tenancy was their home. This confirms the importance of stable housing for ontological security highlighted in previous research (Brueckner *et al.*, 2011; Fitzpatrick and Watts, 2017; Padgett, 2007). Permeating into the tenancy, disrupting a sense of home from forming, was a feeling that they "got to watch where [they] tread" (John). The ascription of "an identity [of not being quite yet ready to manage their own tenancy was...] also to impose boundaries" (Bourdieu, 1992: 120). Even where participants had no reason to believe they were doing anything wrong, the behavioural conditions made them overly self-conscious of monitoring their own behaviour:

"I was kinda worried with the temporary lease kinda thing, [...] you feel like you've got to be extra careful about how noisy you are and what you actually do in your flat for the first year, but then after that you kinda feel settled once you know that it's an unlimited lease." **Fraser**

Vicky and Garry were the only participants who received fully furnished and decorated tenancies. However, this depended on them working with a specific support service in their local authority. The support service had an agreement with the local authority, that the latter would give the support service management of the tenancy, making them the effective landlord who furnished and decorated it before the participants moved in. This is similar to the operation of the support service mentioned by Harding (2004: 107) in his research. As this was the same support service who managed their conditional pathway before being allocated a tenancy, Vicky and Garry were also the only participants to have a conditional pathway with the same recogniser before and on entering their tenancies. The intensity of the support provided by the support service, and its fusion with behavioural conditions, was made clear by Garry:

"When they think you're ready to have your own tenancy they'll like give you a fully furnished house like, but you've got to work with them and you've got to like do the cooking sessions, budget your money with them like, [...] keep your meetings, [...] I worked with them for eight month, and then I got this place, I'm still working with them now, because if you move into the tenancy they help you, they support you with the tenancy for six months to see if you're capable and then after that [...] they sign the house over to you, and then it's your house." **Garry**

Both were also not allowed to refurnish or redecorate the tenancy during the probationary period. Asked his opinion on how the property was decorated, Garry said 'the full thing would be repainted' were he able to do so. He added he finally would feel it was a home once he had done this repainting. By the second interview, when the tenancy had been signed over to him, he repeated this intention once he could afford it. Alongside other factors, when asked, Vicky also felt her tenancy was a home only after redecorating the place:

"I've painted again in every room and decorated my living [room] got my laminate doon, my wallpaper and my thingy that hangs from the wall." **Vicky**

Again, there was a linkage between more intensive support and greater management of the tenancy being given to the support service, a fusion of support and control. It is not surprising in experiencing the most formalised conditional and intensively supported pathway that Vicky and Garry also experienced a high degree of monitoring with penalties for failure to meet them:

"[T]hey give you three chances. Like you've not paid a bill one week, right they'll write that down and they'll write that 'he's no paid it – we'll give him another chance' [...] so 'He's no bought food' - that's the second chance, and then after your third chance [...] they'd extend the six months." **Garry**

This resembles the "regulation of conduct" that Powell and Flint (2009: 172) note occurs with the use of probationary and demoted tenancies. The tenancy agreement becomes porous and filled with conditions denoting standards of behaviour the landlord expects from a tenant. Their use for young people in this research showing a continued perception amongst service providers that they lack the necessary living skills to manage their own tenancy (Centrepont, 2010; Hutson, 1999; Third *et al.*, 2001). It also shows how SSSTs enable a civilizing offensive (van Krieken, 1999) to take place with support being fused with control mechanism in order to impose the conduct desired by support providers:

"Your house has [...] got to be tidy and you've got to have your receipts and that out, 'cause [review meetings are] when the boss comes out to look at the house, to make sure like

everything's like the way it should be. [...] They'll check the cupboards and they'll check the freezer just to make sure there's plenty of food to do you the two weeks." Garry

The Important Thing is the Line

As noted so far, conditional pathways incurred important implications on the nature of the support provided, the relationship young people had with the support service, and how they felt about their tenancy. Furthermore, it has been shown how a rite "institutes a definitive difference between those who have undergone the rite and those who have not undergone it" (Bourdieu, 2014, 168), with those deemed ready having the duty to find them settled accommodation 'unfrozen'. However, Bourdieu (1992: 118) stresses that it is not only the passage through the rite that should receive attention, but that "the important thing is the line". Not only the before and after but the line that separates those who undertake the rite from those who do not.

For Bourdieu, with the general focus in his research on the way the elite constitutes and defines itself as elite, those excluded from the rite are seen by consequence, as marginalised. Yet, for one participant who originally was part of the rite but later excluded, the exclusion was described positively:

"About a million times better just wish I'd been put [in temporary furnished flat] before I had been put anywhere like that [supported accommodation]." Lesley

The reason for this was that Lesley became pregnant during her time in supported accommodation resulting in shared accommodation being deemed inappropriate for her. A knock-on effect from this was that her place on the waiting list was reactivated. In contrast, she noted that when she was in supported accommodation she had no idea when she would eventually be allocated a tenancy. The support service had originally viewed her as not requiring their support but it was through the insistence of the local authority that due to her age she be provided with the support that she was placed on a conditional pathway. This is potentially in violation of the regulation that homeless applicants are not automatically provided interim accommodation based on their membership of a given category (Scottish Executive 2005).

Another participant found himself in the converse situation of needing to change his circumstances in order to conform to the characteristics of those deemed eligible to undertake the rite. In his case, this meant living apart from his girlfriend to enable him to be deemed as 'single' so he could accept a tenancy offer from the support service. As the management of the tenancy by the support service did not allow anyone to stay over 'not even for like a night' (Garry), this enforced an assumption that young homeless people should live alone through the regulations. During the time before the tenancy, his girlfriend stayed with him at his aunt's house and they were both recognised as statutorily homeless. Moving into the tenancy meant she was not able to move in with him and they could not remain living together. However, this did not stop speculation from the support service that she was secretly staying over. At the first interview he said the plan was that as soon as the SSST was over she would be able to move in:

"They think my girlfriend's staying with me, she's not, she's staying at home with her mum [...] but the boss of the [support service] is like, confident that she's staying, but there's none of her clothes lying around or anything like that, it's all my stuff." Garry

By the second interview, the tenancy had been signed over, and she had moved in. Therefore, the management of his pathway also meant placing on hold establishing his own household that both he and his partner would have preferred to have happened sooner. Garry had chosen to work with the support service despite the many reservations he had with the nature of the support provided, as it was perceived as the only means to be housed in the foreseeable future and remain in the local area. It was deemed preferable to remaining on the regular waiting list despite the downsides that came with the support. However, this was the only local authority area where undergoing a conditional pathway shortened the length of time in supported accommodation, due to the shortage of social housing in the area as well as control over some remaining stock given to the support service. In all other areas the freezing of their place on the waiting list, or holding off on making a Section 5 referral, meant participants' time spent in supported accommodation was significantly lengthened.

Where these lines are drawn also makes clear how conditional pathways differ from the rites of institution examined by Bourdieu. Instead of an elite consecrating themselves, it was a rite that relied upon support services and landlords having been empowered to pass judgement on and manage the pathways of young people. In distinguishing certain homeless people as 'not ready' for housing, and denying them the privileges those outside this categorisation would experience, it imparted on them "the curse of a negative symbolic capital" (Bourdieu, 2000: 241) and could be considered an initial desecration rather than consecration. Young people having to go through conditional pathways, undergoing a rite of institution to acquire the symbolic capital of recognition to be recognised as ready, is as much about gaining a renouncement of the negative symbolic capital that they are unready. It is a rite of institution, not to become part of an elite, as is often the case in Bourdieu's examples, but a rite to regain what was frozen and delayed to them but not others, i.e. an entitlement to settled accommodation.

Conclusion

A major contribution of this paper, therefore, has been developing the concept of conditional pathways to conceptualise the effects Housing Ready support models have on the pathway out of homelessness. This developed rites of institution beyond Bourdieu's (1992) original use as a means for elites to consecrate themselves. These conditional pathways extended the applicability of the theory to a group ascribed negative symbolic capital by those with power to recognise. Effectively excluding them from rights enjoyed by others. However, the rite also offers the chance of 'redemption', to expunge their negative identity and reclaim their entitlement. Considerations of a household's readiness were not problematic then simply due to a gatekeeping power delaying access to settled accommodation (Alden, 2015; Sahlin, 2005). Rather, the issue runs deeper by support itself becoming fused with control mechanisms to determine the readiness of service users. This led to a concurrent movement where the greater the intensity of support the more the pathway was managed. With supported accommodation hierarchised as a gradation of steps towards the recognition of being housing ready, the fusion of support and control also fissured the social positions between homelessness and settled accommodation. The policy end goal to provide settled accommodation remains, but its realisation becomes conditional to being recognised as housing ready. A duty to provide settled accommodation, therefore, becomes a duty to help people become ready so settled accommodation can be provided. A right to housing becomes a housing rite, with the rights-based legislative framework instilled with a Housing Ready ethos.

This integrative theory has relevance for theoretical debates on conditionality, power, and hierarchised social positions. Particularly, it is also relevant for comparable groups experiencing this confluence of issues, such as with anti-social behaviour interventions, institutionalised care for mental health patients, and naturalisation for migrants. Indeed, there is scope to synthesize this work with civilizing processes (Elias, 2000), in seeing conditional pathways as a form civilising offensives can take (Powell and Flint, 2009; van Krieken, 1999). Another would be comparative work comparing these conditional pathways to rites of institution as Bourdieu (1992) originally envisaged to further develop understandings of class and power.

This paper also contributes to the debates on rights-based and housing-led approaches. There is much in Scotland's ambitious reform of its homelessness legislation deserving of praise. Caution is required though, as behind the press releases and praise that the new legislation introduced an effective 'right to housing', there are significant caveats. Alongside those already noted by Anderson and Serpa (2013), this paper, in exploring the use of Housing Ready service provision in Scotland, adds a further caveat that entitlement to settled accommodation has not always translated into an immediacy in which it was provided. Although Watts (2014: 15) found that the "simplicity and bluntness" of rights can reduce discretion in determining entitlement, it has been shown here that ample discretion remains to determine when and how this will be achieved. By allowing space where the "vision and division" (Bourdieu 2000: 96) of a Housing Ready ethos can continue to operate, the balance of power is tilted in favour of service providers with conditions placed on the provision of settled accommodation.

This discretion could be further minimised with additional regulations, such as Busch-Geertsema and Sahlin's (2007) recommendation of a maximum time limit within which authorities have to provide settled accommodation. It is impossible though to remove all indeterminacy that can be filled by competing visions from regulations (Bourdieu, 2005; Lipsky, 1980). Particularly, whilst there also remains insufficient resources, with a lack of affordable housing being another factor in how long homeless households spend in temporary accommodation (Anderson and Serpa 2013; Powell *et al.*, 2015; Shelter 2017). This does not mean agreeing with O'Sullivan (2008) that developing a shared understanding between the government and key social partners should be taken instead of a legal approach. Indeed, partnership working and a legal approach are not mutually exclusive. A way to minimize the competing visions at present would be tackling the insufficient housing supply and fostering a similar cultural shift amongst service providers as achieved by Housing First approaches. Such a housing-led ethos could strengthen the spirit of the rights-based legislation in ensuring the broad entitlement to housing as a legal right is complimented by the provision of stable housing being prioritized as the first response to fulfilling it.

Acknowledgements:

I would like to thank Dr Sharon Wright and the three anonymous reviewers for their advice and comments on earlier versions of this article. Additional thanks to Johan Sandberg McGuinne and Dr Katy Jones for their help in proofreading the final version.

References

- Alden, S. (2015). On the Frontline: The Gatekeeper in Statutory Homelessness Services. *Housing Studies*, 30(6), 924–941.
- Anderson, I. (2009). Homelessness policy in Scotland: A complete state safety net by 2012? In S. Fitzpatrick, D. Quilgars, & N. Pleace (Eds.), *Homelessness in the UK: Problems and solutions* (pp. 107–124). Coventry: Chartered Institute of Housing.
- Anderson, I. (2012). Policies to Address Homelessness: Rights-Based Approaches. In S. J. Smith, M. Elsinga, L. F. O'Mahony, O. S. Eng, S. Wachter, & S. Fitzpatrick (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Housing and Home* (Vol. 5, pp. 249–254). Oxford: Elsevier.
- Anderson, I., Dyb, E., & Finnerty, J. (2016). The “Arc of Prosperity” Revisited: Homelessness Policy Change in North Western Europe. *Social Inclusion*, 4(4), 108.
- Anderson, I., Kemp, P., Quilgars, D., & Environment, G. B. D. of the. (1993). *Single homeless people*. HMSO.
- Anderson, I., & Serpa, R. (2013). The right to settled accommodation for homeless people in Scotland: a triumph of rational policy making? *European Journal of Homelessness*, 7(1), 13–39.
- Anderson, I., & Tulloch, D. (2000). *Pathways through homelessness: A review of the research evidence*. Edinburgh: Scottish Homes.
- Balogi, A., & Fehér, B. (2014). The Possibilities and Limitations of Housing-led Projects: A Hungarian example, 8(1), 19.
- Bourdieu, P. (1988). Vive la crise! *Theory and Society*, 17(5), 773–787.
- Bourdieu, P. (1992). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1994). Rethinking the State: Genesis and Structure of the Bureaucratic Field. *Sociological Theory*, 12(1), 1–18.
- Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Pascalian Meditations*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bourdieu, P. (2001). *Masculine Domination*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.
- Bourdieu, P. (2005). *The social structures of the economy*. Cambridge, UK ; Malden, MA: Polity.
- Bourdieu, P. (2008). *Sketch for a Self-Analysis*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Bourdieu, P. (2014). *On the State*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourdieu, P., & Passeron, J. (1990). *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture* (Second edition). London ; Newbury Park, Calif: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (1992). *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*. Chicago: Polity Press.
- Brueckner, M., Green, M., & Siggers, S. (2011). The Trappings of Home: Young Homeless People's Transitions Towards Independent Living. *Housing Studies*, 26(1), 1–16.
- Busch-Geertsema, V. (2014). Housing First Europe – Results of a European Social Experimentation Project, 8(1), 16.
- Busch-Geertsema, V., & Sahlin, I. (2007). The Role of Hostels and Temporary Accommodation, 1, 27.
- Centrepoint. (2010). *The changing face of youth homelessness: trends in homeless young people's support needs*. London: Centrepoint.

- Clapham, D. (2002). Housing Pathways: A Post Modern Analytical Framework. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 19(2), 57–68.
- Clapham, D. (2003). Pathways approaches to homelessness research. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 13(2), 119–127.
- Clapham, D. (2005). *The meaning of housing: a pathways approach*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Clasen, J., & Clegg, D. (2007). Levels and levers of conditionality: measuring change within welfare states. In J. Clasen & N. A. Siegel (Eds.), *Investigating Welfare State Change: The “Dependent Variable Problem” in Comparative Analysis* (pp. 166–197). Cheltenham/Northampton: Edward Elgar.
- Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. (2009). *Concluding observations of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Crown Dependencies and the Overseas Dependent Territories* (Consideration of Reports Submitted by States Parties Under Articles 16 and 17 of the Covenant No. E/C.12/GBR/CO/5).
- Couzens, S. E. (1997). Priority: Home! A True Priority? An Analysis of the Federal Plan to Break the Cycle of Homelessness. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless*, 6(4), 275–282.
- Crane, M., Warnes, T., & Coward, S. (2011). *Moves to Independent Living*. Sheffield: Sheffield Institute for Studies on Ageing.
- Dordick, G. A. (2002). Recovering from Homelessness: Determining the “Quality of Sobriety” in a Transitional Housing Program. *Qualitative Sociology*, 25(1), 7–32.
- Dwyer, P. (2004). Creeping Conditionality in the UK: From Welfare Rights to Conditional Entitlements? *The Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 29(2), 265–287.
- Elias, N. (2000). *The Civilizing Process* (2nd Edition edition). Oxford ; Malden, Mass: Wiley-Blackwell.
- European Consensus Conference on Homelessness. (2010). *Policy Recommendations of the Jury*. Brussels: European Community Programme for Employment and Social Solidarity.
- Evans, A. (1999). Rationing device or passport to social housing? The operation of the homelessness legislation in Britain in the 1990s. In Susan Hutson & D. Clapham (Eds.), *Homelessness: Public Policies and Private Troubles* (pp. 133–154). London: Cassell.
- FEANTSA. (2011). *Housing-led policy approaches: social innovation to end homelessness in Europe*. Brussels: FEANTSA.
- FEANTSA. (2012). *On the Way Home? FEANTSA Monitoring Report on Homelessness and Homeless Policies in Europe*. Brussels: FEANTSA.
- Fitzpatrick, S. (1999). *Young homeless people*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Fitzpatrick, S. (2004). Homelessness Policy in Scotland. In S. Duncan (Ed.), *Housing and public policy in post-devolution Scotland* (pp. 183–198). Coventry: CIH.
- Fitzpatrick, S. (2009). Homelessness in the UK in an international context. In S. Fitzpatrick, D. Quilgars, & N. Pleace (Eds.), *Homelessness in the UK: Problems and solutions* (pp. 158–174). Coventry: CIH.
- Fitzpatrick, S., Bengtsson, B., & Watts, B. (2014). Rights to Housing: Reviewing the Terrain and Exploring a Way Forward. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 31(4), 447–463. Retrieved from
- Fitzpatrick, S., & Stephens, M. (2007). *An international review of homelessness and social housing policy*. London: Department for Communities and Local Government.

- Fitzpatrick, S., & Watts, B. (2010). 'The Right to Housing' for Homeless People. In E. O'Sullivan, V. Busch-Geertsema, D. Quilgars, & Nicholas Pleace (Eds.), *Homelessness Research in Europe* (p. 18). Brussels: FEANTSA.
- Fitzpatrick, S., & Watts, B. (2017). Competing visions: security of tenure and the welfarisation of English social housing. *Housing Studies*, 32(8), 1021–1038.
- Fopp, R. (2009). Metaphors in homelessness discourse and research: Exploring “pathways”, “careers” and “safety nets.” *Housing, Theory and Society*, 26(4), 271–291.
- Gennep, A. van. (1960). *The Rites of Passage*. Psychology Press.
- Goodlad, R. (2005). Scottish Homelessness Policy: advancing social justice? *Scottish Affairs*, 50(1), 86–105.
- Harding, J. (2004). *Making it work: The keys to success for young people living independently* by Jamie Harding. Policy Press.
- Homelessness etc. (Scotland) Act 2003 (2003).
- Homelessness Monitoring Group. (2004). *Helping homeless people: delivering the action plan for prevention and effective response*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.
- Homelessness Task Force. (2000). *Helping Homeless People: Legislative Proposals on Homelessness. Homelessness Task Force Initial Report*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.
- Homelessness Task Force. (2002). *Helping Homeless People: an action plan for prevention and effective responses. Homelessness Task Force Final Report*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.
- Houard, N. (2011). The French homelessness strategy: reforming temporary accommodation, and access to housing to deliver 'Housing First': continuum or clean break. *European Journal Of*.
- Houard, N., & Lévy-Vroelant, C. (2013). The (enforceable) right to housing: a paradoxical French passion. *International Journal of Housing Policy*, 13(2), 202–214.
- Housing (Scotland) Act 2001 (2001).
- Hutson, S. (1999). The experience of “homeless” accommodation and support. In S. Hutson & D. Clapham (Eds.), *Homelessness: public policies and private troubles* (pp. 208–225). London: Cassell.
- Johnsen, S., & Teixeira, L. (2010). *Staircases, elevators and cycles of change: 'Housing First' and other housing models for homeless people with complex support needs*. York: Crisis.
- Johnsen, S., & Teixeira, L. (2012). 'Doing it Already?': Stakeholder Perceptions of Housing First in the UK. *International Journal of Housing Policy*, 12(2), 183–203.
- Johnson, G. (2012). Housing First 'down under': Revolution, realignment or rhetoric? *European Journal of Homelessness*, 6(2).
- Kenna, P. (2005). Housing Rights—The New Benchmarks for Housing Policy in Europe? *The Urban Lawyer*, 37(1), 87–111.
- Kennedy, J., Forchuk, C., Arku, G., & Buzzelli, M. (2016). Service providers' perspectives and residents' experiences with the implementation of “Housing First” program in the city of London, Ontario, Canada. *Housing & Society*, 43(2), 82–102.

- Kresky-Wolff, M., Larson, M. J., O'Brien, R. W., & McGraw, S. A. (2010). Supportive housing approaches in the Collaborative Initiative to Help End Chronic Homelessness (CICH). *The Journal of Behavioral Health Services & Research*, 37(2), 213–225.
- Lahire, B. (2011). *The Plural Actor*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Lévy-Vroelant, C. (2014). Contradictory Narratives on French Social Housing: Looking Back and Looking Forward. *Housing Studies*, 29(4), 485–500.
- Lidstone, P. (1994). Rationing housing to the homeless applicant. *Housing Studies*, 9(4), 459–472.
- Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street Level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Service*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Löfstrand, C. H. (2012). On the Translation of the Pathways Housing First Model. *European Journal of Homelessness _ Volume*, 6(2).
- Loison, M. (2007). The Implementation of an Enforceable Right to Housing in France. *Part B*, 1, 13.
- Loison-Leruste, M., & Quilgars, D. (2009). Increasing access to housing: Implementing the right to housing in England and France. *European Journal of Homelessness _ Volume*.
- Lowe, D. S. (2004). *Housing Policy Analysis: British Housing in Culture and Comparative Context: British Housing in Cultural and Comparative Context*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mackie, P. K. (2012). Housing Pathways of Disabled Young People: Evidence for Policy and Practice. *Housing Studies*, 27(6), 805–821.
- Marom, N. (2014). Planning as a Principle of Vision and Division: A Bourdieusian View of Tel Aviv's Urban Development, 1920s—1950s. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 46(8), 1908–1926.
- Marx, K. (1975). *Karl Marx: Early Writings*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- O'Sullivan, E. (2008). Sustainable Solutions to Homelessness : The Irish Case. *Part B*, 2, 29.
- 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 & Medicine (1982)*, 64(9), 1925–1936.
- Pawson, H., & Davidson, E. (2008). Radically Divergent? Homelessness Policy and Practice in Post-devolution Scotland. *International Journal of Housing Policy*, 8(1), 39–60.
- Pawson, H., Donohoe, A., Munro, M., Wager, F., Netto, G., & Littlewood, M. (2006). *Investigating tenancy sustainment in Glasgow*. Glasgow: Glasgow Housing Association.
- Pearson, C., Montgomery, A. E., & Locke, G. (2009). Housing stability among homeless individuals with serious mental illness participating in housing first programs. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 37(3), 404–417.
- Pleace, N. (2011a). The ambiguities, limits and risks of Housing First from a European perspective. *European Journal of Homelessness*, 5(2), 113–127.
- Pleace, N. (2011b). The Ambiguities, Limits and Risks of Housing First from a European Perspective, 5(2), 15.
- Pleace, N. (2012). Housing First. *Brussels: European Observatory of Homelessness*.

- Powell, R., Dunning, R., Ferrari, E., & McKee, K. (2015). *Affordable Housing Need in Scotland* (p. 68). Edinburgh: Shelter/SFHA/CIH.
- Powell, R., & Flint, J. (2009). (In)formalization and the Civilizing Process: Applying the Work of Norbert Elias to Housing-Based Anti-Social Behaviour Interventions in the UK. *Housing, Theory and Society*, 26(3), 159–178.
- Ridgway, P., & Zipple, A. M. (1990). The paradigm shift in residential services: From the linear continuum to supported housing approaches. *Psychosocial Rehabilitation Journal*, 13(4), 11–31.
- Robinson, C. (2011). *Beside one's self: Homelessness felt and lived*. Syracuse University Press.
- Rosengard, A., Laing, I., Jackson, A. A., & Jones, N. (2002). *Routes out of homelessness*. Scotland, Homelessness Task Force.
- Sahlin, I. (1995). Strategies for exclusion from social housing. *Housing Studies*, 10(3), 381–401.
- Sahlin, I. (2005). The Staircase of Transition. *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*, 18(2), 115–136.
- Schwartz-Shea, P., & Yanow, D. (2012). *Interpretive Research Design: Concepts and Processes*. Routledge.
- Scott, S. (2004). Managing housing in the social rented sector. In D. Sim (Ed.), *Housing and public policy in post-devolution Scotland* (pp. 33–51). Coventry: CIH.
- Scottish Council for Single Homeless. (2007). *The cost of tenancy failure*. Edinburgh: SCSH.
- Scottish Executive. (2002). *Guidance on the Scottish secure and short Scottish secure tenancy provisions of the Housing (Scotland) Act 2001*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.
- Scottish Executive. (2005). *Code of Guidance on Homelessness*. Edinburgh: Scottish Executive.
- Scottish Government. (2012, November 21). Tackling Homelessness. *Scottish Government*. Retrieved from www.gov.scot/News/Releases/2012/11/tackling-homelessness21112012
- Shelter. (2008). *Housing First - a Good Practice Briefing*. London: Shelter. Retrieved from england.shelter.org.uk/professional_resources/policy_and_research/policy_library/policy_library_folder/housing_first_-_a_good_practice_briefing
- Shelter Scotland. (2017). *The use of temporary accommodation in Scotland*. Edinburgh: Shelter Scotland.
- Smith, N. J., & George, G. A. (1997). Introductory tenancies: A nuisance too far? *Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 19(3), 307–320.
- Social Research Association. (2003). *Ethical Guidelines*. Retrieved from the-sra.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/ethics03.pdf
- Stirling, T., & Smith, R. (2003). A Matter of Choice? Policy Divergence in Access to Social Housing Post-devolution. *Housing Studies*, 18(2), 145–158.
- Tars, E. S., & Egleson, C. (2009). Great Scot: The Scottish Plan to End Homelessness and Lessons for the Housing Rights Movement in the United States. *Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law & Policy*, 16, 187–216.
- The Homeless Persons (Provision of Non-permanent Accommodation) (Scotland) Regulations 2010 (2010).

- Third, H., Pawson, H., & Tate, J. (2001). *Sustaining Young Persons Tenancies in the Social Rented Sector: The South Clyde Experience*. Report to Scottish Homes (unpublished).
- Timmermans, S., & Tavory, I. (2012). Theory Construction in Qualitative Research: From Grounded Theory to Abductive Analysis. *Sociological Theory*, 30(3), 167–186.
- Tsai, J., Mares, A. S., & Rosenheck, R. A. (2010). A multi-site comparison of supported housing for chronically homeless adults: “Housing first” versus “residential treatment first.” *Psychological Services*, 7(4), 219–232.
- Tsemberis, S. (2012). Housing First: Basic Tenets of the Definition Across Cultures. *European Journal of Homelessness*, 6(2), 169–173.
- van Krieken, R. (1999). The barbarism of civilization: cultural genocide and the ‘stolen generations.’ *The British Journal of Sociology*, 50(2), 297–315.
- Vaughan, B. (2000). The Civilizing Process and the Janus-Face of Modern Punishment. *Theoretical Criminology*, 4(1), 71–91.
- Wacquant, L. (2002). Scrutinizing the Street: Poverty, Morality, and the Pitfalls of Urban Ethnography. *American Journal of Sociology*, 107(6), 1468–1532.
- Watts, B. (2013). Rights, needs and stigma: a comparison of homelessness policy in Scotland and Ireland. *European Journal of Homelessness _ Volume*, 7(1), 41–68.
- Watts, B. (2014). Homelessness, Empowerment and Self-reliance in Scotland and Ireland: The Impact of Legal Rights to Housing for Homeless People. *Journal of Social Policy*, 43(04), 793–810.
- Watts, B., & Fitzpatrick, S. (2018). *Welfare Conditionality* (1 edition). New York: Routledge.
- Wodak, R. (2004). Critical Discourse Analysis. In C. Sealey, G. Gobo, J. Gubrium, & D. Silverman (Eds.), *Qualitative Research Practice* (pp. 185–202). London: SAGE.