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Abstract

The Bermuda Triangle: Homeless Youth, Social Services, and Education

by Jennifer Hurley

Master's of Arts

Department of Sociology in Education, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto

1996-97

This study seeks to evaluate the provision of social services to Toronto's street youth population. Recently, Toronto has seen an alarming increase in its population of homeless youth, despite the presence of a variety of educational and social service programs that target youth homelessness. In looking to the causes of this discrepancy, where multiple services exist in the face of a swelling population, a review of the relevant literature on street youth, interviews with educators and social service workers, and an analysis of Ministerial Statutes is conducted with an eye to understanding systemic constraints upon "service." The outgrowth of this inquiry indicates that strong organizational territoriality exists between professionals and, implicitly, in the Ministerial statutes that coordinate "service." Territoriality, it is argued, effectively compromises the existence of a "system" by unwittingly creating a Bermuda Triangle effect, where homeless youth become the victims of partialized service and conflated agendas.
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**Introduction: The Landscape**

Particularly within the last five years, Torontonians have seen an alarming increase in the number of homeless youth that live on our city's streets. Estimates for the street youth population range drastically, claiming that anywhere between 5,000 to 20,000 homeless youth are currently without a home (Brannigan, A., Caputo, T.: 1993, p. 22). Recently, even the above estimates have become obsolete in the wake of this past year's provincial government cuts to such services as Welfare, YSAP, and Education and Social Services. Professionals who work directly with homeless youth contend that population numbers have risen distinctly:

> When the Welfare cut came in, we saw, within a month, we saw- a blip, go up, in the number of kids on the street and it steadily rose... Now I don't have accurate numbers, but it was something quite observable (William- Street Youth Worker)

> We've lost two thirds of the services that we have. That despite the fact that the demand has probably quadrupled in the last five years. So I think that says a lot. (Jessica- Street Youth Worker)

In fact, Toronto's street youth statistics now rival those of major American cities, this despite Toronto's comparatively smaller size and the continued presence of various services and professionals dedicated to servicing homeless youth.

These "services" largely consist of what would be construed as "social services," referring to those initiatives housed in Education and Community and Social Service programs, which include youth shelters, outreach centres, literacy programs, and alternative schools that cater to "youth-at-risk." In fact, the services available to the homeless youth population outweigh those allotted to homeless adults by roughly seven to one. It can be surmised, then, that the variety of services available
to street youth reflects a vested interest in the prevention of youth homelessness on the part of the Ministries of Education and Community and Social Services. Such systemic “interest” is also bolstered by the social service workers themselves, who have the reputation of being ardent advocates for their clients and students.

These professionals at times have markedly different occupational relationships to homeless youth, such as those of a lawyer or bail officer versus a doctor, teacher, or social worker. Of the professionals that have contact with homeless youth, the “social service” sector represented by education and social services very often offer a combination of primary (food, shelter, health) and secondary (counseling, employment, education) care programming. In this, such programs have been the site of the most holistic systemic attempt to make contact with homeless youth, where a multiplicity of services are offered in response to client demands.

Nevertheless, the landscape of the street has recently begun to “force” youth homelessness into the public eye. Within the past five years, the number of “panhandling” young adults has risen sharply along most of the major central mid-town streets (Yonge, Bloor, Queen, Church, Jarvis). Perhaps as an outgrowth of our youth-at-most-risk’s emphatic visual “reminder,” the “topic” of street youth is now being actively discussed throughout Metro. In the past year, Torontonians have been exposed to a number of noteworthy homeless youth “stories,” such as those growing out of the cuts to Children’s Mental Health and Social Services, discussions on the legal and social propriety of “squeegee kids,” graffiti tagging and “squatting” in abandoned buildings (Monsebraaten, L. in The Toronto Star, May 11, 1996), assessments of literacy “outreach” programs, and the like (Turner, J. in The Toronto Star, October 1994). In this, public and professional concerns about youth homelessness have actually merged, and this is most likely due to the fact that the "issue" has begun to press with urgency, begging the question of why the population is growing in a climate where a variety of “services” are available.
It is this question of the "system," though, that allows the multiplicity of related street youth services to emerge into plain view. Those occupations that work with homeless youth range from health care practitioners to lawyers, employment counselors, teachers, social workers, youth advocacy groups, bail officers, welfare workers, and counselors. Currently, there are no less than a dozen social work agencies dedicated to servicing homeless youth in the downtown core. In educational circles, alternative schools have comparatively functioned as the most frequent contact point between homeless young adults and the institution of education, where schools may even employ a street worker to outreach on the streets. In Toronto, one alternative school specifically caters to street involved youth, and at least 4 other schools and educational programs have a visible homeless student population. The popular consensus both within and without educational and community service circles is that these professionals have a reputation for possessing an intense dedication to their students/clients, of "working around the clock" (Tina) and doing anything and everything to "keep body and soul intact (Jessica)."

Occupational functions, though, even as they include the above goals, must also necessarily include fulfilling one's obligations in accordance to Ministry guidelines, policies, and agendas. It is as a result of having to maintain these two seemingly symbiotic tasks that gives rise to a disjuncture, or a veritable gap in service. Though the Ministries and workers promote inclusive philosophies of service towards their clients, where collaboration and client-driven models form the foundation for the organization's operation, there is little attempt to create an inclusive and collaborative system for servicing homeless youth. In other words, despite the fact that policy and professional opinion suggest that program is developed around "the best interests of the child," the larger social service sector is mired instead in an organizational territoriality, particularly in terms of its statutory infrastructure, which discourages meaningful connections between the professionals that serve homeless youth.
This presence of "organizational territoriality" in the social service sector refers to an employment based form of territoriality, where simultaneous inclusive and exclusive policies and practices are circumscribed by occupation, and are driven by jurisdictional, spatial, and normative claims. In this, territoriality as a concept involves both exclusive and inclusive dimensions, involving both a worker’s or system’s identification with (inclusivity) and homeless youth’s marginalization from (exclusivity) spatial, functional, and normative centres of service (organization).

The insidiousness of such occupational tensions is in the depth and reach of their effects upon homeless youth. In unwittingly promoting simultaneously inclusive and exclusive occupational functions and service “messages,” a homeless young person is exposed once again to a fragmented patchwork of unrelated professional “help” that is constantly reduced to parts. Social work and education represent but two of these systems, though "social service" may very well be the site of the most concerted service effort to date, and with the most profound impact upon homeless youth. One most dangerous aspect to maintaining dichotomous philosophies and practices, though, where young people are included but their service helpers are kept at an arm’s length, is that the paradox seems to have gone unnoticed. Of course, the system’s discourse, most notably Ministry statutes, while making mention of difficulties in cooperation and suggesting the advantages of collaboration, has not chosen to delve into this issue in any greater detail.

Ultimately, organizational territoriality becomes translated back onto the youth themselves, who suffer from "a lack of concerted effort" (Jessica- Service Worker) on the part of well-intentioned individuals and the systems that employ them. In this climate, service becomes inherently partial, and professionals must contend with often very conflicting tasks and views. The invisibility of this service gap helps to create a kind of Bermuda Triangle effect between Education, Social Services, and the homeless youth population. By Bermuda Triangle, it is meant that as a young person decides to
traverse between the street and education or social services, he or she may become "lost" to the obstructed view of conflated agendas. As hard as teachers and social agents work to attain basic human rights for their students/clients, the pot-holes and flash points of professional contact take the "territoriless" as a casualty. The Bermuda Triangle is an image that comes from the relationship between the three located points, which actually fences in education, social work and street youth with a mine field of a terrain for professional contact. As such, the Bermuda Triangle’s potency is its effect as a totality, and one of the greatest "casualties" of the Triangle is the fact that no one seems to see it nor its victims.

In order to explicate the Bermuda Triangle, it is first necessary to understand its workings in relation to the subject of territoriality. As a concept, territoriality has garnered a lot of attention by persons in numerous disciplines, thus the scope and defining reach of territoriality must necessarily be investigated through the corpus of literature that studies territorial properties and behaviours. As such, the first chapter on organizational territoriality will situate the Bermuda Triangle within the complex relationship between inclusive and exclusive territorial practices informed by space, utility, and norms. For the purposes of this study, territoriality is viewed as a complex interplay of such things as geography, design, economics, jurisdiction, functionality, personal and professional identities, and normative views and systems. The mediating factor for territoriality is of course power, which orders, includes (centralizes), and excludes (marginalizes) ideas, groups, individuals, and whole systems, sometimes simultaneously and occasionally even in opposition.

This talk of territoriality, particularly in stretching dichotomous and rigid notions of inclusivity and exclusivity, will then return to the Triangle at hand. The remaining chapters will focus on a complement of interview and discourse analysis. In speaking with professionals who work with street youth, and in reflecting on the panorama of research on homeless youth, my intentions are to look to voiced and written opinions on
youth homelessness and the "work" of occupational selves and others. These professionals should necessarily be considered allies and experts in the quest to advocate for improved services to homeless youth. In writing on professional viewpoints, I have divided the analysis into two parts, one being a chapter on Inclusive viewpoints and the other being the Exclusive dimensions of the territorially functioning Triangle.

At this point, the focus will then turn to the Metastructure, where the legal/political/utilitarian/philosophical tenants of the Ministries of Education and Community and Social Services will be analyzed, particularly with the view to understanding the larger systemic constraints upon collaboration, and how Ministerial functions and languages intersect with and possibly even influence professional opinions. As occupations, and most assuredly government occupations, have prescribed practical and philosophical dimensions in forming systemic and professional working "identities," explicating statutes represents an attempt to bring the silent and potent voice of governance and policy into the foreground.

Of course, it must be remembered that systemic organizational territoriality has its greatest effect on homeless youth. Placing the issue of territoriality up against a territoriless population exposes a horrifically blatant contradiction in terms. It is within the very languages that professionals and discourses speak that is perhaps the most potent cause for their frequent "misunderstandings." The concluding chapter will revisit the issue of organizational territoriality in terms of how systemic fragmentation and professional suspicions wititlingly or unwittingly help to keep young adults in a homeless state where their very lives are at risk. It is this point which cannot be emphasized enough, for as we continue to allow thousands of our children to fall through a faulty net that we choose not to repair, a most disenfranchised population swells, giving way to the occasional successes and random demises.
1. Organizational Territoriality

I see territoriality as a force shaping our lives in countless unexpected ways, threatening our existence only to the degree that we fail to understand it.

Robert Ardrey (1966)

Given the voluminous discourse that exists on territoriality, it would seem that interested academics have earnestly heeded Dr. Ardrey's words and lessened the so-called "threat" that territoriality exerts on our existence. In fact, it's fair to say that virtually every major discipline has studied the concept, function, and consequences of territoriality in both human and non-human populations. Research's fascination with "claiming space" stems from a basic premise that territoriality is a key word or tool of analysis, at times even being given the rank of a scientific or social fact of animate existence. This panorama of professions essentializes the study of order and disorder though interrogating concepts like the use of space, claim and entitlement, access to resources, defense and protection, inclusion and exclusion, normative and deviant orders, as well as identity politics and social positioning.

How territoriality expresses itself in and between organizations, then, is in part contingent upon integrating this expanse of research, particularly in terms of the degree to which territoriality is said to be infused in the very "nature" of human kind, be it learned or imprinted. Of course, "organization" is considered to be as much a part of human society as is this territorial complex that shapes the function, behaviour, location, ideology, and the very raison d'etre for "organizing." In turn, it would seem that the terms "territoriality" and "organization" are at once coterminous and oppositional, containing both sustaining and destructive properties. In better understanding the features and functions of territoriality, I hope to shed light on how organizations are
simultaneously bounded and enabled, and how territoriality effects an organization's ability to deliver its services.

DEFINITIONS OF TERRITORIALITY

The concept of territoriality is defined by three themes which integrate; 1) conceptual and spatial dimensions, 2) properties of claim and control, and finally, 3) assessments of territoriality's negative or positive value to (non)humans. Discussions of "territoriality" also tend to use a "family" of related terms like "region" and "boundary" that are at times even used interchangeably with "territory" within the literature. Each of these words maintain the integrity of territoriality's physical or conceptual use of space: "...it has a subjective as well as a geographic dimension, it can involve the defense of people as well as places" (Gillis: 1982, p. 4).

Many disciplines recognize the simultaneous influence of abstract and physical "space." In population studies, for instance, theoreticians caution that "if we are to grapple successfully with the myriad crises and tensions accompanying the developing rapid increase in human numbers, both physical and conceptual space need to be considered" (Esser: 1971, p. 330). Analogous examples can be cited in statistics, medical education, geography, astronomy and so forth.

Some commonalities of usage are endemic to the term, per se. Yet "territoriality" can be endowed with causal attributes whose conceptual claims extend well beyond spatial properties. A territory is generally conceived of as "an area of space," but theoreticians who particularly support notions of biological determinism also contend that "the word is also used to describe the inward compulsion in animate beings to possess and defend such a space. A territorial species of animals is one in which all males and sometimes females too, bear an inherent drive to gain and defend an exclusive property" (Ardrey: 1966, p. 3). As such, there is an ethereal and yet compelling dimension to territoriality, and for some authors this characteristic is
extremely abstract, exemplified in Goffman's belief that "a region may be defined as any place that is bounded to some degree by barriers to perception" (Goffman: 1959, p. 106). Bourdieu's notion of habitus links closely with these ruminations on the mechanisms that drive beings to be territorial, that though most definitions include the purely spatial, nonetheless, "the habitus is precisely this immanent law, ex insita, laid down in each agent by his earnest upbringing, which is the precondition not only for the coordination of practices but also the practices of coordination" (Bourdieu: 1977, p. 81). In this, definitions evoke both that which is instinctual and that which is learned, as well as abstract and physical territories.

Another thematic inclusion in most definitions of territoriality is relations of power and control over space. Sack speaks of the practice as "the attempt by an individual or group to affect influence or control people, phenomena, and relationships, by delimiting and asserting control over a geographic area" (Sack in Casimer and Row: 1992, p 2). Central to the practice of being territorial is thus this ability to both claim and control. Territoriality, as such, is separated from other conceptions of habitations in its "exercise of claim over territory, as opposed to merely its occupation" (Chisolm and Smith: 1990, p. 3).

It is probably the result of pairing the spatial-dimensional with the claim over space that has rendered territoriality a partisan concept to most researchers. At the outset, definitions like Goffman's separate out how territoriality functions in both moral and instrumental spheres:

When we examine the order that is maintained in a given region, however, we find that these two kinds of demands, moral and instrumental, seem to affect in much the same way the individual who must answer to them, and that both moral and instrumental grounds or rationalizations are put forth as justifications for most standards that must be maintained. (Goffman: 1959, p. 106)

It is in this moral realm, though, that academicians argue the benefits and deficits of claiming and maintaining "space." On the one hand, the passage from Ardrey cited
above function as a caution of sorts against demonizing territoriality's effects on animate beings. He contends that "territory evolved in many organisms as a kind of defense mechanism, as nature's most effective answer to a variety of problems of survival" (Ardrey: 1966, p. 7). However, it is precisely the "instinctual" or conversely, "compelling," desire to claim that creates "the central paradox: people come together in space to facilitate survival (or human betterment, even prosperity), yet may also be obliged to exclude" (Smith in Chisolm and Smith: 1990, p. 1). With claim, then, comes an overriding competitive drive, which is seen as both a mechanism of survival as well as a "distancing" and sometimes oppressive practice (Taylor: 1988, pp. 319-320).

Some authors even pinpoint this "propensity" in the very intersection between the concrete and abstract. Edmund Leach's example of his garden is a perfect illustration of the valuation of territoriality:

My garden abuts directly on that of my neighbour; the frontier of France abuts directly on that of Switzerland, and so on. But if the boundary is to be marked on the ground the marker itself will take up space. Neighbouring gardens tend to be separated by fences and ditches, national frontiers by strips of "no man's land." It is the nature of such markers of boundaries that they are ambiguous in implication and a source of conflict and anxiety. (Leach: 1976, pp. 33-34)

These three themes; the spatial-conceptual, the power to control or claim, and valued assessments of implications, are found in virtually every definition of territoriality. Authors also have a tendency to think of territoriality in terms of polar opposites; included vs. excluded, spatial vs. abstract, instinctual vs. learned, dominant vs. marginal, despite some who contend that "...as a variable it is probably polytomous rather than dichotomous" (Gillis: 1982, p. 4). The polarization within and between these definitions arises from two sources; that territoriality is conceptualized as a practice where tension is inherent, and that each discipline maintains its own beliefs about the true "nature" of this practice. Conflicting ideologies about territoriality can at times be quite profound, the irony here being that the disciplines studying the topic fall subject to their own need to claim specialized definitions. The fervor to define and recognize
territoriality's influence more than likely stems from the collective belief that territoriality is a basic function of animate existence, or as Ardrey postulates;

Territory, in the evolving world of animals, is a force perhaps older than sex (p. 5)...And it may come to us as the strangest of thoughts that the bond between a man and the soil he walks on should be more powerful than his bond with the woman he sleeps with. Even so, in a rough, preliminary way we may test the supposition with a single question: How many men have you known of, in your lifetime, who died for their country? And how many for a woman? (Ardrey: 1982, pp. 6-7)

In attempting to understand the ramifications of these various definitions as well as the complexity of territoriality's influence, it is thereby necessary to examine territoriality's place within the disciplines that explicate it.

THE SCIENTIFIC IMPERATIVE: TERRITORIALITY AND INSTINCT

Scientists particularly concerned with territoriality reside in zoology, biology, and physical anthropology. Each discipline shares the task of investigating survival, instinct, nature, access to resources, reproduction, and proprietary tendencies. Zoologists like Allee, Howard and Klopfer propose that territoriality is a natural instinct, a chromosomal imprint on the character of all animate beings (Allee: 1963, Howard: 1920, Klopfer: 1969). This imprint, once again, is a natural "answer to the problem of survival," and is thus a sustaining feature of any species.

Through studying the behaviour of animals, Ardrey and others have translated innate territoriality to the human population: "Ownership of land is scarcely a human invention, as our territorial propensity is something less than a human distinction" (Ardrey: 1966, p. 4). The central question in these studies can be captured by Ardrey's, "Do certain laws of territorial behaviour apply as rigorously in the affairs of men as in the affairs of chipmunks?" (ibid, p. 4). The reply from sociobiology has been that humans beings covet, cherish, and protect their borders because of instinct derived from their ancestral animal family. Ardrey titled this, the "Territorial Imperative" (ibid).
The uneasy partnership between humans and animals has been amply criticized by all manner of scientists, though zoology has probably been the most critical of linking animal with human behaviour. Klopfer, in his work *Habitats and Territories*, dismisses the validity of many sociobiological studies with, "Finally, a literature on the territorial behavior of *Homo Sapiens* has sprung into being, some of it, regrettably, is uncritical and sensational to an extreme" (Klopfer: 1969, p. 78). Still others reject the postulation wholesale: "Even today discussion over this interesting topic too often involves simplistic and fruitless appraisals about the so-called innate nature of territoriality among *Homo Sapiens*" (Casimer and Row: 1992, p. 1).

Social scientists in turn have vociferously attacked the determinism of such studies, saying that drawing such connections effectively essentializes human behavior as biologically driven: "The simple fact that a given species can behave territorially led to the generalized statement that it is a territorial one" (Casimer and Rao: 1992, p. 1). If such an "essentializing" line is drawn between human and non-human beings, critics say, social scientists will undoubtedly be led to interpret notions like hierarchy and normative order as being morally "proper" features of a functioning species (Casimer and Row: 1992, pp. 1-2). Social anthropologists in particular have refuted the idea that humans are instinctively territorial. Instead, anthropologists conceive of territoriality as a socially constructed concept that is acted out in real space, and is mediated by power's processes of inclusion and exclusion.

**THE CULTURAL IMPERATIVE: HUMAN ORGANIZATION AND TERRITORIALITY**

*Power*

Within most of the social scientific literature, territoriality is primarily spoken of as a relation of power (Casimer and Rao: 1992, Gillis, A.: 1982, Taylor, R.: 1988,
Chisolm and Smith: 1990). In this culturally constructed definition of territoriality, human beings can only stake as much claim to a space, person, or idea as they have power to legitimate entitlement. Territoriality thereby permeates the social, political, economic, and religious spheres of most societies. (I say most, because anthropology has also gone to great lengths to find non-territorial cultures, where "territoriality" is used in a negativistic sense combining violent human "tendencies" with the desire to appropriate. The Aboriginal Australians, for example, have been held up as an example of a culture who, while maintaining discreet "borders," do not defend them by violent means. Though the concept of ideological ownership is not refuted in these studies, cultures have nevertheless been bifurcated along lines of territorial-violent (Yanomamo): non-territorial-non-violent (Australian Aboriginal)). The ability to exert control over space influences much of the ethnographic interpretations of territoriality. This "powerful" dimension is typically examined in terms of dichotomized processes of inclusion-exclusion and protection-destruction.

processes of inclusion: to socialize and protect

In this realm, territoriality is seen as a tool for maintaining order. As such, being territorial also assumes inclusivity, because "Humankind establishes an identity with pieces of geographical space, and a sense of place, comparable with the deepest of emotional ties and feelings" (Chisolm and Smith: 1990: p. 2). Territoriality in this abstract sense is an organizing principle where socialization, integrating normative order, and identification with culture is mediated by "...in short, 'knowing one's place' and staying there" (Bourdieu: 1977: p. 82). Access to resources and proprietary abilities are therefore dictated by whether one is "included." Here, habitus is linked to territoriality's inclusive dimension, in so far as it is that tendency for humans to behave in accordance with societal (territorial) norms: "The habitus is the universalizing mediation which causes an individual agent's practices, without either explicit reason or signifying intent, to be none the less 'sensible' and 'reasonable'" (ibid, p. 79).
A person's attachment to home, family, nation, and culture is thus part of a process of identifying with conceptual or physical space, and the ability to legitimate such claims is contingent upon membership. Thus, the moral imperative of territoriality is the creation of an "us" that works in partnership to protect "our" normative order. The "included" are thus privileged, as they can monopolize both physical and conceptual space: "The foreign, the outsider, and conflict with neighbors are seen as potentially disturbing to well-being, and measures to counteract any potential negative influences are explicitly set in place and ritualized" (Pellow, Ed.: 1996, p. 213). Such subjective drawing of boundaries, though, even as they sustain order, create an excluded "them" who are without entitlement.

**processes of exclusion: to protect or destroy**

Ironically, it would seem that inasmuch as territoriality seeks to include, by definition someone must be excluded: "One of the apparent paradoxes of the nation-state is that, whereas it customarily bestows certain rights of citizenship equally among the population, its institutions also permit and indeed legitimate unequal treatment in other respects" (Chisolm and Smith: 1990, p. 7). In positions of power, individuals can exert control over access to territory: "Service personnel so commonly take for granted the right to keep the audience away from the back region that attention is drawn more to cases where this common strategy cannot be applied than to cases where it can" (Goffman: 1959, p. 115). In geographical terms, territoriality has been equated with "space-associated intolerance" (Eibesfelt in Gillis: 1970, p. 3), because "Geographical space must simultaneously be shared and divided" (Gottman in Chisolm and Smith: 1990, p. 1).

In an economic and political sense, the exclusion of individuals or groups implies a curtailment of power, where resources, institutions, discourses, and values are manipulated by the territorial "owners." In a more militaristic form of "protection," territorial processes of exclusion also function in a punitive capacity: "And these
concrete practices commonly boast a spatial dimension, as when society seeks to exclude their 'outsiders' from normal places of living and working" (Philo in Chisolm and Smith: 1990, p. 8). This exclusivity, then, sets the central apart from the delinquent: "That such practices are by no means confined to pre-industrial societies is illustrated by the treatment of those identified or labeled as 'deviants' today" (Chisolm and Smith: 1990, p. 8). Thus, territoriality involves a destructive element which seeks to annihilate/subjugate the competition through economic, military, political or social exclusion, while simultaneously protecting ownership of the "terrain:" "Territorial functioning, and these other parameters, have impacts on disorder in part because of their influences on offender- or delinquent-based processes" (Taylor: 1988, p. 258).

**GEOGRAPHY AND ARCHITECTURE: THE SPATIAL IMPERATIVE AND THE IMPACT OF DESIGN**

Spatial influences on territoriality capture the attention of urban planners, geographers, and architects. The building of boundaries, and the design of those boundaries is said to affect human conceptions of spatial propriety and convention:

For example, earth in the flower or vegetable garden is considered natural, whereas if it is brought inside the house on shoe heels, it is considered unnatural and classified as filth. This example shows that social classifications are one means of constructing the world, of attributing meaning to space, objects, and time and of deducing the meaning of them. (Pellow in Pellow, Ed.: 1996, p. 9)

This "built environment" is thus not only a product of territoriality but aids in its reproduction as well: "Moreover, some studies illustrate that the built environment is not merely a product or artifact but a resource with varying degrees of accessibility for different groups of people, thus expressing social relationships, including asymmetries of power" (Lawrence in Pellow, Ed.: 1996, p. 14). Boundaries themselves can thus exert control (Rodman and Cooper in Pellow, Ed.: 1996, p. 96).

This is exemplified in the world of urban planning and architecture, where discussions of design include that of the desired behavior that an edifice or complex
should produce. The building of a factory, then, should take into account the work that is to be done, the product being produced, and the people who will be moving through that space. At times, "design" even professes to maintain the inner well-being of individuals, such as by constructing a house with the proper "spiritual" space, as "Buddhist" homeowners in Vancouver have done.

Exemplified by works like *Community and Privacy* (1963), territoriality discussions were initially "considered explicitly by and for architects and planners" (Lawrence in Pellow, Ed.: 1996, p. 11). Anthropologists, however, began to take interest in the cultural ramifications of construction and design, and so have termed this inquiry "proxemic studies" (ibid, Preface). In combining planners and architects with anthropologists and sociologists, a territoriality mediated by culture and space is forged once again: "First, it is the right to be present in a place. Other dimensions are rights of use and action, appropriation, modification, and disposition. In Western societies, all generally are associated with ownership" (Lynch quoted in Pellow, Ed.: 1996, p. 93). The power that space exerts over humans has thus becomes appropriate "territory" for anthropological investigation as well: "It is the ambiguity of these spaces— their simultaneous acceptance and rejection of the nature of the domains they join and the difficulty of reading them—that gives them their symbolic and emotive power" (Rodman and Cooper in Pellow, Ed.: 1996, p. 92).

**THE ECONOMIC IMPERATIVE: TERRITORY AND PRODUCTION**

In the economic sphere, territoriality serves a much more utilitarian purpose. Here, "territory" is both a physical and economic space that is *used* and has a *functional* value. *Habitus*, by contrast, actually serves to "prevent the economy from being grasped as an economy, i.e. as a system governed by the laws of interested calculation, competition, or exploitation" (Bourdieu: 1977, p. 172). To economists, though,
Territoriality is both an attribute of economics and a system of economic processes, which seems to discourage valued assessments about "claiming space:"

Territorial analysis is intrinsically such a case where, as we move from the dynamics of the mode of production down to the specifics of community and place (and back again) it is necessary to invoke a complex series of intermediate variables, dealing with such issues as industrial organization, the division of labour, technology, labor market processes, international capital flows, and all the rest. (Stott and Storper: 1986, 1)

Here, territoriality is believed to be infused in each major variable that maintains economic order. Access to the control and the means of production, though, accords privilege, a "competing order of settings" which can have dire consequences for the losers (Taylor: 1988, p. 319). Still, relations and processes of production are conceived of as being "innately" territorial, though value tends to be assessed in purely economic terms.

Within this realm, a person's occupation is also partially formed by drawing and erasing boundaries around domains of responsibility and entitlement. Normative values are attributed to occupations by both members and non-members, which is partially why "criminal" means something different than "stock broker." However, as with each discipline's investigation into claiming space, we find that there are multiple sources of occupational "claim" which will now be integrated into themes of territorial space and design, utilitarian modes of claim, and normative/cultural influences.

ORGANIZATIONS AND TERRITORIALITY

In its widest sense "organization," "applies correctly to stable associations of persons engaged in concerted activities directed to the attainment of specific objectives. It is thought to be a decisive characteristic of such organizations that they are deliberately instituted relative to these objectives" (Bittner in Turner: 1974, p. 69). As such, organizations are artificially constructed to meet certain ends, though "organizing" is thought to be a compelling feature of all human societies:
From this viewpoint, society is composed of people in orderly arrangements of relationships; that is, society, the social order, and social groups have structural or formal arrangements and also sets of associated institutionalized relationships or modes of interaction. (in Gamst and Norbeck Eds.: 1976)

Here, human beings are thought to maintain both "formal" and "informal" organizations, where the informal tend to be seen as spontaneously arising, and the formal must have a certain "intention" or "direction" that creates patterned sets of relationships (Bittner in Turner: 1974, p. 70). In turn, "formal" relations and processes should yield "a particularly high degree of calculability of results" precisely because they are organized around certain ends. Bittner criticizes the "insufficiency" of such categorizations, though, because "the sociologist finds himself in the position of having borrowed a concept from those he seeks to study in order to describe what he observes about them" (ibid, p. 70).

In thinking of territoriality and the gamut of organizations that society produces, Bittner's arguments become quite convincing. The ways in which territoriality is expressed in organizations, for example, will have much to do with level of "formality" being investigated (say, whole organizations in competition versus two people competing for a promotion) and the type of organization being studied. (A non-profit group like the ALS Society, for example, has very different entry point than does a Multinational corporation). Thus, territoriality is as much an influence on organization's "claim to space" as is the kind and power base of the "business" being considered.

**SPACE AND DESIGN**

Organizations imply either a physical or conceptual grouping around a certain physical or conceptual space. However, the ability for an organization to decentralize its operations will in part be dependent upon the nature of the work being done. With that said, "modern bureaucracies" nevertheless typically occupy and organize themselves
around physical spaces (Weber in Worsley Ed: 1970, p. 265). In territorial terms, organizations stake claims to both their physical location as well as to their concrete and abstract "territories." In urban settings, for example, political and economic sites of power tend be situated in centralized areas. In the case of downtown Toronto, business and political sectors have been entrenched in specific locales for generations. It is the very nature of dominance to leave a lasting impression on the landscape, as is evidenced globally by pre-historic and historic cultures' monolithic structures. In a territorially successful organization, then, its edifice should resonate with the institution's function even after it is no longer being used in that capacity:

The decorations and permanent fixtures in a place where a particular performance is usually given, as well as the performers and performance usually found there, tend to fix a kind of spell over it; even when the customary performance is not being given in it, the place tends to retain some of its front region character. (Goffman: 1959, p. 124).

The design of an organization is also a mark of its territorial and economic success. The Sears Tower in Chicago, for example, is both centrally located and designed to reinforce Sears' success in the eyes of the public. Notwithstanding the functionality of design, though, the "look" of an organization does not fully define the work being done, nor the employees who work within: "Arguing along the lines of structural-functional analysis, [Selznick] showed convincingly why 'formal administrative design can never adequately or fully reflect the concrete organization to which it is referencing" (in Bittner: 1965, p. 69). In this, designing an organizational space at times serves purposes that are not expressly linked to the work being done. Advertising one's success by building a black monolith that happens to be the tallest office building in America is one example of the territorial function of design. Creating an entire floor of offices for the executives is in turn a way of establishing and underlining hierarchical boundaries within organizations.
Organizational territoriality, though, implies that a dominant organization will partially distinguish itself from marginal counterparts through the advertisement of its location and design. Marginal organizations, by contrast, occupy terrains that are circumscribed by the existence of the dominant, and thus lack a sense of permanency or centrality. The life of a textile sweatshop, for example, may be punctuated by a series of relocations to different sub-standard buildings. Marginal organizations and businesses not coincidentally tend to be located on terrains that reinforce their marginality. The impact of time thus serves to entrench dominance and render the marginal "impermanent."

However, it must be recalled that an organization’s ideological territory, the "business," or clients can also exert influence over location, which can at times represent conflicting territorialities. Though in economic terms the business of living in Buckingham Palace may consume excessive capital (economic territoriality), a "monarch," in accordance with her position, should live there (normative territoriality). At times, multiple "spatial" claims, can also have an additive effect, where the location’s advertisement of a successful business aids in the reproduction of its success. Holistic assessments of spatial territoriality should thus also explicate the intersecting "spaces" being considered, be they normative, temporal, or geographical.

FUNCTIONAL TERRITORIALITY: CLAIM AND ENTITLEMENT

Some economists would argue that modern bureaucracies are organized around territorial principles that are embedded in "economy." For the employee, "jurisdiction" plays a powerful role: "jurisdictions are larger than personal spaces and more fleeting than territories. Jurisdictions are areas to which individuals can lay claim because of their job requirements" (Taylor: 1988, p. 99). In cultural terms, Taylor proposes that "jurisdictions and territories assist in working towards the same goal: increasing the legibility or clarity of social settings." The economics of jurisdictions, though, state that
they are claims of entitlement, meaning that someone will be restricted from accessing resources and their means of production.

The relations of jurisdiction, however, are quite complex, signaling polytomous territorial influences. For example, a Mary Kay cosmetics saleswoman may compete with an Avon lady for a woman's business, inasmuch as two Mary Kay saleswomen will not be placed in the same neighbourhood. In this instance, maintaining "jurisdictions" does provide a kind of social "clarity," following the rule that Mary Kay employees do not compete, but Avon and Mary Kay does. The interplay between "clarification" and restriction is threaded into and between organizations, creating occupational positionality where even though the customer does not have access to the resources or means of production, the Mary Kay saleswoman is equally unable to exert power over Mary Kay's, or access Avon's. This saleswoman's power is thus relational and somewhat more impermanent because "the claim is job dependent" (Taylor: 1988, p. 100): "They are personally free and subject to authority only with respect to their impersonal official obligations" (Weber in Worsley, Ed.: 1970, p. 265).

In structural-functional economics, though, organizations are likened to "organisms," which means that employees, while simultaneously experiencing processes of restrictions and access, nevertheless contribute to the overarching "health" of the whole: "Each link is intrinsically a member of a chain or fabric of links which conducts a reproducible theme" (Bittner: 1975, p. 78). Intra-territoriality, here, is not detrimental to the organization, though professional "claiming" can undermine an organization's productivity. Territoriality in the economic sphere, it must be remembered, is both a product and producer of economy. In order to be "successful" economically, organizations are compelled to compete over conceptual and spatial terrains. As organizations are created to meet certain "ends," the economic influence on territoriality is strong.
Structural-functional notions of organization, though, fail to capture organizational flexibility. Time, for example, has a great impact on both the economic process and territoriality. An organization's domain of entitlement may change drastically either horizontally, vertically, or in both directions, as economies shift. (This "historical imperative" also influences normative territoriality, that where formerly prohibited alcohol becomes an acceptable "market," the seeming "staple" of cigarettes is now increasingly a social taboo, and which in the future may discourage their production.)

NORMATIVE/CULTURAL INFLUENCES

Of course, "culture" is itself a term that implies territoriality, as part of "culture's" definition claims "legitimate" and legitimized (normative) social distinctions between groups of people, and thus, the creation of in-out, member-non-member, culture-sub(counter)Culture dichotomies. Some of these legitimizing features are linguistic, spiritual, political, economic, and social. It is this powerful force of legitimacy that helps to drive inclusive and exclusive territorial behaviour. In this understanding of culture, organizations are producers as well as being part of the structural order (product) of culture. The claiming of cultural space, then, is also a producer of territoriality, which is already part of the normative order. Organizations thus attempt to be successful by "playing the game," where the "rules" are normative, economic, and spatial. These same "rules" also mediate one another, like in the case of shifting opinions on smoking, and thus influence an organization's direction within a direction. Being able to control the rules, though, is a characteristic of the territorially dominant or "legitimate," and territoriality seeks both to include and to exclude.

There are thus multiple levels of "culture's" influence on an organization's claim of space. Some of the inclusive normative influences on humans include socialization and identification. In many cultures, acquiring a "job" is considered to be a rite of passage into the adult world. Identification with an organization will also, then, be a
claim of legitimacy. "Becoming" a teacher, for example, means being a member of the society of teachers, as well as that of his/her particular school. This membership accords privilege to the employee, but it also simultaneously bounds them by sets of professional relationships. This occupation in turn is viewed by society in normative terms that include social status, class, and value. Organizations maintain distinctive "identities," and at times a "characteristic" philosophy or production is advertised as a "selling" feature, as in the case of private schools.

The clients of organizations are also "included" because they are the means to a goal, or in the case of students, are also the product. As with the case of Mary Kay, though, the "client" will not be included to the degree that he or she controls the resources and means of production. As hierarchical processes of socialization and identification occur for all the people involved in or with an organization, the organization itself is "socialized," reflecting microcosmic and macrocosmic dimensions of "inclusivity." However, organizations may also be compelled to advertise the pretense of inclusivity as well:

However, the assertion of pluralism can be used to mask cleavage and conflict serving an ideological role in conveying a false sense of harmony and implying that particular institutional arrangements somehow resolve conflict satisfactorily. (Chisolm and Smith: 1990, p. 10)

This illustrates the degree of an organization's desire for normative "harmony."

Fulfilling linked roles "for the good of the company" though, also draws boundaries. The exclusive aspect to organizational territoriality must thus include both "functioning" boundaries as well as inter- and intra-competition over space. A physician, for example, maintains professional boundaries between him/herself and a nurse. Creating such artificial boundaries forms part of what allows both of them to do their jobs efficiently. In hierarchical terms, though, the physician is accorded greater centrality, which thus precludes the nurse, his/her patients, other doctors, and the general public from claiming his/her terrain. The power to exclude or exile, if we recall,
can function in a punitive capacity. In according privilege, normative territoriality can also be destructive, as when multi-national corporations are encouraged to "swallow" their competitors.

There are also less "direct" forms of organizational exclusivity. Being able to be a client or work for an organization (access) might, for example, be based on very basic requirements of proper dress and literacy. That class may preclude certain individuals from getting an education or being able to by proper clothes, though, means that some people will be denied access to eating in a restaurant, or interviewing for a job. An organization's creation of self-other dichotomies means that each has constructive and destructive properties. In this, the marginalized can be simultaneously included and excluded by the dominant. Workers in a sweatshop are thus exploited by their supervisors, just as they are included as being "employees." Thus are the intersecting fields of exclusivity.

Normative territoriality is a socially constructed principle that valuates and orders society. Individuals and organizational relationships are thus involved in a complex series of relative positionalities that are culturally "normal" or central, or "deviant" and marginal, and which can be seen to serve either constructive or destructive ends.

CONCLUSION

Organizational territoriality represents a complex series of relational, geographical, functional, and cultural influences. Economics is a powerful motivating factor for becoming an "organization," as it also influences an individual's need to be occupied in a particular capacity. That occupation, in turn, has deep seated normative cultural values to workers, employers, and society at large. Organizations themselves are part of the "normal" order of a functioning society, which also maintains organizational hierarchies, and which is partially entrenched in the buildings that they
occupy, their operational relations, and the normative order that encourages such "organizing."

However, "territoriality," like "organization" implies both a coming together as well as competition. When territorialities intersect, they can have additive or negative consequences for either the organization, its employees, or its customers: When Sony chose to monopolize the VCR market in the early 1980's, for example, it failed to recognize the innovative possibility of VHS, which ended up making Sony's Beta an obsolete product. Such intersections support the notion that territoriality is in fact a "polytomous" concept, which takes into account the culture that produces an organization, the spaces that they occupy, their economic and political agendas, as well the social "value" that they serve.

Territoriality also includes asymmetrical power relations that include and exclude, socialize or marginalize, as well as "support" or "destroy." Thus, the social "value" of an organization tends to reflect dominant norms, silencing the voices of the marginal both implicitly and explicitly. This "silencing" can mean restricting a person's access to the organization, successfully "claiming" another organization's "terrain," or even keeping workers in a state of "boundedness," where prescribed occupational limits constrain both social identity and position. Organizational territoriality, then, combines both "functional" and "destructive" aims within and between all of the individuals involved with a certain "company." Thus, intersecting and refracting territorialities constantly shift the enabling and disabling factors of an organization. Investigating organizational territoriality should necessarily explicate the normative value of "organization" while attempting to take into account the patchwork of influences within and between an organization that creates, maintains or circumscribes the ability for it to deliver its service.
2. Background and Methods

THE LITERATURE

There are many studies that exist on street youth, which cross disciplinary boundaries of Sociology, Anthropology, Psychology, Health Care, Social Work, Law, Politics, and Education. Because the "topic" is seen to be fertile ground for research, libraries contain a range of studies that reflect the character of their disciplines of origin. Anthropologists, for example, typically write ethnographies and narratives of street life (Kariel: 1993, Stavsky: 1990, Switzer: 1992, Webber: 1991), psychologists normally focus on family antecedents for youth homelessness and assessments of counseling and programs through case study formats (Garbarino: 1986, Nilson: 1981, Miller et all: 1990), change research in education broadly addresses problems of dropping out and feelings of student alienation (Human Resources and Labour Canada: 1993, Karp: 1988, Radwanski: 1987, Toronto Board of Education: 1991). In this, there are thus a variety of disciplines, methods, and methodologies represented in the literature.

More recent writings on street youth contain some common thematic threads. Many authors have now dispensed with using the word "deviance" when talking about homeless youth, which is more than likely the result of shifting public perceptions towards homeless. Virtually every discipline has undergone an ethical and moral shift in this regard, though homeless youth often turn to such things as illegal means of survival that have in the past been viewed by the public as being particularly immoral, like prostitution or drug dealing. Historically, psychological, sociological, and governmental studies of homeless young adults used the label of "deviancy" to blame young adults for their predicament (Cohen: 1980, Social Psychology Quarterly, 1981;44, American Journal of Sociology, 1992;98(6)), and the law adjudicated them as "delinquents" until the adoption of the Young Offenders Act dispensed with the term altogether. The philosophical about-face of recent writings has infused discussions of community,
education, and culture with the importance of including advocacy studies of homeless young adults in the corpus. Many of these recent projects have also included the words and views of young people, who are thereby accorded the status of an expert resource.

As a totality, the existing research on homeless youth provides extremely useful information about street life, about the people that try to help young adults, and about the families that they come from. One glaring absence in the literature, though, has its source in the fact that many discourses deal with this "topic." As was mentioned, anthropologists write ethnographies, psychologists write antecedent case studies, education speaks of general reform, and governmental statistical papers tend to omit homeless people altogether (Human Resources and Labour Canada: 1993). What is greatly lacking, though, is any articulation between disciplines to problematize the "issue" of street youth comprehensively, nor does the literature tend to supply practical aids towards finding solutions for youth homelessness.

Ethnographies, which embrace the voices of young adults and which tend to take a holistic look at street life, work on the principal of a participant observation that generally does not involve itself in proactive work. Psychological case studies focus on what contributes to becoming homeless more so than they do on what life is like on the street. Social Work studies look to practical dealings with clients, but tend to lack the global view of ethnography. Educators speak about the problem of dropouts, but don't include mention of street youth in their studies, (Karp: 1988, p. 183, Human Resources and Labour Canada: 1993, p. 2), though mention is made of homeless youth in board sponsored studies of student alienation (Toronto Board of Education: 1991, pp. 1, 41, 45). Government statistics, including those dealing with housing and education, ignore homeless youth in particular.¹ Though citations are made of "other" disciplinary findings,

¹ When Census Canada chose to "locate" the homeless population, Census-taking took place at only one adult Community Mission, and thus, the wide array of children and youth social services were not included in the census.
discourses are nonetheless mutually exclusive to the extent that such "outside" information is rendered merely additive.

Studies on street youth therefore shy away from crossing disciplinary borders to take a comprehensive look at what might be yielded from their melding. This disciplinary protectionism gives studies of street youth an overall tone of resignation, an impression that very little can be achieved in practical terms, that researchers can report on what "life" is like and what brought young adults to the street, that talk can be made about better ways of counseling clients, but that comprehensive and practical solutions are not part of the agenda. The lack of coordination on the part of disciplinary discourses is a profound reflection of what often happens on the ground, where ministries work in isolation instead of in concert.

At a real-life, occupational level, quite comparatively, it has also been said that the street youth service sector expresses divided strengths. Researchers very often footnote or make side-line comments on the lack of relationship that appears to exist within the "social service" community (Brannigan: 1993, p. 49, Yeates et al: 1991, p. 556, Smart: 1991, p. 525, Finkelstein: 1991, p. 21). Though individual to individual workers may find allies of "understanding" as it were, the system as a whole, it is said, does not collaborate well. Once again, comments like differing agendas and professional animosity have been cited as being one of the mitigating factors to effectively servicing homeless youth. What the literature does not do, however, is face its own accusations head-on, in extensively assessing this system's ability to effectively and concertedly attack the homelessness problem. That the youth homelessness discourse itself tends to be fragmented and isolated is testament to a systemic problem so broad that it attacks even the discourse itself.
METHODS

As the issue of organizational territoriality fundamentally becomes acted out both in adopted philosophies and practiced behaviours, and as the literature itself has acknowledged but not yet delved into the "heart" of professional relationships either between individuals or systems, it seemed especially important for me to speak with the front-line professionals who work with homeless youth. Given that there are no "mainstream" schools that implicitly or explicitly cater to homeless youth, I decided to concentrate on the alternative panel, where I spoke with representatives from two of Toronto's ten alternative schools, as well as the Alternative Education Coordinator for the Toronto Board of Education. Of the variety of social services that cater to homeless youth, I opted for agencies that offer a combination of primary and secondary care services. As I was in part intending to assess the "relationship" between educators and social services workers, I chose those services with a greater likelihood of professional contact. In total, then, I conducted 9 interviews over a span of 8 months.

The choice and "intention" of the interview format was of particular concern to me. At the outset, it seemed especially important to recognize the limits of conducting one-time-only interviews (as opposed to say, ethnographic inquiry) prior to entering into interview research. Interviews tend to be conducted within discreet time-frames, and the one-time-only interview represents the extreme on this continuum. Of course, investigating professional "opinion" through interviews also carries with it the danger of translating the words and views of a number of professionals to the whole of educators and social workers. Interviews, in turn, while being able to elicit opinion, cannot however measure the behaviour of individuals, as the interview does not allow for participant observation style research. In part, then, augmenting interview research with the literature on homeless youth marked an attempt to find a wider mention of the existence
of either territoriality or professional relationship breakdown in the social services, so as to avoid essentializing the opinions expressed by my participants in the interviews.

The opinions of individuals can in turn be constrained by such things as selecting participants (voices), the personalities and biases of both the participants and myself, and even the conditions under which the interviews are conducted (Silverman: 1993, pp. 90-114b). Moreover, as these interviews were being conducted at a time of great professional upheaval (Fall of 1995- late Spring 1996) where provincial cuts to the social services were imminent (and by the spring, had been enacted) I also became acutely aware of the potency of “opinion” vis a vis the person and his/her professional climate. The use of interview and discourse analysis, then, represents an attempt on my part to balance the deficiencies of each style of research through combining their strengths. Where discourse analysis could provide me with information about professional organization and practices over a wide spectrum of locales, as well as with the perspectives and interests of a wide variety of disciplinarians, interviews, in providing a local and personal forum, would allow me to gain insight into personal and professional viewpoints on professional relationships that tend not to be explicated in detail within the literature.

As I wished to elicit a panorama of professional opinions, interviews seemed to be an appropriate forum for collecting opinions about professional practices. Nevertheless, as has been noted above, the brevity and artificiality imposed by the confines of interview research prompted me to design an interview with an open discursive atmosphere, where I could ask general questions about work environment, client needs, and professional collaboration, though I also wanted my participants to feel comfortable enough to guide me to topics that they felt were of special import. Thus, I adopted a set of core questions with room for flexibility, with the aim of at least partially circumventing interview subject and time constraints by allowing my participants to
shape the character of the interview. The actual length of the interviews ranged from forty minutes to an hour and a half maximum.

Particularly because I was investigating contentious issues like professional relationship and breakdown, I wanted to approach the interviews from an acknowledged standpoint of having been offered the privilege of speaking with competent experts in the field, who were generously giving their time to educate me to the issue of youth homelessness out of a genuine concern for their clients and students. As it has most often been front-line professionals who have been "blamed" for youth homelessness, (though the youth themselves infinitely more so), I felt that such a naive and limiting entry point would wittingly or unwittingly ignore the system that produces, prescribes, and constrains an occupation's character and function. As such, I view the professionals as being integral experts on potential solutions.

Interviews were conducted at the work site of each professional. In order to maintain an interactive environment between myself and my participants, and to ensure accurate quotations, I tape recorded each interview. Prior to meeting with each professional, I informed them of my wish to tape record our conversations. With their approval then, I taped all 10 conversations. Prior to tape recording, I also administered an Informed Consent form assuring each participant of the complete confidentiality of our interviews, which included any mention of a named agency affiliation. This step was taken in order to encourage my participants to speak as candidly as they wished. The Informed Consent form also advised each person that a copy tape of their interview would be forwarded to them if they so desired, and that if at any time they wished to cease participating in this study, I would destroy all evidence of the interview, either in tape or print. Once the interview was completed, I also asked each person if they would be willing to answer further questions should the need arise, and then requested any literature or reports that their service published.
One extremely important methodological choice for the research was whether or not to include interviews with homeless youth. In terms of ethical issues, I questioned the efficacy of "using" interviews with young people when the research actually focused on the personal and systemic dimensions of organizational territoriality. As the questions that I would be posing would be professional in nature, it seemed that the greater fodder for information would be found in focusing on educators and social workers instead of the individuals who access the system. In turn, as I personally maintain a fundamental belief that homeless youth must receive stable, long-term contact with professional services when they choose to seek them out, in this case I felt that the time constraints presented by interview research would represent yet another brush with an impermanent interested party, and which could be detrimental. Possible future research that would be pursued in this area would thus necessarily take into account a holistic concept of young people participating in "research" that seeks to improve the system, in including youth as advocates.

The overall plan of the research was to simultaneously learn from expertise and yet also interrogate the system and its discourse. In looking to textual research, I examined a wide array of studies on homeless youth that would represent the different professions that have "studied" the "problem." In turn, it also became necessary to review the literature on territoriality in order to explicate a conceptual definition and develop a workable analytic framework for analyzing "The Bermuda Triangle." Finally, as the focus ultimately narrowed to the institutions of Education and Community and Social Services, I wanted to familiarize myself with their research on homeless or "at-risk" youth. This eventually drew me to analyze the tenants of each Ministry, as it is a combination of "theory" and "practice" that brings an organization into being, just as it also creates policies on educating at-risk youth. In the end, the most important search was to find reports from city-wide working collaborative programs. In critique also lies
the potentiality for seeing "solutions," and I felt it was my responsibility to offer a possible alternative when deconstruction would only expose systemic frailties.

The most important concern of mine in undertaking this research was to enter each investigative process with one primary objective, that being to search for potential solutions to the epidemic of homeless youth. As principle learner, I wished to advocate as an informed student of youth homelessness. As a city like Amsterdam offers government sponsored apartment housing to young people on the street, and Los Angeles and Seattle adopt collaborative service visions, I was aware that multi-level systemic net-building existed. In this, understanding my positionality as "learner-advocate" seemed absolutely integral to the project, especially in order to find my "place" along this continuum of "interested parties."

With an eye to directions for further inquiry, there seems to be two main roads that could be taken towards broadening the scope of understanding around the prevention of youth homelessness. With an expansion on the breadth of research and fieldwork time-lines, a multi-pronged data gathering strategy could be implemented (one example being adding a survey) to create a more holistic knowledge base on street youth and territoriality, particularly through undertaking a more long-term, expanded fieldwork project in the Toronto area. As such, further research at the grass-roots level would necessarily increase the number of interviews with social service workers to garner a wider range of professional opinion. As the brevity of interviewing has been a constraining factor for this research, an ethnographic study of a working collaborative program could complement the brevity of survey or interview research with a more organistic understanding of the relationships between young people and social service workers within an organization. Choosing to focus on a "working" program would attach a positive agenda to this fieldwork initiative, as being able to spend time in a collaborating system would allow for deeper education on what concrete and successful strategies for cooperation have been already been implemented in the Toronto area.
Another direction that might be taken is to move the focus from the grass-roots to the level of policy-making, shifting to perhaps a more proactive agenda which would seek municipal, provincial, and federal legislature with collaborative intentions that have in fact become entrenched in everyday working social fabric, with the aim of best understanding what type of legislature would be the most successful in looking towards structural change. In turn, interviews could be conducted with government officials who work with legislature to garner their opinions on the potential for working collaboration between Ministries, which could also elicit their opinions on the ingredients of “working” collaborative legislature. Once again, more extensive research around the interplay between policy and practice could shed further light on the systemic networking that needs to be done. Of course, there would no more important voice than that of homeless youth in this “network” of people. Future research, once again would thus be designed around the premise of advocating for and with street youth.

**INTERVIEWS: BACKGROUND**

Given that confidentiality was at a premium, each person that I interviewed has been given a pseudonym. The general breakdown of the professionals are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>AGE RANGE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>SOCIAL SERVICE</th>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>FEATURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sara</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>street worker</td>
<td>Outreach Agency</td>
<td>Mid-town</td>
<td>street outreach, legal, medical, welfare, employment*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>liaison worker</td>
<td>Youth Services</td>
<td>Mid-town</td>
<td>agency liaison, outreach, lobbying, employ. and ed. counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raza</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>teacher, coordinator</td>
<td>Alternative School for Toronto Bd. of Ed.</td>
<td>Southern Toronto</td>
<td>Grades 10, 11, 13 street outreach, nutrition program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tina</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>street worker</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geraldine</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>40-45</td>
<td>Alternative Education Coordinator</td>
<td>Toronto Board of Education</td>
<td>Mid-town</td>
<td>coordinates alt. ed. schools, funding, curriculum, student liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>street worker</td>
<td>Outreach Agency</td>
<td>Mid-town</td>
<td>street outreach, medical, legal, employment * resource centre, advocacy, volunteer program, events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlos</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>street worker, counselor</td>
<td>Alternative School, Toronto Bd. of Ed.</td>
<td>Mid-town</td>
<td>Alternative School, Toronto Bd. of Ed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>30-35</td>
<td>Youth Outreach Coordinator</td>
<td>First Nations Social Services</td>
<td>Mid-town</td>
<td>Youth Outreach Coordinator, First Nations Social Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

* Ambassador Program Participant
3. Inclusive Perspectives: The Work That We Do

Territoriality's very definition demands the creation of an "us." In organizations, this identification is represented in locale and design, in the value ascribed to "families" of workers, in the desire to attract clients or business, in relationships with others, and in one's professional philosophical mandate. In talking of a client population of street youth, a large degree of the "inclusive" activity of education and social services is directed at youth themselves, where whole agencies or schools are structurally and philosophically termed "client driven."

SPATIAL DIMENSIONS: ACCESS AND INVITATION

The location of schools and agencies that cater to street youth tend to be clustered around particularly dense areas where street youth "hang out," comprised of an area that stretches through the city core from Bay Street to Sherbourne Ave., and from Bloor St. to Queen St.. In terms of my interview sample, the only exception in this regard is one school that is located in south-central Toronto, which, though this historically was a gathering area for homeless youth during the late nineteenth century, is now part of the non-residential fashion district. It is important to note, though, that agencies and schools are also peppered throughout the east and north of Toronto that were not included in this sample. Nonetheless, the bulk of services still remain within the heart of the city.

Given that the client population of these social services is incredibly mobile, locale plays a powerful role in attracting youth. A number of agencies exist directly on Yonge St., particularly outreach and intake centres, and schools tend to be situated on adjacent streets. In attempting to effectively serve one's clients, the importance of youth service locations cannot be overstated. On the so-called Yonge Street "strip," it is necessary to actively encourage young people to walk the two or three blocks to receive
service. This can be even seen in one of Covenant House’s campaigns during the nineteen eighties, where they effectively advertised the shelter’s just-off-Yonge Street location by placing adhesive Covenant House “footprints” on the sidewalk that would literally “walk” interested clients to the hostel doorstep.

As central Toronto is the terrain of most homeless youth, agencies and schools form part of a young person’s familiar landscape. For street workers employed by agencies and schools, it is both economically and occupationally practical to be able to outreach on the streets, where workers can have the opportunity to meet new faces and also distribute much needed food coupons or sleeping bags. Ultimately, though, it is the clients that tacitly demand in-situ agencies and schools. The prospect of traveling to an agency, for example, necessitates buying TTC tickets, which for a homeless person may be simply unfeasible, and may even give that agency a reputation of being “uninformed” (Carlos).

Notwithstanding the economic necessity of being located close to one’s clients, it is also easier to refer clients to other agencies or schools that are located in the familiar area. Many homeless youth that visit agencies are extremely hesitant about accessing “other” services. This fear is compounded by the fact that often youth workers say that their clients need “step by step negotiation through the system. It’s just big and intimidating and part of the adult world” (William). Having satellite offices close by that also contract out professionals helps to encourage young people to navigate that system. Each street worker that I spoke with also noted that their clients’ hesitation to access services is often traced to literacy issues, and that “other” more institutional services do not understand their clients’ needs:

Like, I have a young client whose comprehension level is really low, and um, his reading and writing ability are at about, oh, maybe a grade three level. So in order to read the forms is a real problem. This young person has been to the welfare office before and wasn’t able to say I can’t read what’s on the form, and just signed the form without knowing what they were
signing...[and] behaviourally, presented as a goof, because he was really scared.
(Sara-street worker)

Most agencies and schools make use of a "drop-in" policy, and so are designed to have an open door casualness that defies an institutional character. This in itself may unintentionally be accentuated by the buildings that tend to house youth services and alternative schools. A large percentage of youth services are ad hoc offices located in anything from a house to a former club to a storefront, not to mention subway or department store alternative schools. Still, as client safety is at a premium, one of the house-based agencies that I visited required clients to ring a doorbell to be allowed in. Inasmuch as centres and schools attempt to be physically "open," then, there is also an element of privacy that particularly surrounds the agencies, such that small signs advertise location and interior offices tend to be removed from the gaze of the street.

Within each of the services that I visited, a welcoming atmosphere permeates design and character. In all but one of the agencies, floor plans include a central livingroom or meeting place area, and also contain "private" areas for counseling, thus giving the option for intimacy or community. Each of these "livingrooms" are decorated with couches and comfortable chairs, have important information advertised on the walls, post message boards for clients, and offer pamphlets on social issues like racism, job placement information, and health related brochures on pregnancy and AIDS awareness. Most every agency has bowls of free prophylactics and may even sport signs of "Hey, look at these condoms!" Not surprisingly, these services also prominently display advertisements for other agencies and schools that cater to youth.

As schools and services maintain their own philosophies and client populations, more specialized "decoration" is directed at each particular culture of clients. An agency that caters to African-Canadian youth thus has posters of Malcolm X and African proverbs on its walls, inasmuch as a gay-friendly agency actively advertises zero
tolerance on discrimination and violence. These "decorations" also aid in identifying and representing one's clients. In other words, clients can "find" themselves on the wall. Decoration, then, helps to bolster the self-esteem of youth, including bristol boards with motivational sayings like, "You are special," or picture-displays of agency and client activities. At times, agencies or schools display poems or drawings created by clients that staff say is an attempt to illustrate how much their clients' contributions are valuable and valued.

The character of these organizations is thus carefully crafted to appear simultaneously professional and informal. As clients may drop in simply to use the phone or have a quiet place to sit, the informality of access is at a premium. This openness and equality also extends to the offices of the workers involved with youth, and this is particularly so in the educational setting. In both of the schools that I visited, staff rooms are "open" shared spaces. In one school, the street worker office is located in the path of students walking to their classrooms, separated only a glass wall and an open door inviting students to drop in. This kind of atmosphere also undercuts any physical suggestion of hierarchy, both between youth and workers as well as between the workers themselves. Such shared spaces highlights the lack of a "formal" authoritarian presence (say, of a principal), and also allows for students to take "ownership" of more areas of their schools.

The space-associated atmosphere of services catering to street youth has an unflagging air of acceptance and invitation, of partnership and equality. Particularly in the agencies that I visited, young people can see themselves on the walls, can appreciate the artwork of their friends, can easily note useful information, and can use the office as a centre or contact-point for any range of services. Even the most casual observer of alternative schools and youth agencies can appreciate the degree to which the design of these centres have their clients in mind.
PERSPECTIVES: THE UTILITY OF INCLUSIVITY

Much of the "inclusive" work of the people that I spoke with is framed in terms of functionality. For the most part, sentiments were directed at their individual agency's community: "We have almost a small town situation" (Tina). Responsibilities between workers are seen to be shared, where each person may have a specialty or responsibility, but flexible boundaries are the norm. "So it demands an adaptability from the street worker" (Tina):

"What I do with one person can be so totally different from what I do with another...You need to be as non-traditional as you can be."
(Sara)

This adaptability, it is said by professionals, will simply help workers to seem "non-judgmental" to their clients. Raza, a coordinator of an alternative school, in defining the school said that "It's not one thing...it's a kind of a spider net," and that teachers "just kinda pick up stuff, ongoing."

Both alternative schools and agencies are organized around "client-directed" initiatives. Professionals such as lawyers, welfare counselors, and nurses are contracted in, because the "more people are willing to come here to make initial connections, the more likely they'll go to those other clinics" (Sara) or agencies. In turn, these professional volunteers purposefully "relax their standards around what they need before they see someone" and therefore, "they break down barriers to kids accessing service" (Sara). Most youth agencies attempt to make the bureaucratic portion of a young person's contact with service "kind of painless" (Sara).

Youth workers say that "We will make referrals" (William) for their clients, because it is simply more practical for the agency to traverse "the system," and also because clients "often do not even know how to keep communication going...so I end up doing a lot of the in between work" (Jessica). Perhaps even more importantly, referrals are an indication of an agency's willingness to find "experts" for their clients: "If we can
do it, we'll do it, and if we're not the best person to do it, we'll find someone who knows how to do that for you" (Sara).

Agencies in particular organize their hours of operation around their clients, often being open one or two nights per week. Street workers will then walk "the beat" to make contact with potential or current clients, because a young person "may be down the street for three months and never come in" (Sara). Alternative schools that cater to street youth offer nutrition programs so that homeless students can better concentrate on their work, because "If I can eat, I can study" (Geraldine). In turn, alternative school students accumulate a series of thirds of credits, given every 5-6 weeks, so that accomplished work can be "put in the bank" (Carlos- street worker, alternative school). This, youth workers say, helps students see their progress, and encourages former students to re-enroll later if life circumstances make coming to school impossible for a time.

It can be said that alternative school teachers and agency workers must consistently adapt:

Sometimes you wander into a crisis and you need to help kinda put the pieces back together so that they're not in a position where they're vulnerable that they're gonna be abused by a date or use poor judgment in terms of getting into a van with four guys in it.

(Sara)

What constitutes "success" to these professionals can be "very individualistic...our funders have a different perspective, but now you're asking me this question" (Jessica- youth liaison worker). For one client or student, the goals that workers set may range from being able to keep an appointment to getting a high school diploma. Overall, then, the workers of these services help to pinpoint goals for their clients, and then "we help, um, build all of the things that someone would need to be able to reach that goal" (Sara). In being "client-driven," street-involved youth workers tend to recognize that "[clients] need to be able to determine their own benchmarks for success" (William).
Workers see themselves and other youth professionals as being able to handle such flexibility:

>This school would not work if you just dropped in any teacher.
>It just would not work...People who aren't committed to the vision and some of the principals we have...
>(Tina)

A number of youth workers and educators that I spoke with mentioned that one of the alternative schools had a staff that seems to "work around the clock" (Tina), which accents the demands that youth workers feel that they work under.

Some of my participants had positive words of recognition for work done by other professionals: "The Toronto board has, all the boards have made some efforts over the years to try and make their system more accessible to dropouts" (Jessica). A number of street workers referenced a particularly successful alternative school with statements like "I don't know what it is that they are doing that's so unique," but said that staff were main reason for their ability to work with street youth, because teachers attempt "to try to keep body and soul intact so [young people] can focus on their school" (Jessica).

Largely, such inclusive structures, practices and opinions are dictated by a client population that must be actively sought out and encouraged. Within agencies and schools, zero tolerance policies on violence and discrimination are usually adopted so that a visiting young person can know that services can be "very safe, accepting places for people to be, very non-judgmental," and that, "You're safe to come here provided you're making it safe for everybody else" (William). Geraldine, an alternative education coordinator, says that alternative educators "do whatever it takes to keep the kid in school," that alternative schools "must go on program. We have to." What "program" means in this context is both the philosophical orientation of the alternative school as well as the design and kind of courses that the school offers. Schools thus "rely on what we're doing in that school to get students" (Geraldine). Teachers in alternative schools
are said to be people who "are not interested in moving up the food chain. They want to teach" (Geraldine).

The alternative schools and agencies that I visited can be best characterized as being "client-driven" insofar as there is both a utilitarian and philosophical decision to structure program around young peoples' needs. The utilitarian concern in this regard is that young people simply will not access services unless they are geared towards their needs and understanding of their life circumstances. For agencies in particular, participation in a service is on a volunteer basis (with the exception of bail referral programs) and as such, because young people feel uncomfortable with the "system," great lengths are taken to achieve an atmosphere of care and concern over that of a bureaucracy. In my conversation with Sara, she said that as a trained social worker she has had to "unlearn" portions of her formal training in order to be effective, precisely because homeless youth present very special needs and circumstances. The perception of both educators and social workers is that an agency or school that is "client driven" is simply going to be more effective.

THE NORMATIVE MANDATE

It is likely the result of professionals' hands-on experience that most agencies and alternative schools have chosen to adopt inclusive, flexible, and client-directed visions for their organizational mandates: "It's all built in to serve the students" (Geraldine). Some of the people that I spoke with defined it very loosely: "We're a service for everyone. We don't make a distinction" (William). At times, such philosophies are enshrined in the written mandates of agencies and schools:

[Our service] strives to provide for a life of quality, well-being, caring and healing for our children and families in the Toronto Native Community. It does this by creating a service model that is culture-based respecting the supreme values of Native people, the extended family, and the right to self-determination. (Vision Statement)
In these times of increasing economic despair and youth alienation, the philosophy of [our school] remains the same: to assist students who are in danger of dropping out or who wish to return to a small supportive re-entry program, and to allow them to earn academic credits on a short-term basis while encouraging them to make good decisions about the next phases of their lives. (Alternative School 1992-93 Annual Report)

[What is our agency?] a voluntary, individualized, contractual service that changes as youth develop skills essential to success in adulthood (Agency brochure)

How are students involved in school decisions? Through the General Meeting students have input into the running of the school and into the planning of programs, trips, and after school activities. Students are also involved in decision making by participating and having voting representatives at the weekly staff meetings. (School brochure)

The professionals who spoke with me consistently referenced their clients when talking about the benefits of adopting inclusive policies: "Well, first of all, you're not going to find other people who are going to look down on you...If I can come in with my hair shaved and with my skull dyed purple and nobody cares, well, I'm going to be comfortable, right?" (Geraldine). A number of my participants went out of their way to introduce me to programs that reflect their mandate, such as a nutrition program in an alternative school, or a youth centre that features make-up and hair tips for their transsexual clients, as well as conducting safe sex toy use workshops (Sara). Others have pointed out that the key to being accessed is that young people will know, "I don't have to conform" (Geraldine). In one of the alternative schools noted above, students and faculty conduct regular meetings. These students "have a large say in running the school," (Tina) to the point of having fifty percent of the staff hiring vote. This allows students to have "more control" over their education because they are given "ownership" (Carlos).

It's important to note, though, that agencies and schools often come under fire for adopting "loose" and "flexible" policies. In speaking with William, he notes that the
general public at times criticizes the these programs because young people are seen to be "taking advantage of the system." His reply to this is simply, "Well, good. They will use the service for what's in it for them..." Alternative school respondents say that they feel as though the public and "mainstream" education questions their programming:

Our program is very flexible. It has guidelines. Um, it's definitely structured. A lot of people say, oh it's alternative. There's no structures. That's a fallacy. There's structure here. The structure is flexible.
(Carlos)

In the eyes of many of these professionals, client-directed, adaptable policies are misrepresented, and as such "We're not in a constant state of revolution, but we're in a constant state of education...to some extent, having to prove ourselves" (Carlos). This need to educate the "system" helps to crystallize teachers' and workers' belief in their mandates:

You see, there's an authority in this office, there's a legitimacy. And so we're going to use that legitimacy to help you. So the system's not completely fucked. There's some good things, 'cause this is part of the system, so there's an option, right?
(Carlos)

Ultimately, though, the bottom line in virtually every one of my discussions is that mandate is generated from the following axiom: "the needs of [our] clients comes first" (Tina).

Part of this prioritizing at times necessitates being "partnered and connected with lots of other agencies" (William). For example, the Coalition of Street Workers meets monthly in order to keep abreast of new issues and discuss further collaborative projects. Most partnerships, though, tend to be described as arising from a client-need, as opposed to an agency-level formalized policy: "We work with, um, agencies who share, who have, um, our students as their clients...if it's useful, we will have a meeting" (Tina). Virtually every person that I spoke with mentioned that agency-education
collaboration does exist, and characterized the connection as being "informal" or "loose."

Very often, though, dialogue between agency and school is the result of an advocacy issue:

We'll go to school interviews. We'll do some leg work prior to the meeting so that if it's alright with the young person, that the young person...whether it's educational testing or whatever, has an idea that this is a very scary step, and especially with institutions this often means that all hell breaks loose and just kind of educating the system to what street youth are all about (Sara).

Again, other liaisons may simply "inform," but do not actively develop joint programming. In one of the alternative schools, however, social work-educational partnerships are already in place, and participation is based on Commitment to the advocacy, but also how you do it. In terms of alienating. I mean, you know, a lot of people who are alienated, my approach is this. We're dealing with a population that's highly alienated. Let's not alienate them more or alienate ourselves from the service. And you know, a lot of times people begin like that, you know, and then you build a bridge and then you say, hold on a second here, we're trying to help somebody. It demands an incredible degree of being calm and kind of, you know, [being] together with people and not getting into these fights, you know, people are like, antagonistic...and it's the approach, right? So it's just exploring the...there's a million options out there on how you approach a problem and try to be as creative as possible and use everything that you have at your disposal, right? (Carlos)

As a result of this kind of problem-solving approach, Carlos' school has the exceptional reputation of being able to partner with other services: "There's relationships being built. Really strong relationships with other agencies, other youth agencies...Within the system, there's partnerships with the schools." Noting the hesitant stance of mainstream education, this alternative school also encourages discussion and "a lot of advocacy to change the system to make it more receptive...We are as legitimate as you are. Our programs are as legitimate as your programs. So what we need to do is work together and not work against each other" (Carlos). Comments like this illustrate the expansive reach of territoriality, that though certain professionals can and do partner
with one another, these groups in particular recognize that the "system" as a whole needs "change," that individual programs that counterbalance such things as service gaps and territoriality are still exceptions within the system, and which by definition limit the reach of their influence.

THE AMBASSADOR PROGRAM

One of the more "formal" agency generated endeavours that could be considered "collaborative" is the Ambassador Program. Initially the genesis of four Toronto youth agencies (1990), Ambassador sought to test a two-pronged method of combating the dropout rate. In the pilot inception of the program, which included an evaluation by all the program's students and teaches (1993), 16 clients were chosen from participating agencies. These "Ambassadors" would then enroll in a Toronto Board alternative school, and also conduct outreach meetings, or "Speak Outs," to area high schools and elementary schools. "Ambassadors" then and today are involved in working with their agency, their school, and other board schools to promote awareness of the consequences of dropping out of school:

The title Ambassador was originally selected because it referred to the fact that young people, charged with a special mission, could act as representatives or agents within their own community. (The Ambassador Partnership: 1993, p. 1)

By reaching out to street youth, Ambassadors help to inform their peers about available community assistance. Acting in a more preventative role, Ambassadors educate young people who are still in school about the consequences of poor life choices. (ibid: 1993, p. 2)

Each of the partnered agencies "designates a staff person to supervise Ambassadors in their work in the agency, and other roles as negotiated" (Program Proposal in Ambassador Partnership: 1993, p. 1).

Now in its sixth year of life, the program has grown to include nine agency partners. One of the alternative schools currently has 20 students that are off-site Ambassadors who attend school, give outreach presentations in high schools, and also
fulfill the co-op component of the program by working part-time (usually) at a participating agency. The staff representatives meet regularly as a collective. Of course, inasmuch as this is an educational program, it is still nonetheless an "agency" program that only has tacit Toronto Board of Education acknowledgment, with the exception of the alternative schools. The Ambassador Program is thus an anomaly in that it represents a ground level collaborative effort between educators, social workers, and young people. In speaking of the dangers of clashing agendas and territoriality, a number of my participants noted that despite the active presence of organizational protectionism, staff members that are involved in the Ambassador program collaborate "all the time" (Carlos) and "very well" (Kevin, William), which suggests that the development of collaborative programming is a powerful force for overriding the potential of dissension within and between occupational groups.
4. Exclusive Perspectives: Protecting Domains

The inclusive work and viewpoints of the professionals who spoke with me are also surprisingly and uncomfortably paired with a doppleganger, or "evil twin." Despite professionals' overwhelming commitment to "inclusive" client service models, relationships between educators and social workers could be described as "tolerated" at best. In fact, grassroots organizational territoriality in its more exclusive form is characterized by individuals who harbor intense professional suspicions, and who speak of the need for protecting their professional domains. The following discussion will illustrate that organizational territoriality not only exists between educators and social workers, but that territoriality also unwittingly creates a veritable service gap for homeless youth.

In terms of space, interestingly enough, alternative schools and agencies seem equally "marginalized" by a dominant society that necessarily also includes "mainstream education," particularly in relation to locational centrality and permanence. "Exclusivity" as a behaviour or held philosophy, though, also most definitely acts upon and has acted upon the clients of services, who have very often had horrific experiences with "social service" (Finkelstein: 1991, p. 60, Palenski: 1984, p. 84, Webber: 1991, pp. 10, 16, 24, 33, 177, 243). In the case of the professionals, frequently my participants spoke of the "utility" or functionality of maintaining distinct and separate jurisdictions. Nevertheless, in the minds of many of the professionals that I spoke with, there is an ardent belief in their protection advocacy role for their clients, especially because clients most often form the ideological basis for developing policy and program.

Once again, this "inclusivity" is in part an outgrowth of young adults' critique of their often abusive experiences with the "system," and thus, the mission statements of alternative schools and social services are imbued with special experiential import. The difficulty, though, comes in the fact that inclusive visions are also coupled with a strong
skepticism about the professional other and beliefs about the need to maintain arm's length dealings with them. The potency of such a simultaneous presence of inclusive and exclusive viewpoints is that the normatively inclusive visions are also used to describe and even explain exclusive work and philosophies of "service."

**SPACE AND DESIGN**

The location and design of alternative schools and social services provides a tangible example of their normative "place" in society. Inasmuch as location represents an attempt at inclusivity- a device to attract and keep clients, dominant "society" also places social services and alternative schools at physical margins. Thus, spatial territoriality in this most exclusive form represents not an oppositional relationship between alternative schools and agencies, but instead between these organizations and society at large.

It is extremely important to define at the outset what is meant by "alternative schools." In Metro, there are currently 10 designated Alternative Education Schools for the Toronto Board panel. An Alternative School, as defined by the Ministry, is "a program that is operating as an alternative by a school board" (Ministry of Education: 1986, p. 2). "Mainstream education," loosely refers to the wider public and separate school system. "Mainstream schools" are by definition legally mandated to educate every Canadian (Ministry of Education: E.2,18 (21)). The "alternative" is precisely an educational option, and it is this very significant distinction that helps to perpetuate prioritized notions of "regular" versus "independent" schools. As such, in talking of marginality, the "mainstream" is being considered part of the dominant order.

The "residence" of mainstream schools provides a sharp contrast to that of their alternative counterparts. Mainstream schools are located on Crown lands designated for educational purposes (ibid, 192 (1)). These schools tend to be located in residential neighbourhoods, and are therefore part of the "community." The buildings on these
lands are designed to maintain an educational identity (ibid, 1, definitions). Residents of such neighbourhoods have a financial and constitutional obligation to support the running of this school (ibid, 33(3), 65(5)).

An alternative school might be located in an office building, or a dance club, or a subway, or a Board designated school, or even a combination of these in its lifetime. Alternative schools are to some degree equated with urban locales, and Toronto is certainly no exception in this regard. In referring to how her school at times enrolls students from Mississauga, Tina was frustrated that "Toronto gets stuck with all of it," because Metro's suburbs do not offer comparable Alternative Education programming.

Alternative schools are dramatically smaller than mainstream schools, with an average population of 140 students and 8-10 teachers. As a result of size, off-site principals oversee 4-5 schools, and so the day-to-day running of an alternative school is overseen by an on-site coordinator, though this position is only "unofficial[ly]" (Raza) recognized by the Board. Most schools' staff have moved at least once in their tenures. Alternative schools with plans for expansion have recently seen their budgets slashed.

Street youth agencies, particularly the youth hostels, are designed to be widely accessible. However, recent budgetary constraints are acutely evident, with up to eighty percent funding losses drastically shrinking staffs now expected to absorb the case loads of their unemployed peers. Most agencies have experienced different "homes" that they have adapted to, the funding for which comes from competitive grant applications directed to the Minister (Ministry of Community and Social Services: C.11, 8,(1), 193(1)). One Toronto agency in particular was "given" office space in the hospital district as part of its municipal funding. Youth services are almost never located in neighbourhoods other than the downtown core.

In contrast to mainstream schools, then, alternative programs and youth agencies are never placed at the heart of a residential community. They have often moved many times, even though their existence often relies on advertisement through
"word of mouth" (Tina). Anywhere between 8-12 professionals might work in an alternative school, and as little as two youth workers and one director may now be the "staff" servicing youth "in the thousands" (William). Staff and clients almost always share a work/service space. Often this space is thought to be less than premium, such as when an Alternative Education Coordinator for the Board spoke of her designated office by saying

If I turned on these lights up there you would think you were being interrogated in some South American country. It's unbelievable...So you can kind of tell even that I'm alternative on this floor anyway, right? (Geraldine)

In speaking specifically on space and staffing cutbacks, discussants from both groups referred to the Premier as "this idiot. You can quote me on that" (Carlos). Social workers in particular are beginning to feel that the government has "no desire to hear about this agency or any other agency" (Jessica). Professionals' anger and frustration over cuts made to the staff size, space, location, and design of agencies and alternative schools is amply evident. With limited physical and economic resources, youth professionals feel that their work often resorts to "holding hands and just like, you know, guiding people through despair" (Carlos).

**UTILITARIAN CONCERNS: RESOURCES AND ORDER**

It must be stated, then, that an overburdened staff perpetually in a state of trying to keep pace will not necessarily have the "luxury" of undertaking collaborative work. Most collaborative research acknowledges that it "takes time and effort" (Carlos). Even more compromising, perhaps, is that "It's difficult for a teacher to work with five or six community organizations. Everyone has their own agenda. They want different things and yet the teacher has to abide by school board rules" (Geraldine).
Most often, the theme of the "logistically difficult" appears when professionals speak of the "Other's" dealings with youth. One youth worker, in thinking of mainstream education feels that

They're not interested in whether or not these kids who are on the streets are in school or not. They don't do outreach to these kids. They don't make education accessible and I don't think they really care...So why would you go look out for trouble, so to speak. Why would you wanna drag kids in who are going to tell you to fuck off...Why would you go seek that out.
(Sara)

One of the alternative school street youth workers calls it

Territoriality, and who takes ownership of this and ownership of that. As opposed to, if you're working for the Board then the student is the main, is surely the main priority, and it, I think that there are less issues around sort of territory...of responsibility*
(Tina)

The necessity for educating the "other" is also a recurrent concern for professionals:

Sometimes it can be a problem if an agency is not familiar with how the school system operates and isn't part of that school.
(Tina)

Whether it is difficulties that arise for clients and workers or between professionals, the sentiment "it's easier to be territorial than it is to be collaborative" (Carlos) takes on a particularly utilitarian dimension for professionals who are servicing a growing and very needy clientele.

Ironically, part of the rationale for upholding a function of exclusivity refers back to the utility of variety. One service that caters to black youth finds that "The kids who come here wouldn't go to S.O.S." (which caters to youth involved in the sex industry), and that likewise, "Kids who are known prostitutes often run into difficulties in some of the other agencies from the other kids" (William). Comparatively, part of the grounding for Alternative Education dictates that Toronto's ten schools must be "all alternative from
each other" (Carlos) in terms of target population and programming. Thus, the function of jurisdictions in this context widens in support of "exclusive" services that cater to particular clients.

In adding up the key ingredients to successful collaborative partnerships, for example, Kevin cites

an understanding on their part that, you know, that, yeah, that Native street youth have some more specific issues to deal with and that a Native agency would most likely be able to help.

At this occupational end, then, one key to successful collaboration between services, say workers, is contingent upon the recognition of an individual agency's "expert" areas. Still, the difficulty inherent in multiple services is simply that

If we accept the wisdom of providing a diversity of services, this tends to result in competition between agencies for "ownership" of the problem. Police officers see delinquents- social workers see victims of abuse- health care workers see people at risk to disease- educators see dropouts- and the devout see souls in moral peril. (Brannigan: 1993, p. 46)

The "functionality" of exclusivity is once again compounded by the fact that the necessity for diversity reflects not only the nature of a profession's work ("I work with students, not clients") and the inherent client-directedness of an organization ("we cater especially to you"), but also the need for an organization's economic self-preservation (distinctive service=funding).

With the current cuts, "you've got people scrambling for services" (Jessica). Under these conditions, the boundaries of jurisdictions are becoming ever hazy, where "The obligation for helping youth and their families belongs to many, yet there is little consensus on functions and responsibilities" (Smart, in Journal of Adolescent Health: 1991;12,525). Youth workers who say that they are being "descimated" (Sara) by the cuts at times feel forced into "trying to push connections with other agencies" (Sara). Quite simply put, "push[ing] connections" becomes problematic precisely because workers are already in the position where they "won't have the time to help [clients] access healthy things like going back to school or getting them the literacy help that
they need’ (Sara). Thus, not only do some service workers feel that they are overburdened, but they also feel that connections are being “pushed” on them, which suggests that when “cooperation” is perceived to be forced upon professionals, professionals will not surprisingly assess collaboration in negative terms.

Opinions on the utility of territoriality represent an intricate web of rationales. In exclusivity’s most grassroots day-to-day experiential form, professionals feel that while collaborative work is often useful, it is extremely difficult to put into practice. Because agencies and schools involved with street youth expressly attempt to remain distinctive, this need for professional autonomy is also bolstered by the fact that clients seek out specific services that remain at a certain “distance” from one another. Professionals’ opinions are very likely exacerbated by budgetary constraints that have even compromised the delivery of primary care initiatives. In a climate where services to street youth have been drastically reduced and where programs have had to justify their existence through proving the distinct “need” that they fulfill, the word “collaboration” is suddenly seen as a threat to an agency’s very survival.

NORMATIVE CONCERNS AND THE BERMUDA TRIANGLE

Normative exclusivity, which seeks to exclude or “marginalize” on the basis of proposed ideological “norms,” is an aspect of territoriality that is threaded throughout the sentiments voiced by professionals about their service “other.” When it comes to thoughts on one’s clients, however, professionals speak of the frequent abuse that their clients have suffered at the hands of many different service workers. Professionals who work with street youth have invariably heard their clients speak of negative service experiences. Neither educators nor social workers are exempt from such critiques, as is evidenced by accounts of discrimination and outright condemnation voiced on the part of young people:
I didn't want to try to read and write because I didn't want to get put down. That's what education does to you. (Charlie in Webber: 1991, p. 24)

I've had lots of experience with social workers over the years, especially since I started my long haul to getting clean. Provided you come on powerless and remember your place, ask for help they think is "appropriate"- their favourite word- then they will help you get money and training to stay within you social class. They'll agree, for example, that secretarial training would be "appropriate" for someone like me. But, get uppity ideas about controlling your own life or getting a university education and see how much they'll help you then. (Crystal in Webber: 1991, p. 203)

Researchers, when commenting on what committed youth workers must overcome to properly service homeless youth, cite clients' past service experience as a mitigating factor:

> With few exceptions, these kids tend to experience intervention as oppression more than as assistance. Their stories are laced with incidence of indifference and outright prejudice- sometimes criminal neglect- on the part of public child protection agents. (Webber: 1991, p. 10)

Because street kids generally have had devastating experiences in the education system, efforts to lure them into any program that even hints at school as they know it are bound to fail. Most runaways and throwaways have been, as Beat the Street co-founder Rick Parsons says, "labeled into ignorance. The major problem for most of our students is not letters, it's labels." (in Webber: 1991, p. 177).

From the perspective of many young people, education and social services can be extremely "exclusive," territoriality in this instance acting in the past and present experiences of young people well versed in "the system:"

> Some of them have been abused by the system in a lot of different ways. (Sara)

> ...Because the street youth don't trust the system because they have good reason not to trust the system...Well, that's not going to turn around in a month. (William)

> They've been told that they can never write, that they're stupid. (Carlos)
Ninety percent [of our clients] result from Adoption breakdown... The issues for us are so systemic...loss of family...taken away from their culture...

(Keith)

Clients' stories about their experiences with "other" professionals, both positive and negative, necessarily helps to shape a worker's conception of institutional selves and "others," particularly in cases where professionals have limited contact with one another. Often, professionals frame their critique of "other" services in the context of a client's experience. At times, workers offer up a pastiche of client stories, as in the instance of Sara's thoughts on clients' experiences with the health care system:

They're afraid of big institutions like hospitals...Street youth are looked at very differently by institutions, particularly hospitals, because they're thought to be seeking narcotics...and not really have...or seeking a warm place to stay for a couple of hours, or just wanting food. So sometimes their responses to street youth are not great...[Street youth] are not pleasant looking sometimes or pleasant smelling, um, or, or don't have very pleasant social skills, so they're someone that you just want to go like this to [hands off motion] sometimes if you're a welfare worker or if you're a nurse or a doctor in an emergency room.

(Sara)

At other times, a personalized story is told: "Like, I have a young client whose comprehension level is really low...This young person had been to the welfare office before and was unable to say I can't read what's on the form" (Sara). Whether comments are offered in the form of a more general, "There've been reports of [hostel] staff turning their backs when they [transvestite clients] have been hit by other residents," or specific stories of clients who have experienced that "The Cherry Beach Express' is alive and well" (Sara, referring to police brutalizing of homeless youth), clients form an informal though trusted source of information about "other" professionals.

Given that many young people have had horrendous experiences with institutions, and given the "logistical" difficulties of working with other "interested" professionals, it is not surprising, say, that social workers' opinions about mainstream educators are at times extremely critical:
I don't think they care.
(Sara)

I think there's a tendency to want to only have education for the kids who are playing the education game well... School is the next place where kids will become connected, if it's not home. If home is not the place that will root them, that will become that anchor in whatever community they're in... it'll be school. But if school is a miserable experience for these kids, they basically become relegated to the refuse. They are the expendable kids in our society. They become the shit heap that the rest of us climb up.
(William)

Educators, while being less emphatic about their displeasure with social work, do make mention of the difficulty of agendas:

I think that um, we have social workers, and we have psychologists that are employed by the school board and um, I guess I have a bit of a bias, because I'm part of that department as well and um, sometimes it can be a problem if an agency is not familiar with how the school system operates and isn't part of that school.
(Tina)

Carlos, a youth worker for an alternative school, specifically singles out Welfare as a stumbling block, citing that Welfare workers often think that "you're out to cheat the system" because of street workers' dual advocacy role for their students. In turn, Carlos notes that problems of territoriality arise within the social work profession when members of a coalition "come with their own agendas" and he cites a specific example of an organization:

That they had developed, at some point, a fortress... mentality. "We're the one's who can help street youth. Everyone else can't... We are it. Street youth come here. [We are the ones] who can really talk to them and understand them and the agencies are fucked"
(Carlos)

At times, social workers feel that

There is a tendency to want to only have education for the kids who are playing the education game well... I think the school system for the kids that are street involved needs to be, um, needs to be client directed
(William)
Some educators also have concerns about the "constant state of education" between themselves and the mainstream:

We are as legitimate as you are. Our programs are as legitimate as your programs. What we need to do is work together, not work against each other. (Carlos)

We're still part of the mainstream. (Raza)

By the same token, however, such schools also tell this "mainstream" "Don't deal with us the same way you deal with a regular school. We have a different population," and "We don't mess around with program...you just don't come and impose things"(Carlos).

It is extremely important to note in these sentiments the relationship between territoriality and advocacy, as clients often form the ideological basis of agency's "territory," in this case acting as a positive force that works for the rights of these youth:

You know where we're territorial, it's in our ideology, right? I mean, we definitely have a definite bent in ideology. I mean, that that's what we get angry [about], right? We will go, "Wait minute!" and we're fighting and we're fierce...We put people to shame. (Carlos).

This same alternative school protested over cuts to a residential co-op plan for the school by holding outdoor "street" classes: "We took a risk. What are they going to do...fire the whole school?" (Carlos). One youth worker, who cited "advocacy on a wider basis" as being part of her job description, also noted that with cuts to social services

...it's getting increasingly harder to organize things like that because we're, you know, losing major pieces of the community. As that happens, you've got shock waves. (Jessica)
These protection-advocacy statements are at times directed at one's own professional peers:

This school would not work if you just dropped in any teacher. It just would not work. People who aren't committed to the vision and some of the principles we have.
(Tina)

I've seen [territoriality]. The one good thing going in this office is that we're not territorial...There's no territoriality between the teachers, believe it or not. They're not territorial. There's a little bit of difficulty with other......
(Carlos)

...and I think if you're not interested in moving up the food chain you're probably quite threatening...They teach...not to be a victim, so they fight...So naturally I think [alternative schools] are looked at in the system...and if you teach for too long you won't get a job in the system.
(Geraldine)

The other thing is ...commitment to and awareness of the issues of poverty especially...
(Carlos)

It would seem, then, that normative "exclusivity" affects relationships within organizational groups as well as ideologies about occupational "selves" and "others."
Most of my participants' critiques of one another are firmly planted in fundamental beliefs about advocacy "in the best interests" of students and clients. Critiques are most often housed in stories of clients' negative experiences, or in discussions around conflicting professional "visions" and "principles." Nevertheless, educators and social workers most often find their professional others "ideologically" difficult to relate to, especially given that conflicts with agendas often reflect very non-negotiable legal parameters like statutes and insurance policies.

In this, some social workers and educators have voiced that territoriality is less a concern of individuals and is more a function of an uncooperative system "...there just isn't enough cooperation all the way around...There hasn't been a concerted effort to make it feasible...It's not that there hasn't been some sort of effort made, it's just the size of systems." (Jessica). Organizational "norms" very likely form the most persuasive
arguments for or against collaboration, as "norms" are maintained by the individuals who work within organizations as well as being housed in the ideological tenants of the statutes that govern "service." In explicating territoriality, then, it seems particularly necessary to investigate how the structural parameters of education and social service serve as a mitigating factor of the Bermuda Triangle.
5. Structural Analysis: The Realities of Servicing Children and Youth and The Needs of the State

The statutes that govern Education and Community and Social Services are punctuated with two very revealing "themes" relevant to the discussion of organizational territoriality. Comparing the legal/social reach of each Ministry, it would seem that Education as a whole is accorded a more centralized status and concomitant territorial powers. Perhaps most notably this may be due to the fact that Education is compulsory (Ministry of Education: E.2,17(28)), unlike most Social Services, and that responsibility to "participate" in education is not only limited to children and young adults who attend school, but is also the obligation of communities that support schools through taxation (ibid, 65(5)). Social Services by contrast, "offer" service that is often voluntary in nature. Determining the "need" for a service agency, in turn, is assessed in a particularized fashion by its Ministry, leaving the "whole" of education with infinitely more "claim" than the individualized (and therefore somewhat more fragmented) system of a collection of agencies.

Within each of the major tenants of the Ministries, that being The Education Act and a cluster of Community and Social services statutes including the General Welfare Assistance Act, Family Benefits Act, Health and Welfare Act, and most relevantly the Child and Family Services Act, there is also present a somewhat inharmonious coexistence between the blatant territorial language that describes and prescribes each Ministry's decidedly inclusive vision. It is particularly within the statutes speaking on Ministerial "powers" where we find a sharp contrast drawn between institutional norms (inclusive) and functions (exclusive). Within Ministry statutes, though inclusivity is the cornerstone of each Ministry, the ways and means by which the system and its professionals achieve their ends are decidedly territorial. Unwittingly perhaps, the ways and means work in direct opposition to the "visions" of each Ministry.
Not surprisingly, in interviewing service professionals, their sentiments often reflect this same dichotomy, that though inclusive, accepting, client-driven, cooperative efforts mark the practice of social agencies and alternative schools, there is nevertheless present a territorializing of one's work in relation to others.

SPACE, PLACE AND CENTRALITY

The most physical feature of education's proscribed "place," as it is enshrined in the Education Act, accords the Ministry extremely wide powers over Ontario's lands. The spaces originally allocated for education were designated as Crown Lands in the mid-nineteen hundreds (Ministry of Education: E.2, 192(1)). As such, the indelible mark of education takes on a historical dimension as well, where school lands in Metropolitan Toronto may have maintained an educational identity for well over a hundred years. Despite the existence of such Crown Lands (ibid: 11(15)), the Education Act also allows for creating new school locales, and it is the language that describes this provision that is most telling:

...any part of territory without municipal organizations that is deemed to be annexed there for public school purposes.(ibid: 8(30a))

Thus, the Ministry of Education, in using military style territorial language, has the power to annex additional lands, as opposed to being given the power of, say, "negotiation."

Interestingly enough, alternative education is both part of and is yet a sub-section of this "mainstream" system. Though lands are not accorded to alternative schools with the same kind of national educational birth right (partially because of the short history of alternative education), space must nevertheless be provided to the alternative panel as part of the Ministry's pledge to provide "a program that is operating as an alternative program by a school board" (Ministry of Education: 1986, p. 2). Of course, the "identity" of alternative education is marked in part by the "interesting" housing of its schools. It must be noted, though, that such locations may mark a conscious decision on the part
of alternative educators to effectively reach their target student body. Take for instance Contact School's original manifesto/application to the Ministry in 1978, where the writers specifically note that a central location

would not preclude any student in the city from attending. Convenient access to the TTC subway system seems almost an imperative. (Larter, Gershman: 1979, p. 4)

Though the locales of alternative schools could be considered "marginal" (if the "neighbourhood" archetype is taken as the norm), there is nevertheless a predetermination of "place" for alternative education within the confines of Metropolitan Toronto. Thus, alternative education is now theoretically a "compulsory" cousin of Metro's Board of Education (Ministry of Education: 1986, p.2), complemented by a Ministry that is committed to promoting "particular philosophies and approaches to learning and school governance" (ibid: 1986, p. 10).

A Social Service, by contrast, has to prove the efficacy of fulfilling a social need (whereas the "belief in" alternative education [need] is already a commitment of the Ministry of Education). That particular needs are addressed by social services renders their application process that much less secure, as interested parties seek for their Minister to be "satisfied" (Ministry of Community and Social Services: C.11, 12.8(1)) with the proof levied by a grant proposal that there is in fact a "need" to be filled. Where an alternative school's program or ideological basis may held under scrutiny, its financial viability remains the concern of the Ministry. That alternative schools must undergo an application process does draw attention to mainstream education's luxury to presume space, but it is also characteristic of flexible and autonomous notions of "alternativity." Social service providers, however, must apply for approval for both vision and practical (financial, locational, administrative) feasibilities:

Where the Minister approves an agency to provide a service under subsection (1), the Minister may give the agency financial and other assistance in accordance with the regulations. (ibid: 8(3))

Where the Minister is satisfied that an agency is, with financial
assistance under this part of the regulations, financially capable of establishing, maintaining and operating a service and that its affairs are carried on under competent management in good faith, the Minister may approve the agency to provide that service (ibid: C.11,8(1)).

In this, each Minister's role and power base is also indicative of the differences inherent between national standardized compulsory education and a pluralistic notion of generally optional community services. The Minister of Community and Social Services personally controls much within the collective of agencies, including "restrictions on the agency's territorial jurisdiction" (Ministry of Community and Social Services: 1985, p. 24) Where the Minister of Community and Social Services (via Metropolitan Program Supervisors) controls the very raison d'etre and "reach" of a service, the Minister of Education is responsible instead for wide Ministerial control with respect to proscribing diplomas, courses of study, curriculum guidelines, and areas of study. Indeed virtually all aspects of education may be controlled by the Minister, and this authority is further enhanced by the province's major contributors towards educational expenses under the regulations of the Act. (Makuch: 1976, p. 33)

The Minister of Education's power of "annexation" or claim over space is broader than his/her social service counterpart. Where the Minister of Community and Social Services requires grant applicants to submit "reasons for the location for the proposed service" (Ministry of Community and Social Services: 1985, p. 22, "Rights and Responsibilities" section), the Ministry of Education

In respect of the territorial districts, the Lieutenant Governor in Council may, by regulation

(a) form any part thereof that is not in a school section into a district school area (Ministry of Education: E.2, 51(2)

...the Minister may by order designate any portion of such lands as a school section and may appoint as members of the board such persons as the Minister considers proper.(ibid: 59(1))

A Minister of Community and Social Services, while having control

\[\text{---}\]

1 my emphasis
over "governing the establishments, management, operation, location, construction, alteration and renovations of buildings, or any class of them, in which approved services are provided" (Ministry of Community and Social Services: 1985, (214)10), is technically without a larger or more permanent reach. Even the language of the Child and Family Services Act reflects the Minister's variable claim over the physical terrain:

The Minister's approval under subsection (1) may specify a building, a group of buildings, part of a building or a location in a building as the approved premises. (CFSA 9.(2))

The Minister of Education, in his or her role of maintaining and even expanding the landhold of the Ministry, is responsible for the "permanent improvement" of a school site, and he or she, under the auspices of the Lieutenant Governor in Council may "(a) designate as a school division all or part of one or more municipalities or territory without municipal organization or a combination thereof" (Ministry of Education: E.2, 5, (1)). This sheer imbalance of "claim" that each Minister has over space reflects profound differences in both the expanse of land control and philosophy of Ministerial functions.

Though there are extremely marginalized dimensions to alternative education's place within this continuum (discussed in the section on exclusivity), somewhat straddling the extremes of having to "prove" the need for space through submitting proposals, like social services, instead of having the power to control and manipulate "given" and "needed" localities, like mainstream education, its physical positioning is nonetheless still more "secure" in theory than are social service agencies. That there is always a "place" for the alternative may in fact provide a professional and jurisdictional cushion not offered to the social service providers, who have seen entire branches (Children's Mental Health) of their "territory" disavowed by the Ministry.
OPPOSITIONAL LANGUAGE VERSUS PHILOSOPHY: CONTRADICTIONS

Our laws regarding social services and education are steeped in the language of territoriality and the drawing of Ministerial boundaries. From the aforementioned selections of the Ministries' Acts alone, it is easy to see that one's "place" is very much described in terms of claim and territory. Every school board is considered to be a "territorial district" and also a "corporation" (Ministry of Education: 1993, definitions). Its Minister has the power to "annex" territories to the greater good of the "corporation" which requires new lands for schools. His or her authority in turn is enhanced by the investment on the part of the province, thus the authority of ownership is shared by the Minister, the province, and the taxpayers that support neighbourhood schools.

Ironically, talk of "territory" and "jurisdictions" and "annexations" sit side by side with articles like the following

True equity involves more than just providing everyone with equal opportunity for learning. It means that access to learning can be blocked in many ways: by gender or race, age, physical disability, geographic isolation, economic background, or even different ways of learning. (Ministry of Education: 1991, p. 8)

In this, it is important to note that the stress for "equity" is placed on the student. Such inclusivity, however, is not only unexpected for the "territorial district," but is in fact discussed in terms of damage control as a result of competitive drives:

despite paragraph 28 of subsection 171(1), prohibiting/regulating and controlling any program or activity of a board that is or may be in competition with any business or occupation in the private sector and providing that such regulations have general application to a particular board (Ministry of Education: E.2., 11,(35) )

A passage such as this indicates that competition "is" or "may be" present, and that instead of prescribing "preventive medicine" that would preclude feasible competitiveness altogether, the Ministry instead wishes either to "prohibit" or "regulate" those programs. It is only in the most recent amendments to the Education Act that discussion of the "other" starts from the vantage point of partnership: "Changes include
allowing school boards to eliminate junior kindergartens, and to cooperate with other boards and organizations" (Bill 34, March 28th, 1996). Education's language thus reflects an unease between the Ministry's inclusive vision and its oftentimes exclusive territorial practices, which, as is evidenced by this most recent call for "cooperation," is in need of reconciliation.

The Social Service counterpart, it has already been argued, has very little territorial claim over space. It is not surprising, then, that the territorial language of say, the Child and Family Services Act, is found instead in its sections on functions. Where the Minister of Education has control over a vast terrain, the Minister of Community and Social Services' power lies in an internal space, that being in determining the function of each employee under his or her control. A social service provider must

a) make the prescribed reports and furnish the prescribed information to the Minister, in the prescribed form and at the prescribed intervals. (Ministry of Community and Social Services: C.11, 5(5a))

The repetition of the word "prescribed" in this selection is hardly a matter of redundancy, though the fact that such language is situated in a section on "Flexible Services" is most definitely ironic. "Prescribed" could be considered a leitmotif of the Child and Family Service Act, and within its Regulations whole groups of sections ((214)24-30, with the exception of 29 ["provided"]]) begin with this word. One of the Minister's main functions is to "prescribe a) standards of service; and b) procedures and practices to be followed by societies" (ibid: 214(32)4). The Minister has incredible powers of "prescription," particularly in terms of social service providers and agencies:

upon reasonable written notice to the approved agency, [the Minister] may vary, remove or amend the terms and conditions or impose new terms and conditions. (ibid: C.11, 10(1))

In of itself, this kind of statement seems innocuous, part and parcel of defining and redefining social service "functions." However, placed up against the following, we soon see a disjunction
[The ministry declares] that the least restrictive or disruptive course of action that is available and appropriate in a particular case to help a child or family should be followed (Ministry of Community and Social Services: C.11, 1(c))

That "least restrictive" courses of action must necessarily not include such things as drastic change (in agency location, in its very terms of functions) means that articles like (C.11, 10(1)) above work in direct contravention of upholding that which is "least restrictive" to the child. In according the Minister such wide reaching powers to prescribe even very minute social service/servant responsibilities, his/her "prescriptive" powers are tacitly rendered more central than "the best interests of the child." The nature of these powers, moreover, tacitly allows for the exclusion of the Act's most basic declaration, making it appear that the Ministry accords more power to its exclusive practices through legally regulating them.

The Ministry of Community and Social Services has "as a paramount objective, to promote the best interests, protection and well-being of children" (Ministry of Community and Social Services: C.11, 1(1)). The Ministry of Education is committed to reducing any and all barriers that stand in the way of one's ability to enter and remain in the school system. The very statutes that govern these Ministries, however, are mired in talk of ownership, entitlement, prescription, and utilitarian "control." Though Ministry visions are inclusive, insofar as they recognize "equity," reducing barriers, and at times "cooperation," the steps and maxims required to undertake such collaboration is defensive and narrow at best.

In thinking of my interviews, where normative talk was invariably inclusive, but functions tended to be discussed in terms of borders and jurisdictions, it seems likely that such paradoxical sentiments find their source in Ministries that perceive no inherent contradictions between their inclusive norms and exclusive functions/claims to space. Organizational territoriality is rarely limited only to interpersonal relations, as the rules that govern one's work, and even a person's identity as an "agent" or a "teacher" helps
to form oftentimes oppositional lines of reasoning, where everyone becomes invited to a very limiting environment.

Ministry Statutes, it must be remembered, also reflect the design and function of government. That “cooperat[ion]” has recently been “allowed” in education, for example, suggests that competitiveness may very well be influenced by Ministries that allow oppositional philosophies of inclusive visions and exclusive practices to coexist within their internal statutes. Such calls to “cooperate” though, also tacitly suggest that the various Ministries do not work in concert. By this it is simply meant that inasmuch as Ministries are designed to function as a “system” of government, the realities of the so-called “relationship” between Educators and Community and Social Service workers suggests that the system isolates Ministry professionals from one another.

In this, the “partialized” service offered to homeless youth serves as an exemplar of the degree to which the Ministries function less as a system and more as fiefdoms charged with protecting their agendas and domains. Even the languages that social service workers and educators speak are at times mutually unintelligible (“it can be a problem if an agency is not familiar with how a school system operates” (Tina), “it’s just kind of educating the system [of education]” (Sara), “we’re in a constant state of education” (Carlos), “[welfare workers think] you’re out to cheat the system” (Carlos)). Comparatively, future research into the system of social service Ministries should look for whether similar unintelligibilities exist between government officials in both their opinions and their structural practices.

At times, those professionals charged with upholding the mandates of their Ministries may even compromise each other’s agendas. To illustrate an example, when a social/educational program needs to contact one of their students/clients at the youth hostel where he or she is staying, professionals working at that youth hostel will most likely withhold information about their clients in order to protect them from the dangers of being contacted by pimps or rivals who endanger the safety and integrity of the
"haven." Though such a breakdown of information sharing might be circumvented by implementing a *shared* communication network for professionals (or telephone line), such a *network* does not exist, which seems to be indicative of a poverty of structural investment in cooperative and systemic "service." Such a service "gap" represents only one example of social services that have the effect of being a "system" in name only.
6. Conclusion. Territory Over The Homeless: A Contradiction in Terms and Issues for Professionals

There is something patently absurd about drawing territorial boundaries around homeless youth, reflecting a panorama of issues connected between professionals, clients, structures, and community. The overwhelming emphasis of the most recent literature, particularly that of implemented programs, is on collaboration. Calls for cooperative efforts have come from Health Care, Social Work, Education, and the Social Sciences. Still, each of these significant visions originate from decidedly distinctive agendas. The very languages that educators and social workers speak reflect the unease with which "the problem" of youth homelessness is understood. Any implementation of collaboration, then, should also necessarily evoke a common discourse reflecting a flexible and yet shared advocacy on behalf of youth and homeless rights. This vision must also be supported by the practical application of a consistently inclusive homeless youth service model.

In speaking with William, he described his clients as having

...no sense of root. There's nothing that roots them. It was that lack of rootedness in whatever community that they are in...They flew toward the bright light [Toronto]...

Given the complexity of demands and risks of living homeless, mobility, which is a form of rootlessness, is certainly one of the keys to a young person's survival. A number of my respondents referred to the "migration pattern" of their clients (Sara), that young people often move out West to survive the winter months or lay-low to escape warrants issued for their arrest. The many reasons to stay "moving," (police brutality, peer avoidance, health concerns, crowding, etc.), either locally or provincially, helps to label this population of young people "transient" (Sara), temporarily located, and without societal "roots."
In this, a homeless young person has virtually no power to claim space, and while he or she may mark "territories" or neighbourhoods, this by no means can be considered a permanent or even a socially sanctioned claim (exemplified, say, in Metro’s proposed graffiti “tagging” ordinances, which theoretically would make “tagging” illegal within Toronto. A fair proportion of these “taggers” are homeless youth, who sometimes speak of marking their neighbourhood (territory/sense of belonging) or of wishing to leave their (permanent) mark on a physical object. A young homeless person is thus in a position of extreme powerlessness, where spatial entitlement is non-existent, evidenced quite poignantly earlier this year when the Mayor of Toronto forced the "eviction" of young people who were "squatting" in an abandoned (ownerless) property. Despite the fact that Mayor Hall cited health and safety risks as the rationale for her decision (Monsebraaten, L. in the Toronto Star, May 11 1996), these homeless youth’s complete absence of claim to even discarded and ownerless property is quite profound. That one of those young people was brutally murdered by a serial killer only three days after this “eviction,” a period of time in which this young man transformed from a "squatter" into transvestite prostitute in order to survive, leaves behind a desperate and urgent charge that the drastically marginalized, the territoriless, may even risk death when space is denied them.

Of course, a young homeless person’s lack of “territory” is also something that professionals discuss as a “feeling” that compels young people to leave home: “They’re also kind of unrooted people” (William). Failure at school, physical or sexual abuse, neglect, being a "multiply" foster child, and many other factors can contribute to this feeling of "unbelonging." Thus, the majority of young homeless people have had an ironic, punishing relationship with territory throughout their lives. These young people have been excluded from claim (ownership/identity/belonging) to the point where workers say that their clients are unable to express what they want, because virtually no one has ever asked and therefore educated them to what "want" and "need" mean.
Thus, a homeless young person experiences layers upon layers of marginalization, from personal relationships to that of space, "residence," and identity politics. This kind of "neglected" status is usually also something that has been very much a part of a young person's life prior to becoming homeless. Clients of agencies around North America speak of being disconnected, of being devalued or ignored by authoritarian figures like parents and teachers, or of being handed off from foster home to foster home (Webber: 1991). What neglect thus comes to mean in this context is a denial of territory, be it a territory of rights, ideas, emotions, belonging, or identity, a status that is reinforced daily by ignoring a young person's right to claim to a "home."

If we place this profile up against the issue of occupational territoriality, it becomes quite clear that servicing any homeless population will be greatly compromised by replicating the relations of disconnection that have formed the lived experience of these young people. Occupational territoriality, it must be remembered, is ultimately employment based, written in the language of the organization, where individuals and structures promote both inclusive and exclusive claims over the territorial properties of space, utility, and normative ideologies. Street youth form part of the pop-culture typology of those individuals who "fall through the cracks." Quite simply, this refers to risk fulfilled, of absences, neglect, and invisibility, the cracks representing separate institutions with gaps in between. Thus, if professionals are being territorial about such things as jurisdictions, ownership of clients, the professional "other," and information itself, even as they actively try to "reclaim" homeless youth, they will reneglect the needs of these young people.

REVISITING THE LITERATURE: CALLS FOR COLLABORATION

To give education and social services their due, each institution has already acknowledged that jurisdictional (boundary) gaps and professional isolation must be
overcome in order to service the overall community effectively. Internally, Social Services feels that among its delivery "constraints" are

1. Lack of consensus on what the objectives of services are or should be.
2. Lack of agreement about who should set service objectives. (Ministry of Community and Social Services: 1990, p. 75)

In 1990, the Ministry of Community and Social Services, in its internal report, wrote

One of the major weaknesses in the current system is the fragmentation of decision-making authority within groups of similar services. This causes confusion and frustration for both clients and service providers (p. 77)

One of the key expectations of a new approach to planning is that it should help to coordinate the broad array of services. (Ministry of Community and Social Services: 1990, p. 91).

Comparatively, the Toronto Board of Education also wrote

Ways that agencies can better connect with schools, including: jointly made long term proposals for coordinated efforts beginning at birth; short term solutions emphasizing communication, not just around crises but in formulating strategies. (Toronto Board of Education: 1990, p. 40)

Even in the realm of education theory, seminal figures like Michael Fullan feel that,

To the extent that each side [government agencies and education] is ignorant of the subjective world of the other, reform will fail - and the extent is great. (Fullan: 1991, p. 73).

In a somewhat larger context, the literature has also begrudgingly acknowledged that this challenge seems insurmountable in the face of a client population of homeless youth:

Many communities across the country have struggled\(^1\) to develop service delivery models that addresses the needs of these adolescents. (Journal of Adolescent Health: 91;12:550)

The few successful service plans that do exist hail from the United States, most notably in the cities of Seattle and Los Angeles. In terms of practical philosophy, there are two

\(^1\) my emphasis
essential ingredients to each city's plan. The Los Angeles model, which is a municipal coordination effort, formulates the relationship of services as a kind of "subcontracting:"

Our approach has been collaborative; we subcontract a substantial portion of the work to other youth agencies in the community in order to build and strengthen the network of existing services. (Yeates et al in Journal of Adolescent Health, 1991;12: 555)

Due to the potency of culturally adopted "normative" philosophies, and particularly referencing inclusive client-visions, the city of Seattle has adopted a similarly integrative mission statement for the practices of its services:

The city must commit itself to addressing the problem of homeless youth and the need to develop a regional network of services...and will work on the development of a unified advocacy agenda. (Smart in ibid: 1991;12,526)

In this, it would seem that a combination of vision and practicum makes for a reflexive, mutually supportive, and most importantly shared advocacy agenda that would betray no seams. Such systemic "seamlessness" would be to the benefit of both clients and professionals. A "seam" for a client is a prospective gap and therefore risk to his or her safety, whereas "seamlessness" implies continuity of care. Seamlessness for professionals allows for the development of an explicated, mutually understandable language that is consistent, and yet is flexibly related to each profession implementing the visionary "strategy" or advocacy. Moreover, a simple and common goal would make for better vertical "understandings" between the different levels of the Ministries and their government servants.

Here, we must recall Michael Fullan's words once again: "To the extent that each side is ignorant of the subjective world of the other...." It is this normative dimension of territoriality that is the most insidious and therefore hardest to "weed out." The logic and power of language, however, dictates that if meaning (sign symbol norms) and policy (turned into action) "state" an unbroken inclusivity, the adoption of societal inclusive service philosophies and practices will follow with greater ease. Explicated advocacy language has historically been an extremely powerful tool for generating
change, such as the critique of language used in Civil and Women's Rights movements, and should therefore represent a primary focus for action within systems as well.

This advocacy language, it must be constantly remembered, originates from the wants and needs expressed by homeless youth, as it is the victims who possess the knowledge that can best educate the "experts," who then must bring those words into the public forum and subsequently apply themselves to the process of implementation. These "experts" represent all the individuals who learn from their experiences in working with homeless youth. This obviously represents a multitude of professions and personalities. Some of the "interested parties" have already been engaging in coalition work, sometimes across occupational jurisdictional boundaries. These more formalized advocacy groups should thus necessarily be expanded, however it must be recognized that with expansion comes great philosophical and even practical changes in the day to day runnings of an advocacy organization. In being proponents of a practiced form of inclusivity, a giving over of power to the greater question of keeping youth safe from harm must follow.

As collaboration has already been a question of interest to each Ministry, internal and external reviewers could be appointed to act as liaisons in the initial "connecting" phase between practitioners. This liaison role might even be expanded to form a permanent position. Any person working in this capacity should most definitely maintain bipartisan interest in education and social services, but should also represent the voice of youth. In this, such a liaison will to some degree have to act in part as an arbitrator, in order to find the "common ground" to stand on. Perhaps at this point of unification, street involved or formally street involved youth advocates could join the program at an organizational level as well. The presence of youth may also help to sharpen the focus on unity, though this would by no means represent the sum total of the "voice of youth's" contribution. As it is basic neglect of youth that has sustained high populations of street
youth throughout Toronto’s history, young people are critical to the success of youth advocacy programs.

Initially, the concept of creating a larger network body through the use of a liaison may seem luxurious in this economic climate of job insecurity, particularly in calling for the creation of a "new" role. Economically speaking, however, "collaboration" has also been promoted recently in the literature because of economic constraints (Ministry of Community and Social Services: 1990, p. 179). If one could look through the eyes of a person who has worked with homeless youth for any length of time, though, it would record a human and economic cost of catastrophic proportions:

I think you're going to see the problems of the downtown core GREATLY intensify, and um, but they'll deal with it through corrections and police...Violence, okay, I see, I see crack use going up, because of that I see violence intensify, I see crime intensify and I see more and more people having to hit the streets...So what you see in a so many block radius is going to expand...

I think that in the long run there's gonna be so many people who die on the streets and who just have no way of digging their way back out and that the cost of what he's [Mike Harris] doing is going to be very high...

I mean, I don't care if we have a deficit, do you know what I mean? I don't want to have no deficit at the cost of people.

(Sara)

The social costs...are staggering...even if it takes a long time to get that person through school...[it's] a lot cheaper to keep 'em in school than prison.

(Geraldine)

I don't think we can afford the loss we're gonna take...There are far more kids on the street throughout the winter, than there were last year...You don't not pay for it, one way or the other...The most frightening part of it is that it's not stuff we're gonna see.

(William)

The urgency of these words merely hint at the long term effects of such an extreme poverty of humanitarian concerns over homeless youth. An unfortunate outgrowth of our system of service though, is that service providers are invariably blamed for systemic "failures." The question of "good" or "bad" intentions is not even of issue in a fractured and necessarily partial climate of providing service. The only question that
should now be asked, is what can be done to prevent youth homelessness? Our homeless population has simply grown too large to ask for any more Band-Aids when the call is for surgery.

The Bermuda Triangle is a force that indiscriminately swallows its victims. The potency of this Triangle once again is its effect as a totality, in making its victims seem to simply "disappear". The Bermuda Triangle itself goes unseen, and pivotal to the Triangle's legendary status has until very recently been the much mythologized *incomprehensibility* of what it does. The inexplicable functionality of the Bermuda Triangle has provided ample fuel for generations of travelers' fears of the unknown. The Bermuda Triangle is a metaphor for a potent, able, and seemingly indiscernible obliterator of people. That the relationship between homeless youth, education and social services shares even some of the Bermuda Triangle's characteristics speaks to a system that may be a better obliterator than it is a servicer, as it unwittingly continues to pull homeless youth into a maelstrom of invisibility.
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Additional pamphlets of information supplied by:

Anglican Houses: "Street Outreach Services"
Canadian Foundation for Children, Youth and the Law: "Toronto Teen Street Guide"

The Centre for Advancement in Work and Living: "How to Learn a Living"
Eva's Place: "North York Emergency Home for Youth"
K.Y.T.E.S: "Kensington Youth Theatre and Employment Skills"- memo
Metro Community Services: "Metro Youth Job Corps"
Metro Youth Employment Outreach Program: "Let Us Help You Get It"
Na-me-res Native Men's Residence
Native Child and Family Service of Toronto: "Youth Services"
Oolagen Community Services: "Oolagen Youth Support Project"
PARC: "Pape Adolescent Resource Centre"
St. Stephen's Youth Employment Centre: "Employers...How much time and money did you spend filling your last vacancy"
The Toronto Board of Education: "Dropping Back"
Y.M.C.A.: "HAFSY: Housing Access for Street Involved Youth."
Youth Link Inner City