Feels Like Home
Home-making by Homeless Mothers in the Shelter in Lithuania

Ginte Zulyte
s1056360
Master thesis, 2012
Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology
Leiden University

Supervisor:
Dr. Erik de Maaker
Department of Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology
Leiden University

Feels Like Home

-

Home-making by Homeless Mothers in the Shelter in Lithuania

Content

Word of thanks

The author of the thesis wishes to thank the following persons for their contribution to the realization of this thesis:

the homeless mothers and the staff of Child and Mother Care Home "Užuovėja" and Vilnius Archdiocese Caritas Mother and Child Care Home for their collaboration and assistance during the research;

the supervisor Dr. Erik de Maaker for his comments and advice with regard to the fieldwork, analysis of the data and its presentation.

Introduction

1. Research context

In 1990s Lithuania regained independence after 50 years of occupation by the Soviet Union. One of the most important changes was the shift from a planned economy into a market economy. The economy of Lithuania was rapidly separated from the former USSR. A lot of factories and other huge Soviet companies were closed without creating any new job prospects. The state was incapable of attracting many investors at that time. Therefore, a lot of people lost their long-term jobs. Moreover, a lot of occupations became useless in the new situation. Another significant change was the restitution of Lithuanian as the official state language. As a result, Russian people who did not speak Lithuanian were excluded from a whole range of jobs and disconnected from the more active social life in Lithuania. A lot of jobless Russians and other non-speakers of Lithuanian started sinking into poverty. Additionally, all the inhabitants of the country had to adapt quickly to the market economy where the state was no longer in charge of assigning jobs, an accommodation and sometimes even a car for a good worker and a loyal communist, as had been the practice in the Soviet times. The people had to learn how to plan their lives by themselves. A lot of inhabitants, who were not flexible enough to react to all these changes, became jobless, often for a long period of time. As a result, some of them sank into poverty, depression, and alcoholism. A lot of jobless people (not only single mothers who could not afford paying for public utilities (that means: water, electricity and so on) anymore) were thrown out of their accommodation by bailiffs and became homeless.

The phenomenon of homelessness became a challenge for the young state. The policy of segregation of the homeless (which was implemented under the Soviet regime) had to be transformed into the modern policy of integration of homeless people (which has been promoted by the EU). (The new political goal of Lithuania was to join the EU and other democratic political and economic organisations. Therefore, Lithuania began to strive to pass all their standards.). During Soviet times there were mainly two means for "tackling" homelessness: imprisonment of homeless people or their forced treatment in mental hospitals. Homeless people could not be visible to other inhabitants of Soviet Union or foreigners. Otherwise, they could ruin the propaganda image of the "perfect life" in the Soviet Union, because 'homelessness' in Soviet times indicated a failure of the state to take care of its citizens the way it wanted to. Rather than blaming that on the state, this was explained as the fault of the people who were homeless. Therefore, homeless people were treated as anti-social elements and it was warranted to lock them up. Only homeless children had a right to receive support from the institutional care system – they were placed in orphanages until the age of 18.

When Lithuania regained independence, it had to develop quickly a care system for homeless people in order to assure human rights for all its inhabitants and to implement the EU directives.

Although some Catholic charities (NGOs) were also very active in this sphere, the state still could not satisfy the needs of all the homeless people in Lithuania. According to the data of the Department of Statistics, in 2001 there were 1250 homeless people in Lithuania (Department of Statistics of Lithuania). At that time homeless people were defined as people who lived in the streets in cities, close to nodes of heating network, in drainage pits, in tents in forests or other public spaces (ibid). People, who could not afford their own accommodation and had to live in interim accommodation (shelters, orphanages etc.) run by the state or NGOs, were not considered as homeless in 2001. According to the Lithuanian practice interim accommodation is a shelter (run by the state or NGOs) where homeless people can stay in only for a fixed period of time. Its duration depends on a type of interim accommodation (e.g., 17 years in orphanages; 1,5 year or 3 years in shelters for homeless mothers; a night in dormitories for the homeless). Inhabitants of a shelter are supplied with basic conditions (a roof over one's head, food, sanitary and cooking facilities). Sometimes they are also offered social, juridical and psychological assistance.

During the independence there have been established four shelters for homeless mothers with children in Lithuania. They were designed according to a model of family-type shelters in Western countries. These types of shelters enable homeless mothers to stay together with their children. (In Soviet times single homeless mothers, who experienced difficulties in sustaining themselves and their children, had often the only one option – to abandon and put their children in orphanages.) The demand for family-type shelters has not declined in Lithuania since its independence. It has even risen since 2008 when the international bank crisis evoked economic crisis, which was followed by the new wave of homelessness. Most of the homeless mothers come to the shelters because of the lack of sufficient income for sustention of basic living conditions for themselves and their children. E.g., if a single mother has never been employed, she cannot receive any benefit for maternity leave. She gets only a benefit of 115 Euros for one child. She may rent one room in a shared flat for 90 Euros (including public utilities). In total, she has 25 Euros left for monthly living expenses and that is definitely not enough to survive. A single mother may also receive a benefit for the unemployed from the Labour Exchange in Lithuania. However, it is only for six months. As a result, if this single mother has not got a functioning social network (relatives and friends who can support her and her child morally and financially), she can hardly satisfy basic needs of her child and herself.

The director of the Vilnius Archdiocese Caritas Mother and Child Care Home, Vida Neverovič, and the director of the Child and Mother Care Home "Užuovėja", Žana Aleksienė, admit that the interplay of political, economic factors and psychosocial variables are characteristic of homelessness of single mothers in Lithuania. Similarly to findings of the research carried out in the shelter for homeless mothers in New York City (Styron, Bulman, Davidson 2000: 145), homelessness in Lithuania is also largely influenced by scarcity of affordable housing for low-income families; insufficient income for people receiving public assistance or performing unskilled labour; inadequate social services; an increase in families headed by women; drug and/or alcohol abuse; childhood and adult victimization; lack of social relations and parenting capabilities; current or past mental illness. Furthermore, both directors add one

more very important factor which significantly influences homelessness of single mothers in Lithuania. It is the psychosocial background of parents of homeless mothers. According to V. Neverovič and Ž. Aleksienė, most of the inhabitants of the shelters come from orphanages or 'asocial' families. (An 'asocial' family, or a family under social risk, is a family, which consists of children under 18 years of age and there is at least one of parents who: abuses alcohol, drugs, psychotropic or toxic materials; is addicted to gambling; is not able to take care after his/her children because of the lack of social skills; uses psychological, physical coercion on children or abuses them sexually; uses financial state benefits not according to the interests of family. Therefore, physical, mental, emotional and moral development and safety of children are endangered (Law of Social Services of the Republic of Lithuania, Žin., 2006, Nr. 17-589)). Neither in an 'asocial' family nor in an orphanage (where all the house duties are done by the staff) has a woman learnt how to take care of herself properly. As a result, most of them do not develop any self-care skills (cooking, doing laundry, cleaning up etc.). Additionally, they have not got any relatives and close friends, or their relations with them are broken (Interviews with V. Neverovič (17th Jan 2011) and Žana Aleksienė (4th Feb 2011)).

In spite of the significant role of personal reasons for becoming homeless, researchers in Lithuania and worldwide still tend to focus mainly on political economic causes of this phenomenon, missing out on the perspective of homeless people. Furthermore, scarce cases, where the psychological state of homeless people is analysed, usually highlight reasons for becoming homeless. However, they do not pay attention to the after-effects of homelessness. (The latter research would be especially crucial in the countries like Lithuania where long-term (more than 12 months) homelessness dominates (Kocai 2006: 56)). One of the main negative after-effects of the loss of home is considered to be the continuing degradation of self-awareness of a homeless person (Kocai, 2008; Kocai, 2006). According to Kocai, in the long run homeless people limited to basic needs, primitive and poor environment loose their abilities and deaden their reactions (2008: 109). Additionally, there are widely admitted assumptions that it is exactly home which depicts individuality of a person and helps him/her to reflect on his/her life-story and values of a life (Miller, 2008, 2010; Dant, 2005; Cieraad, 1999; Hecht, 2001; Woodward, 2007 etc.). Therefore, home-making is considered to secure and enhance the self-awareness of a person while inability to make home is expected to cause the opposite process.

The thesis focuses on the following questions: Do homeless people tend to make home in a shelter?; If yes, how do they do that?; How is their home-making related to their self-awareness? The analysis of home-making in a shelter is based on the data gathered during the three-month fieldwork at the two shelters for homeless mothers and children in Vilnius, the capital of Lithuania: Vilnius Archdiocese Caritas Mother and Child Care Home (henceforth – Caritas shelter) and The Child and Mother Care Home "Užuovėja" (henceforth – "Užuovėja").

2. Concepts, assumptions and arguments

Homelessness and home

In the thesis homeless people are defined as "people who do not have permanent accommodation and enough finances to rent or to buy at least minimal accommodation. Homeless people sleep outside, close to nodes of heating network, in drainage pits, dumps, in non-residential buildings and in temporary accommodation (shelters etc.)." (Department of Statistics of Lithuania)

The concept of home is understood as a complex formation. Its meaning is based on the multidimensional perspective elaborated in the framework of material culture studies in the EU and the USA (Miller; 2008, 2010; Morley, 2000; Dant, 2005; Cieraad, 1999; Hecht, 2001; Woodward, 2007; Seremetakis, 1996 etc.). During medieval ages home in Europe was perceived as a less clearly bounded space "(more like we might nowadays think of a café or a pub) and was open to the comings and goings of a multitude of diverse persons, involved in highly varied activities" (Morley 2000: 21). However, in the seventeenth-century Europe it became a space with "boundaries much more clearly drawn between work and non-work, insiders and outsiders, private and public" (ibid, 21). Moreover, in the nineteenth century it was complemented by important emotional aspects such as comfort and intimacy (ibid, 22). In Western thought the latter meaning of home did not changed much in the twentieth century. Nowadays, it implies three interrelated connotations of home.

Firstly, home "is inscribed in a particular physical structure of a house" (ibid, 19). Home and a house become as if two sides of the same coin. With respect to this connotation home cannot exist without a house or a building. Four walls of a house provide the sense of privacy and security for its inhabitants. Secondly, home is largely related to the concept of a family which is thought of as a nuclear-family consisting of a father, a mother and children. Therefore, home is usually perceived as its living space (ibid, 21). The third connotation of home highlights the feeling of affection to home. It suggests that home cannot be equalled to a house, a flat or other type of accommodation. While making home a person does not only invest in it financially or physically but it also has to make it on the social-psychological level. This means that home does not consist only of a bed to sleep in or a chair to sit on but it also includes one's taste expressed in choosing bed linen for that bed or memories relating to close people who were sitting on that chair. According to this connotation, a home space invested with both material and psychosocial resources "transcends geometrical space" of accommodation (ibid, 19). Furthermore, it also involves close people living together. Ideally, it becomes the most intimate and securest space of a human being (Bachelard 1989: 28; Tuan 1977: 30; Bollnow 1963: 152).

The definition of homelessness is, however, usually tied only to the first connotation of home. Homelessness of a person is often defined according to the status of his/her accommodation. E.g., homelessness is "an opposite of having adequate housing" (Glasser and Bridgman 1999: 2). However,

having taken into account the broader notion of home, loss of home does not result only in loss of a house, a flat or other type of accommodation. Home based on the third connotation includes emotional affections, memories, symbolical meanings, values, tastes of a person etc. Therefore, a human being who looses home probably will also loose self-awareness in the longer run. Consequently, the question arises: How does a homeless person cope with the loss of home not only in terms of the first and the second connotation but also in terms of the third connotation? In order to answer it, the research focuses on the home-making capabilities of the homeless mothers living in the Caritas shelter and "Užuovėja": Are they capable and willing to make a new home space in the shelter?; If yes, how do they do this?

Place[1] attachment mechanisms

In order to elaborate the questions mentioned above, the thesis draws on the relations between a human being and a space which are explored by the representatives of anthropology of space. The concept "place attachment" (Eds. Low & Altman, 1992) and other related terms used in the thesis are derived from this field.

One of the main assumptions of anthropology of space is that any space (home as well) is not a pre-given but a socially and individually constructed entity (Low, 2003). Each person makes a personal space in a different way out of general space. (E.g., a father may experience the entire home as a leisure zone, a mother may perceive it also as a work place, and children may embody it as a playground.) General space may be described as "potential environment" – a physical environment which is "only potential with respect to how it affects people" (Gans 1993: 27). In relation to this, a personal space may be called as "effective environment" which is "that version of the potential environment that is perceived, conceived – and created by users" (ibid, 27). Therefore, home, like any other particular and meaningful space, does not appear with a piece of accommodation but it has to be created by its inhabitants. While creating home a person operates in the framework of its cultural notion. Nevertheless, there is always a space for individual variations in home-making. When a person makes a particular and meaningful space ("effective environment"), he or she forms an emotional bonding to it. It means that he or she is no more indifferent to this space; he or she embodies it or longs for it. This kind of space becomes full of personal meanings and memories. An emotional bonding to a space is named as place attachment (Eds. Low & Altman, 1992).

In academic literature, three distinct place attachment mechanisms are distinguished: 1) place attachment mechanism based on social encounter; 2) place attachment mechanism based on the factor of time; 3) place attachment mechanism based on recreation of environmental settings. Riley suggests that

---

[1] In the thesis the term "place" will be used only in these phrases: "place attachment", "place bonding mechanism", "a sleeping place". If relevant see more about the ongoing debates about the difference between the terms "space" and "place" in: Casey, E. S. (1996) 'How to Get from Space to Place in a Fairly Short Stretch of Time: Phenomenological Prolegomena' in: Feld, S. & Basso, K. H. (eds.) *Senses of Place* Santa Fe: School of American Research Press: 13-52.

there are two important factors which enable a person to form place attachment: social encounter and time (1992: 19). According to this researcher, social encounter is important because "the attachment comes from people and experience, the landscape is the setting" (ibid, 19). To simplify, the longer a person socializes with his or her relatives, friends, and colleagues in the same space the more he or she might become attached to it. Thus, an environmental setting becomes as if a platform for socialising. The factor of time implicates that environmental settings may be not only "concretely experienced" (experienced at the present time) but also internally remembered and refigured. As Riley notes: "The essential experience is not to the landscape itself, but to its memory and the relived experience" (ibid, 20). For example, a person drinking tea from an old tea-cup may not only enjoy aesthetical qualities of a cup. He may also remember his or her grandparents or other relatives, and friends he or she was drinking tea with. Contrary to the place attachment, which comes from the social encounter and involves alive people from the present, the time factor enable a person to develop place attachment through mementoes by reminding of deceased ancestors, significant events in the past, people who are faraway or are not reachable any more. In the thesis the place attachment based on social encounter is termed as the first place attachment mechanism. The place attachment based on the time factor is defined as the second place attachment mechanism. Furthermore, these two place attachment mechanisms are complemented by the third place attachment mechanism which also enables a person to form an emotional bonding to a space. Marcus (1992) describes this mechanism as recreation or manipulation of environmental settings and argues that it is especially important during childhood. However, it is also frequently noticed in the later stages of human life. People recreate and manipulate their environment by creating or adding new material objects to it or by refurbishing it (e.g., putting new flower pots, planting a grove, making a bench in the yard etc.) irrespective of their age. These means of recreation of environmental setting allow a person to make new arrangements of a given material structure thus expressing his or her taste and leaving his or her "traces" in a territory. When forming an emotional bonding to a space all the three place attachment mechanisms involve material objects[2] and people from general space ("potential environment") as their resources. Those resources that play an important role in making of "effective environment" are called "effectors" (Pennartz 1999: 96).

Consequently, it is possible to make an assumption that the three place attachment mechanisms enable a person to make a home space on both material and psychosocial levels. Therefore, when a person looses home, these mechanisms are supposed to be responsible for making a new home space. Hence, are place attachment mechanisms observed in the home-making by homeless mothers in the shelters? Moreover, if a homeless person is not capable of home-making, does it mean that her/his place attachment mechanisms are deteriorated?

---

[2] In the thesis material objects are defined as non-human objects which can be mobile (e.g., furniture, pictures etc.) or immobile objects (e.g., an estate, walls of a room etc.). The mobile material objects are also termed as things in the thesis.

A lot of researchers also highlight the importance of place attachment for developing self-definitional processes, self-worth, self-pride, self-fashioning of a person etc. (Riley 1992: 10). All the three place attachment mechanisms mentioned above seem to have different functions related to building self-awareness of a person. The first and the second place attachment mechanisms (which allow the intertwinement of personal past and present) enable development of the sense of self-continuity of a person. (E.g., mementoes from childhood in adult home may remind of one's roots, parents, and other close people; they may help to evaluate and compare personal achievements in the longer run.) The third place attachment mechanism is closely linked to self-expression of a person. In relation to this, it is also important to observe the link between the place attachment mechanisms involved in home-making by homeless mothers and their self-awareness.

Arguments

This thesis argues that people stop making home not when they loose their private or rented accommodation but only when their place attachment mechanisms deteriorate. The weakening capabilities of the application of place attachment mechanisms in home-making reveal that the self-awareness of homeless people gets in danger. To put it the other way round, the homeless cannot regain their self-awareness as soon as they get new accommodation. First of all, they need to restore or develop their place attachment mechanisms.

3. Academic and social relevance

The phenomenon of homelessness is often approached from a sociological or political perspective by focusing on the political economic problems of homelessness: housing policies, social exclusion, integration of homeless people to a job market, unemployment etc. (Tucker, 1990; Daly, 1996; Tipple & Speak, 2009). However, the point of view of homeless people is usually obviated. Most of the researches on the lives of homeless people in Europe are implemented under the umbrella of the European Federation for National Organisations Working with the Homeless (Abb. FEANSTA). This organisation tries to "raise public awareness about the complexity of homelessness and the multidimensional nature of the problems faced by homeless people" (The European Federation for National Organisations Working with the Homeless). However, it remains largely focused on the comparison between governmental policies on homelessness in different European countries.

In Lithuania, the issue of homelessness is also usually addressed from a sociological perspective (e.g., the national report for the Council of Europe (Ališauskienė, 1997) and the two national reports for European Federation for National Organisations Working with the Homeless (Dzedzevičiūtė & Navickas,

2008; Urbienė & Žaronaitė, 2003)). The information provided in these reports is mainly an overview of statistics and the historical situation of homelessness in Lithuania. The reports stress the issues of housing policy for homeless people (Dzedzevičiūtė & Navickas, 2008; Urbienė & Žaronaitė, 2003) but do not reflect on their point of view.

As a result, most of the researches on homelessness lack an anthropological approach. They mainly analyse homelessness in the framework of complex societal problems (violence, urban poverty, sanitary issues etc.) and, first of all, they stress the needs of a wider society. An anthropological approach could give 'a voice' to homeless people in order to learn about their needs, priorities and feelings from themselves. However, even analysts, who focus on the reasons for becoming homeless, tend to limit themselves to an overview of statistical surveys. Moreover, as it was mentioned above, researchers rarely analyse the after-effects of homelessness on homeless people. The exceptions are the researches on the spatial experience of homeless people implemented by Robert Desjarlais (1997) and Martha T. Valado (2006). R. Desjarlais researches how homeless people living in one of the shelters in Boston experience its space and how their spatial experiences differ from those of the staff of the shelter. M. T. Valado reflects on the personalisation of public spaces by homeless people in Tucson, Arizona, USA. Both anthropologists reveal the link between spatial experience and self-awareness of homeless people. The thesis aims at exploring this link further and focuses on the relation between home-making in a shelter and the self-awareness of homeless people. Additionally, the thesis broadens the domain of anthropology of space and material culture studies. Although both fields have been analysing home-making, none of them has paid much attention to the homeless life so far. Additionally, the Lithuanian academic discourse has covered the process of home-making neither in the context of private accommodation nor in shelters and other spaces inhabited by homeless people.

Furthermore, the thesis contributes to the information about homeless people who live in an interim accommodation or institutional care (shelters for mothers and children, orphanages, nursing home, refugee centres). The latter category of people is still not so well represented in an academic discourse as compared with homeless people living in the streets (Bridgman, 1999 (USA); Desjarlais, 1997 (USA); Valado, 2006 (USA); MacFadyen, 2005 (India); Hasegawa, 2006 (Japan)). Moreover, Lithuanian researchers usually analyse a situation of homelessness in general and hardly reflect on different categories of homeless people, their gender or age. One work which aims at analysing homelessness in Lithuania from the aspect of gender is carried out by the sociologist Kocai in 2007. Kocai mentions that one of the main reasons for female homelessness in Lithuania lies in the Lithuanian orphanages which are incapable of preparing girls for independent adult life (2007: 3).

Speaking of the application of the results of the research in practice, it is expected that they could contribute to the improvement of material and psychological conditions in shelters for homeless people.

4. Fieldwork locations

Caritas shelter

The Vilnius Archdiocese Caritas Mother and Child Care Home is a non-governmental institution established in 2005 by the Catholic international organization Caritas. It provides a temporary shelter for pregnant women and mothers with children up to 1,5 year of age. It is located in an old, not renovated building in the old town of Vilnius. The shelter is able to accommodate up to 14 women. Most of the women living in the Caritas shelter are 20-23 years of age. However, sometimes homeless teenage mothers are also accepted to stay in (Vilnius Archdiocese Caritas).

Caritas shelter provides material and psychological support for its inhabitants. The women are advised on juridical and medical issues. Once a week inhabitants of the shelter attend social skills activities organized by a psychologist of the Caritas shelter. The women may also ask for individual psychological consultations. Social workers help them to find a job, their own accommodation or to get a place for a child in a kindergarten. Homeless mothers, who do not have domestic skills, are taught how to cook or to clean a room. During the summer time the staff of the shelter organises camps in nature for its inhabitants. It is important to mention that the Catholic background of homeless mothers is irrelevant for the governors of the shelter. Homeless mothers are not forced to go to the mass; they can confess whichever religion. Nonetheless, a majority of the staff of the Caritas shelter confess Catholicism.

The inhabitants of the Caritas shelter are usually the women who have not got a functioning social network. A lot of them have also experienced physical and psychological violence. Some of them are aggressive and suffer from dependence on alcohol or drugs. Most of the women come from the orphanages or from 'asocial' families. However, the director of the shelter, Vida Neverovič, notices a new trend in the social background of the women coming to the shelter in 2011. She states: "More and more elderly women apply for a place in the shelter; probably, it's due to the economical crisis and high level of unemployment."

Women are allowed to stay in the shelter until their child is 1,5 year of age. However, sometimes exceptions may be made to this rule and homeless mothers may stay here longer. If inhabitants of the Caritas shelter become incapable of taking care after their children (because of addiction to alcohol, drugs, other psychological problems), the staff of the shelter reports to the Security Service of Child's

Rights (henceforth – SSCR) (original name – Vaiko teisių apsaugos tarnyba). In this case, a child is usually separated from his/her mother and brought by SSCR into the Baby Care Home.

"Užuovėja"

The Child and Mother Care Home "Užuovėja" was established by the Ministry of Social Security and Labour of the Republic of Lithuania in July, 2010. As compared to the Caritas shelter, "Užuovėja" has a stable financial support. Therefore, the staff of "Užuovėja" is not forced to devote a half of working hours for fundraising like a few members of the staff of the Caritas shelter. The mission of "Užuovėja" is "to warrant short-term (long-term) social care, educational and social services for teenage girls (without parental care) with children. Girls must be assigned with temporary or permanent social care, or they may live temporarily in the Care Home <"Užuovėja"> with their children until the issues of their return to their parents or the assignment of social care is solved." (Child and Mother Care Home "Užuovėja")

There are 12 places for homeless teenage mothers with children in the shelter. It is located in a suburb of Vilnius. Girls usually can stay with their children in the shelter until they officially become adults (reach 18 years of age). However, if a girl is following a study programme of secondary or higher education or vocational training, she may live with her child in the shelter until she is 21 year of age.

"Užuovėja" is also collaborating closely with the SSCR. This organisation informs regularly "Užuovėja" about pregnant teenage girls or teenagers who have children and live in inappropriate conditions. It is important to mention that teenage mothers are not allowed to stay on their own or to live in 'asocial' families and other insecure and dangerous environment such as tents in fields, squats etc. However, they are also denied the right to stay in orphanages. According to the law, the orphanages of the Republic of Lithuania are devoted to children and youth from 1 year old till 18 years old. Therefore, no babies are allowed to stay in an orphanage. Most of the girls who live in "Užuovėja" are mothers at the age of 15-17 with children up to 1 year of age. They come from orphanages or from 'asocial' families in different regions of Lithuania. Some of them are brought to the shelter against their will.

Inhabitants of the shelter are provided with cleaning and cooking services during weekdays. Moreover, they may also use baby-sitting services if they attend school or some extra-curricular activities. If teenage mothers become incapable of looking after their babies, the SSCR brings a child into the Baby Care Home and his/her mother is sent back to an orphanage or other relevant institutions (e.g., rehabilitation centre for drug addicted people.)

Relation to the research participants

In both shelters I have encountered two groups of people: the staff of the shelter and its inhabitants. My position towards the first group (the staff) was quite clear: I presented myself as a student and told

them about my research goals, expected results, and methodology. Speaking of the homeless mothers, my role was more ambiguous. Having considered the ethical aspects, I have decided to relate to the homeless mothers in the role of a psychologist rather than that of a student or a friend. This role has seemed to be the clearest to my research participants and the most comfortable for me. Nevertheless, our first talks were not so fluent because some of the women were a little bit reserved, ashamed or did not have enough trust in me. Therefore, I invited them to 'play a game' – to make photos of their home spaces in a shelter. I passed a camera from one woman to another. Sometimes I used to leave it in the shelter for several days thus fully trusting the homeless mothers. Certainly, they could also use it for their own purposes (e.g., making their own portraits). I felt that the women were happy that I entrusted the camera for them. Furthermore, most of them really engaged in this 'photo game'. Nobody refused to collaborate due to the reason of not knowing what to photograph. Also, they were quite sure about pictures they would like to take. For example, none of them asked me to give advice on the kind of pictures she should make. Some of the homeless mothers even admitted that it was really an interesting task (Anžela, Diana, Jekaterina). Therefore, this collaboration seemed to 'break the ice' in our relationships and deepened our trust in each other. Their reliance on me was indeed similar to the trust in a psychologist who would not reveal your personal secrets or spread your thoughts about the others.

5. Methodology

In the beginning of the fieldwork I entered the Caritas shelter in the city of Vilnius. However, having faced an intense rotation of homeless mothers there, I decided to expand my fieldwork into "Užuovėja" shelter. I have spent about three months visiting homeless mothers in the two shelters.

During the fieldwork I applied the methods of participant observation, informal conversations (with the homeless mothers), and semi-structured interviews (with the staff of the shelters). I chatted with homeless mothers when they were taking care of their babies, cooking, eating or spending their free-time (which mainly consisted of watching TV). However, the women were eager to talk to me more frankly, when there was nobody around. Therefore, I preferred tête-à-tête conversations instead of talking with several girls at a time. I spent less time for interviews with the staff as our conversations were shorter and more structured due to the limits of time the staff could offer to me. However, I also tried to involve myself in talks with the staff during informal occasions such as birthday parties, church mass etc.

I was especially focusing on the patterns of place attachment mechanisms applied by homeless mothers in their home-making. Therefore, I also decided to apply the method of photo-interviewing (mentioned in the previous section) which turned out to be one of the most significant methods of the research. The method brings together collaborative art practices and ethnography in order to tell about research participants in a collaborative way. I chose to apply one of the photo-interviewing modes,

reflexive photography (Hurworth, 2003), in my research. When applying this mode research participants are asked to take photos on a specific topic (e.g., atmosphere at university, a trip). Later on, a researcher discusses and interprets meanings of these photos together with research participants (ibid).

The photo-interviewing method denies a role of a researcher as an objective observer. Moreover, it refutes a function of a camera, which is similar to that of a weapon, when a photographer can "shoot" something or somebody "beleaguered and too rare to kill" (Sontag 2005 [1973]: 11). This method rather "implies working with informants, attempting to understand and represent their points of view and experiences" (Pink 2006: 37). Photos produced and discussed by both research participants and a researcher combine intentions of both sides and should represent the outcome of their negotiations. Sometimes photographs, which are made by an informant, can "challenge the assumptions behind the ethnographer's original intention and initiate shift in the anticipated use of photography as a research method" (Pink, 2001: 58). Therefore, a picture taken during reflexive photography does not become a mere illustration or unquestionable evidence of cultural difference. It enables research participants not only to be observed but also to participate actively in telling their stories. Moreover, in their pictures they can release responses which are difficult to express in words.

I have found the photo-interviewing method relevant for the research due to the following reasons: 1) the method would enable the homeless mothers to participate actively in the research; 2) the pictures made by them would grasp unspeakable dimensions of their home-making process (especially, when some of the homeless mothers lack social and communication skills to express their thoughts in a fluent and coherent way); 3) consequently, the pictures would provide me with extra information which I could receive while discussing them (for example, I would be able to compare pictures made by homeless mothers with the objects in their rooms or in the other spaces of the shelter and to discuss the reasons for their inclusion or exclusion into/from the pictures); 4) my conversations with the research participants about the photos would not influence or direct their opinions about home-making. (The conversations made before the photography or without using the photo-interviewing method at all, on the contrary, could have severely impacted on their perception of home).

Having considered all the latter advantages in my mind, after two weeks of the fieldwork I asked homeless mothers to take 5-10 pictures which in their opinion depict their home space in the shelter. Later on, I discussed with each homeless mother the meanings of the photos taken by her. This discussion usually led to informal chats about the life stories of the homeless mothers, significant biographical events and their relation to previous home and to the shelter.

6. Structure of the thesis

The following chapter of the thesis present a theoretical framework of the research. It describes the relevant concepts such as space, home-making, therapeutic narrative etc. and relations between them. The theory chapter is followed by the chapter of data analysis which gives a more detailed view of the fieldwork locations and describes seven home spaces created by seven homeless mothers. (All the photos provided in the latter chapter are made by the research participants. The captions are formulated by the author of the thesis. The cover photo is made also by the author of the thesis.) Moreover, the data chapter aims at providing a reader with the whole view of home spaces created by the seven research participants. Therefore, all the photos made and selected by them for the depiction of their home spaces are included in this chapter (except for the pictures of their children). (The shelters prohibited the inclusion of the photos of the inhabitants and the staff of the shelter into the thesis. They were worried that some parts of the thesis or some information gathered during the fieldwork could leak into gutter press or internet. According to the staff of the shelters, that could have ruined the future of their inhabitants. Therefore, in the beginning of my fieldwork I had to sign the agreements with the shelters which prohibit the publishing of pictures of the research participants and their children.) Finally, the last pages of the thesis present the conclusions of the research. They reveal that there is a two-way relation between the self-awareness of homeless people living in a shelter and the place attachments mechanisms involved in their home-making.

I. Making a Home Space
A theory part

1. A space as a construction

One landscape – many worlds

As it was mentioned in the introduction, the emergent field of anthropology of space treats a space as a construction (Low, 2003). This approach to a space is grounded on the assumption that people construct particular and local spaces from universal, general, "terrestrial" space by giving personal meanings to a landscape they live and move in. Thus, "a single physical landscape can be multilocal in the sense that it shapes and expresses polysemic meanings of place for different users" (ibid, 12). The perception of a space as a construction is closely related to the ontological turn in anthropology (eds. Henare, Holbraad, Wastell 2007: 1-31), which refers to the works of philosophers Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari and, consequently, to the writings of Henri Bergson on the issues of human memory and perception.

In "Matter and Memory" Bergson explains the relation between space and human perception of it. Space is like "a net we throw under the material continuity of things in order to master it, to decompose it in the sense of our activities and our needs" (Guerlac 2006: 169). Accordingly, "…a space is added to material things after our perception of them" (ibid, 169). Here it is important to notice that things, however, do not exist in our perception of them – rather our perception is in things. As Thrift notes:

> Things do not need to be chaperoned by human beings to have presence or force. Many accounts have emphasized this point dating from before phenomenology. But it has now become something of orthodoxy. So, at the very least, things are counted as material prostheses to the human body, extensions that allow human beings to become more alive. (2010: 639)

Henare, Holbraad and Wastell go even further in explaining the ontology of things and draw on the "radical constructivism" which is "not dissimilar to that envisaged by Deleuze" (2007: 13). The latter approach affirms that things and concepts "are one and the same" (ibid, 13). Therefore, a person does not perceive things, but rather conceive them – "think them into being" (ibid, 14). By conceptualizing things a person or a society can make a world which is not just shorthand for a different worldview but a different world existing on its own (ibid, 10-11). (For example, in one tribe potatoes can be considered as food, while in the other they can be treated as power. However, it does not mean that these two different views towards potatoes are just two alternative worldviews. They rather signify different worlds.) This understanding of world closely relates to the concept of space used in this thesis. For example, the same environmental setting may have different meanings for different members of a family. A son, a mother

and a father may take different paths while walking in it. Moreover, they can use or conceptualize its material objects in a different way. They can also develop relationship with different people living there. Thus, they would make three different spaces ('worlds') out of one environmental setting.

Nevertheless, the approach to a space as to a construction is in quest for the further explanations and leads to the idea of "effective environment" and "potential environment" developed by the sociologist Herbert J. Gans and the concept of "smooth" space and "striated" space borrowed from the philosophy of Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari.

Dimensions of space

1) "Effective-potential" dimension of a space

Construction of a space never happens in vacuum. Herbert J. Gans (1993) distinguishes between "potential environment" and "effective environment". "Potential environment" is a physical environment which is "only potential with respect to how it affects people" (Gans 1993: 27). "Effective environment" is "that version of a potential environment that is perceived, conceived – and created by users" (ibid, 27). In other words, a space always implicates a dimension of the "potential" and the "effective". To be more precise, the potentiality of general space has to be made effective on the conceptual level (Pennartz 1999: 96) in order to create a particular space out of the general one. The elements of "potential environment" that play an important role in making of "effective environment" are called "effectors" (ibid, 96).

2) "Smooth-striated" dimension of a space

Another factor which affects construction of a space is "smooth-striated" dimension. Philosophers Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari highlight the distinction between the actions of a human being, who is constantly constructing his/her own space, and the outside barriers (usually made by a state or its institutions), which tend to limit these individual actions. Accordingly, Deleuze (2004) distinguishes between the "striated" space, which is formed by state order (e.g., highways, fences, city parks, private lakes, etc.), and the "smooth", nomadic space, where a human being moves unrestrictedly. This nomadic movement is not directional and functional like a movement shaped by state order. It rather makes expressive connections between a human being and a material object (mobile and immobile) or between human beings. Exactly these expressive connections form a particular and "smooth" space. As Deleuze and Guattari state:

> There is a territory precisely when milieu components cease to be directional, becoming dimensional instead, when they cease to be functional for becoming expressive <…> what defines the territory is the emergence of matters of expressions (qualities). (2004: 315)

The Deleuzian notion of "territory" could be compared to the concept of "effective environment", while the notion of "milieu" could be paralleled with that of "potential environment". Therefore, a particular space or "effective environment" comes into being out of "potential environment" only when expressive connections are formed between components (material objects, people) of "milieu".

It is exactly the three place attachment mechanisms described in the introduction (place attachment mechanism based on social encounter; place attachment mechanism based on the time factor; place attachment mechanism based on recreation of environmental settings) which enable a person to make his/her "effective environment" out of "potential environment" and to resist or "bypass" "striations" in a space. When a person becomes attached to a space, then it ceases being just 'functional' for him/her (e.g., a road leading from 'A' to 'B'). A space becomes 'expressive', because a person 'inscribes' in it the meanings important to him or her. As Low states:

> Humans 'write' in an enduring way their presence on their surroundings… <therefore> …space holds memories that implicate people and events. (2003: 13)

Belk similarly admits:

> To be attached to certain of our surroundings is to make them a part of our extended self. (1992: 38)

Consequently, place attachment enables a person for his/her self-extension in a space through personal experiences, interactions and activities.

2. Home-making – a process of home attachment

Home space

As it was mentioned in the introduction, the notion of home in Western thought was changing from the notion of a less clearly bounded space in medieval ages, "more like we might nowadays think of a café or a pub", to the notion of an intimate, private and secure space in contemporary world (Morley 2000: 21). In addition to the cultural influence on the construction of a home space, personal experiences also significantly impact home. In academic literature, childhood home is considered to be one of the main factors influencing preconceptions of future home-making:

> Contemporary home sometimes reproduce or reject features of childhood home, thereby reflecting place attachment as a past-present representation. (Eds. Altman & Low 1992: 7)

Therefore, people who have positive experience of childhood home tend to recreate or move some elements from their past home to their adult home. However, the people, who associate rather negative emotions with their first home, usually create their adult home dissimilar to their childhood home thus reinventing themselves (Marcus, 1992). Nevertheless, in both cases all the people having moved to a strange space generally decide about it from their previous experience:

> An anthropologist, traveler, or anyone whose place has been transformed, for example, by a natural disaster or suburban development – in other words, anyone dislocated from his or her familiar place, or from the possibility of local identity – is keenly aware of contrasts between the known and the unfamiliar. In such situations, people often see a new landscape in terms of familiar ones. (Rodman 2003: 216)

In spite of the significance of past experiences in home-making, the role of present expectations, interests, activities as well as gender and age of a person should not be underestimated. Home-making is rather the intertwinement of past and present.

Home: "smooth" and "striated"

Theoretically, home could be called a "smooth" space which cannot be "observed, quantified, conceptualized from the exterior, <…it> must be embarked upon in a tactile encounter with sound and colour, it must be conquered via itinerarization and ambulation which resists the production of a spatial matrix preexisting the act of traversal" (West-Pavlov 2009: 182). Nevertheless, in practice a home space can often face "striations".

On the one hand, the 'smoothness', security and coziness of home is significantly assured by four walls of a house that enclose interior space and exclude outside. The walls of a house directly reflect the psychological idea of the self and non-self (Woodward 2007: 156). On the other hand, the same walls of a house can "striate" a home space in the case of inconvenient architecture of an apartment or inaccessible parts of a house to some co-inhabitants (e.g., a workroom is usually inaccessible to little children). Moreover, a home space can be also "striated" by material objects which become junk in the long run or by sounds coming from exterior etc.

Nevertheless, "smooth" movement at home is an ever-lasting objective. It prompts a person to dispose of objects which "striate" his/her space, to 'inscribe' a home space with personal meanings and, as a result, to create self-extension in it.

Home and house: "effective" and "potential"

Philosopher Martin Heidegger (1975 [1971]) in his famous lecture "Building dwelling thinking" offers a phenomenological perspective to the relation between building and dwelling. His thoughts on this relation could be paralleled with the idea of the relationship between a house (building) and home (dwelling). Heidegger admits that building does not shape "a pure space" ("effective environment"). It is a human being who develops it by relating himself or herself to the locations provided by building ("potential environment"):

…Building, by virtue of constructing locations, necessarily brings with it space, as *spatium* or as *extensio*, into the thingly structure of buildings. But building never shapes pure "space" as a single entity. (1975: 158)

Accordingly, it is the relationship between man and locations of building that could be called dwelling (ibid, 157). Therefore, in order to dwell one has to be willing and capable of making connections with a location produced by a building. Moreover, dwelling expresses a special form of connection: dwelling means taking shelter in a house, in a location (ibid, 145).

Pennartz (1999) in his research on home tries to concretize the relationship between dwelling and building by looking at the relation between material aspects of a house and conceptions and behaviour of its inhabitants. To be more precise, he attempts "to distinguish those components of the home environment that are likely to function as "effectors" of the experience of the atmosphere <of home>" (Pennartz 1999: 96). The researcher finds that some architectural aspects of a building may provide better conditions for certain home atmosphere than the others do.

In addition to the immobile material aspects of a building, mobile material objects and relationships between people living together inside a house can also become important "effectors" in home-making. Their significance is revealed by the place attachment mechanisms.

Place attachment mechanisms in home-making

1) The first place attachment mechanism in home-making

A house or a flat can become a setting for socializing and developing relationship with closest people. Consequently, the longer period of time people live and socialize together in the same housing the more mutual experiences they share with each other. Moreover, a person also begins to associate material objects with his/her co-inhabitants. For example, a dweller can attach to their belongings or gifts, as the latter objects express the presence and nearness of people living together. Also, he or she may relate to the objects frequently used by them (for example, a sofa where a father reads a book or an armchair where a

mother knits). Thus, the relationship with the other inhabitants and all the material objects related to them can become "effectors" which make a home space.

2) The second place attachment mechanism in home-making

Home attachment, like every other place attachment, usually consists not only of present but also of past experiences (Riley 1992: 20). Therefore, home is not only a 'repository' for present interpersonal communication.

If a person lives in the same house or a flat for a long time, then past and present coexist in plenty of material objects[3]: immobile (e.g., a ceiling, walls of a room) and mobile. However, in the modern global world it is common to change a residence quite frequently. There are less and less people who live in the same accommodation through all their life. As a result, mobile material objects become especially salient in contemporary times. To be more precise, they come to the fore "when people possess nothing else, when things are the only tangible assets in the creation of a sense of home" (Marcoux 2001: 72).

Mobile material objects can connect oneself with close and important people in one's life and provide the sense of self-continuity including feelings of security, affection, relatedness etc. For example, a person may attach to a book, because it reminds him/her of his/her grandmother who was reading it to him/her when he/she was a child. Moreover, "things become all the more important when they constitute the sole link with a person, for instance a deceased person: an ancestor, kin, close friend" (ibid, 72). Also, mobile material objects kept at home can relate to the most important events of a life-course (e.g., graduation, a picture from a school theatre performance etc.). In the long run some material objects may even become "biographical objects" – material objects which store biographical memory or/and collective representation of the past (Hoskins 1998: 9).

However, memory can be constituted not only by keeping material objects but also by displacing or disposing of them. "Bringing things with oneself, then, is to make the choice of remembering" (Marcoux 2001: 73). (E.g., people tend to dispose of those material objects which are associated with the persons they care little or they do not like (ibid, 83)). Therefore, memory should not be treated as 'a box' where anything goes. A person has always freedom to throw away objects which are related to people or events that he or she wants to erase from his/her memory. Thus, material objects kept at home do not serve just for reminding one's biography as a sequence of events and for triggering all the memories from personal life. Therefore, the function of the second place attachment mechanism is not only preservation of the past experiences. It is also responsible for disposing of some of them.

---

[3] In this context it is important to mention that material objects possess the quality of "stillness" (Seremetakis, 1996). "Stillness is the moment when the buried, the discarded and the forgotten escape to the social surface of awareness like life supporting oxygen". (ibid, 12) ""Stillness" may take you through the journey to different times". (ibid, 16) In other words, some material objects may become like fossils containing time and, consequently, containing personal memories.

3) The third place attachment mechanism in home-making

Present conditions and aspirations of a person are reflected best by the third place attachment mechanism – recreation or manipulation (Marcus, 1992) of a house or a flat by creating, adding some new material objects to it or by transforming and 'refreshing' its old material objects. Certainly, this mechanism can also relate to one's past (e.g., when a person is willing to recreate his/her childhood landscapes in adulthood home). Nevertheless, it usually reflects the present of a person. Generally, people create, buy or redecorate material objects and place them at home in order to express themselves (e.g., a favourite flower or an image of a favourite animal (e.g., a dolphin), a poster depicting their hobby (e.g., tennis)). Also, material objects kept at home often objectify their present aspirations (e.g., a picture of a country one wants to visit). Furthermore, the process of redecoration and refurbishment of a flat or a house may mark the beginning of a new period in one's life (e.g., birth of a baby).

To sum up, the three place attachment mechanisms applied in home-making enable a person to interweave his/her past and present in a home space. Moreover, as it was mentioned in the introduction, all the three mechanisms implement important functions related to the building of self-awareness of a person. The first and the second place attachment mechanisms enable development of the sense of self-continuity, the third one – the sense of self-expression.

3. Home-making by homeless people in a shelter: a therapeutic narrative perspective

Homeless people and place attachment

If people have not got permanent accommodation, it does not mean that they cannot be attached to any meaningful space (e.g., childhood home, adolescent home, a cot in a forest, a shelter). Furthermore, they can try to apply place attachment mechanisms in order to make self-extension in certain parts of public or private spaces (a squat, an underground station, etc.). As Valado notes:

> What is revealed by examining homelessness from a spatial perspective is that homeless people constantly strategize to find or make private, safe, functional, comfortable, and supportive places in a hostile landscape. In so doing, they claim public spaces for personal use — importantly, this involves claiming not just a physical space but also a social space, a space where people can access social networks and fulfil the human need for social interaction. By claiming a physical and social space, homeless people establish regularity and predictability in their daily routines (May 2000; Wolch et al. 1993; Wardhaugh 1999), thus lending a sense of "time-space continuity" that is vital to personal identity (Rowe and Wolch 1990; Wolch and Rowe 1992). Though homeless people's effort to claim space draws censure, it is, at the most basic level, simply what humans do. (2006: 16)

These findings confirm that "…the fact that homeless people do not have the resources (or, in some cases, the desire) to obtain legal access to such spaces <a house, an apartment> does not mean that the human imperative to claim space is in any way weakened" (ibid, 16).

However, some researchers affirm that in the longer run the lack of environmental settings for self-extension and the lack of memories of such settings may ruin self-awareness of a person. As Marcus notes:

Without such memories our very identity as a unique human being may be lost. (1992: 110)

For example, when a person loses home (e.g., in case of fire), he or she loses a roof over his/her head. However, he or she also loses a 'repository' of memories that 'anchors' him/her in space and time. Having been separated from personal material objects, a person stops "thinking through <these> things" (eds. Henare, Iolbraad, Wastell, 2007) and in the longer run he or she might lose memories associated with the latter objects. Kocai also admits negative impact of long-term homelessness on homeless people by stating that homeless people limited to basic needs, primitive and poor environment loose their abilities and deaden their reactions (2008: 109).

On the one hand, the mission of shelters for homeless people in the EU and the USA could be considered as a direct response to the human imperative to claim space. (This mission is also frequently revealed by the titles of shelters which include a word "home".) Shelters usually function as a temporary accommodation for homeless people who abandoned or were forced to abandon their home due to different reasons (e.g., in a case of fire, acts of violence, drug abuse etc.) or have never possessed their own home (e.g., were living in an orphanage). On the other hand, by providing homeless people with a residential building shelters try to prevent their claim for public spaces. Overall, shelters in the EU and the USA aim at curbing homelessness because living in the streets is treated as an abnormal social phenomenon there. Therefore, a shelter usually serves as a platform for integrating its inhabitants back to society and helps them to dispose of their marginal social status. Inhabitants of a shelter are provided with basic or even medium living conditions (considering the standards of a country). Sometimes they are also assisted in developing their social and domestic skills or in finding a job.

"Potential environment" of a shelter

"Potential environment" of a shelter can look quite similar to that of a private or rented accommodation (e.g., a house, an apartment, a room). According to the policy of the most of shelters, this environment should inspire homeless people to create their safe and intimate "effective environment" – home. However, the conditions for home-making in a shelter implicate a few aspects which are not characteristic of home-making in a private accommodation. The first aspect is linked to different and colliding preconceptions expressed by inhabitants of a shelter about its "potential environment". The

second one relates to the rules of a shelter which result in restrictions on the three place attachment mechanisms.

A shelter provides its inhabitants with one "potential environment" (housing) which can be formed into different "effective environments" (home(s)) by different and in the beginning unknown to each other people. Additionally, homeless people are allowed to bring a few personal belongings (e.g., photos, a cup, books etc.) that they can use as the "effectors" of their home spaces. Different experiences, social backgrounds, expectations and characters of inhabitants of a shelter cause their different conceptualizations of mobile and immobile material objects encountered in a shelter as well as different relationships with other co-inhabitants. Thus, a shelter becomes a "multilocal place" (Rodman 2003: 215), which contains many different "effective environments". Furthermore, its inhabitants may differ in their aspirations and capabilities of forming their "effective environments". Some of them are less willing to make self-extension and to personalize a space of a shelter than the others (e.g., if one was forced to stay in a shelter). Moreover, some inhabitants can be not self-confident enough to compete for the relationships with people and common material objects which can be used as the "effectors" for their home-making in a shelter.

Nonetheless, the relation between inhabitants of a shelter and its "potential environment" is influenced not only by personal preconceptions and capabilities of people living in a shelter. It is also notably affected by rules of a shelter which are obligatory for all its inhabitants. The main function of the rules is to warrant order and security in a shelter. For example, social workers may enter a room of inhabitants at every moment and may insist on cleaning it; an inhabitant is allowed to switch on a washing machine only with the assistance of a social worker; rooms do not have lockers and inhabitants cannot lock them; etc. Also, a shelter is usually considered to be a temporal housing where homeless people are permitted to stay only for a certain period (e.g., a half of a year). In respect to this, sometimes rules of a shelter restrict application of all the place attachment mechanisms.

Speaking of the first place attachment mechanism, a shelter like a private house or an apartment can become an environmental setting where important social relations develop. For example, common activities organized by a shelter can inspire its inhabitants to make interpersonal relations. However, neither private accommodation nor a shelter could be fully protected from negative experiences or breakups of relationships. (E.g., a homeless person has to share a room with another dweller he or she does not get on with. The same could happen in a private apartment, e.g., when a couple is about to break-up.) Moreover, a shelter can limit frequency or/and duration of the visits of relatives and friends of inhabitants of a shelter. Sometimes it can even prohibit visits of some people.

Owners of a long-term private accommodation may be more privileged than inhabitants of a shelter to apply the second place attachment mechanism. The more time one lives in the same house or apartment the more memories and associations are stored at home. As it was mentioned in the previous sections, then a home landscape is not only concretely experienced but also remembered (Riley 1992: 20). Homeless people are usually allowed to stay in a shelter for a limited period of time. Nevertheless, these

circumstances do not deprive them of all the possibilities to 'embed' their memories in a space of a shelter. If an inhabitant of a shelter feels a lack of memories 'soaked' in immobile material objects, he or she can bring mobile material objects and place them in a room as his/her 'repositories' of personal memories. To paraphrase Marcoux, when people possess nothing else, then things are "the only tangible assets in the creation of a sense of home" (2001: 72).

The placement of personal mobile material objects is linked not only to the second place attachment mechanism. It also directly relates to the third place attachment mechanism (recreation of environmental settings). The latter mechanism is most frequently affected by the shelter rules. Firstly, inhabitants of a shelter are usually not allowed to refurbish their room or other parts of a shelter. They cannot renovate a room (e.g., repaint walls). Secondly, they are frequently not permitted to place personal mobile material objects where they would like to (e.g., to hang a picture on a wall in their room). Thirdly, meanings 'inscribed' by different inhabitants of a shelter can contradict or overlap with each other. Sometimes this can even provoke competition between the inhabitants for some material objects or for relationships with people that can enable their self-extension in a shelter's space. Fourthly, homeless people often face 'traces' left by previous inhabitants of a shelter (e.g., inscriptions on walls, paintings etc.) and cannot dispose of them. Finally, most of the inhabitants of a shelter come from the lowest social strata and cannot invest in decoration of their rooms. Usually, they are provided with basic sanitary products, food, medicaments, clothes, and some other things (which are mainly second-hand objects received from charity funds) but they are not given money to buy something extra for themselves. However, a shelter can also occasionally support the third place attachment mechanism. For example, if homeless people lack their own possessions, they can be supplied with some stuff from a charity, which funds a shelter, or from other resources.

Home-making as a therapeutic narrative in a shelter

If homeless people are willing and capable of making home in a shelter, they can immediately enter into the contact with "potential environment" of a shelter. The interaction between them and the "potential environment" can become very similar to the relation between a patient and a therapist who develop together a therapeutic narrative.

A therapeutic narrative is described as "a construction of an 'untold story' out of discrete episodes" (Mattingly 1995: 46). It aims at: selecting separate life episodes, making them meaningful during the life-course, and structuring them in a coherent plot (ibid, 46). As Ricoeur notes:

Emplotment is the operation that draws a configuration out of a simple succession. (1984: 65). (ibid, 46)

Each human being needs an emplotment because, according to Forster, human life is "'measured not by minutes or hours, but by intensity, so that when we look at our past it does not stretched back evenly but piles up into a few noticeable pinnacles' (1927: 28)" (ibid, 45). Moreover, a therapeutic narrative is usually developed "'between patient and therapist through a subtle and elusive interaction of the two' (Wyat 1986: 195)" (ibid, 43).

To summarize, home-making, as it was explained in the previous section of this chapter, is as if an untold personal story which is being 'inscribed' in a home space. Past is always being reworked in the present, thus allowing constant re-writing of a personal biography in a home space. However, home-making does not aim just at creating a sequence out of all biographical events. Material objects are rather used in a home space for making a personal narrative out of the most important events and the most significant people met in one's life (Miller 2010: 97). Furthermore, in a shelter home-making acquires one more quality which asks for a therapeutic narrative perspective. There home-making is developed through the interaction between two sides: the "potential environment" of a shelter and inhabitants of a shelter. The "potential environment" (including restrictions on it) acts in a role of a therapist, while a role of a patient can be taken by an inhabitant of a shelter.

In the following chapter a therapeutic narrative perspective will be applied on the home-making by homeless mother in the two shelters in Lithuania.

II. Two Shelters – Seven Home Spaces
Presentation and analysis of the fieldwork data

1. Entry role

Having entered the Caritas shelter, I have encountered two groups of people: its staff and inhabitants. Although in the first days I observed a few sincere moments and talks, there was also a certain distance between the two groups. Social workers were conscious about their personal space and social work ethics, while the homeless mothers felt shortage of trust in the staff. Having in mind these circumstances, I realized that my role had to be concerned with the two groups. However, already in the beginning I thought that if I fail to find a role satisfying both groups and myself, I would lean towards the inhabitants of the shelter and not towards the staff as it was not my direct informant.

As it was mentioned in the introduction, my position towards the first group (the staff) was quite clear: I presented myself as a student and told them about my research goals, expected results, and methodology. Speaking of the second group, my role was more ambiguous. The staff presented me to the homeless mothers as a student. However, I felt that the world of a student is quite far away from most of their quotidian lives. Majority of them had never graduate from secondary school or even primary school. Moreover, I was worried that they would treat me as one of the staff and would not be sincere enough to me. In respect to this, I was aware that I had to 'retune' my student role. I attempted to present myself more as an art student, a photographer who is willing to collaborate with them. However, they did not show interest in photography workshops. Moreover, I was quite surprised that they were quite good in making pictures and even editing them on the computer. As a result, my primary idea to attract their interest by photography workshops collapsed. Only later on, I realized that it is not so important what your occupation is or what you are doing here or at all. The women were rather judging my clothes, hair style, the way I speak and the words I use. E.g., they asked me why I was wearing legwarmers and if my eyebrows were plucked or not... They were exploring me as a person, as a woman. When playing the social skills game at the Caritas shelter I was really surprised that they were quite precise in describing my personality. Therefore, sometimes I really felt out on a limb while being 'a research subject' for five-ten 'anthropologists'. I got the impression that at least for a few of them I seemed quite a strange person: I had not got a child, I did not smoke, I was talking in a calm voice and I was not aggressive, I did not have relatives in jail, etc. …

After a week in the field, I assumed that I had two options of the role: 1) to become 'a cool girl' wearing 'cool clothes', using 'cool' vocabulary with plenty of slang, possessing an i-phone, studying at the foreign university and bringing make-up and cigarettes for homeless mothers; 2) a 'good girl' who wears very simple clothes, eyeglasses, sometimes naive and sincere, but has some knowledge (based on

the friends' and acquaintances' experience) about the 'real' world of homeless mothers. In a word, I was deciding between a role of a 'cool friend' and a role which is closer to a psychologist or a social worker. On the one hand, I realized that the role of a 'cool friend' might provide me more information relevant to my research. On the other hand, the women would have also probably wanted to show off in front of me and be 'smarter' than they really are. Moreover, being rich and 'cool' might have meant (for some of them) being far away from their world. Finally, nobody is so 'cool' when he or she shuts the door of his/her own room. Nonetheless, I would have probably continued considering pros and cons if the ethical dimension had not come into my mind. I remembered that in the first week I was asked by one of the women to buy some cigarettes, but I could not do this. Moreover, I could never buy or lend cigarettes or alcohol to any pregnant woman. Therefore, I was sure that I wanted to remain faithful to my own beliefs and values and to be myself as much as possible in the given situations. Also, I wanted to avoid the situations when I have to take one or the other side of girls in case of the quarrel between them. Therefore, the role of 'a good girl' or 'a psychologist' provided me with more opportunities to do this and to remain faithful to my personal values.

Nevertheless, the choice of the role of a 'good and ordinary girl' also demanded some information to be hidden in the backstage and some strategies to be planned in advance. First of all, I had never admitted that I was studying abroad because it would have probably been considered as a privilege for rich people only. Secondly, I was warned by the staff that I should not take care of any child of the homeless mothers or help them with other daily duties. Fortunately, this condition did not result in negative effects and also gave some positive results because my presence was not exploited by any girl who tried to shun her responsibilities. I carried babies only for a while or played with them when I wanted. Consequently, the role of a 'good girl' was limited to talking, lending an ear or even a shoulder to cry on. However, this role still implied one of the main ethical issues for the researchers: am I just exploiting my research participants and giving nothing in return? I decided to cope with these awkward questions not by radical changes in my research (e.g., changing my research topic or question) but by small quotidian actions. E.g., I took some girls to the cinema, brought a journal about studies or made some photos for them. However, in the end I realized that my ear for their life stories was probably the most significant for them.

While doing a fieldwork at the Caritas shelter, I started searching for another fieldwork location. Although I did not plan to do a multi-sited fieldwork, I decided to enter the second fieldwork location mainly due to the intensive rotation and mobility of the inhabitants of the Caritas shelter. (The girls were going to hospital because their children were sick; they ran away from the shelter or were expelled from it; they were giving a birth to a child etc.). I felt that I was constantly making new contacts and losing them after a short while. Therefore, in the end of the first month I started a research in another fieldwork location – the shelter "Užuovėja". As this shelter was established for teenage mothers with children, its inhabitants could not leave the shelter on their own will. Hence, this fieldwork location offered much

more stable conditions for making contacts with research participants. My entry in this field location was also based on the role of a 'good girl' which served quite well the purposes of my research.

After two weeks in each fieldwork location I decided to come back to the idea of photography. However, this time I did not offer photography workshop for them but I kindly asked them to participate in a sort of 'photo game' and to make pictures of their home spaces. I used to leave a photo camera for the homeless mothers who shared it according the order of rotation. As I realized later on, the fact that I entrusted a camera for them helped to deepen our relationships and mutual trust. Furthermore, in both shelters I tried not to show a bias to any of my research participants. I was also avoiding the statements or questions which would lead to gossiping. (E.g., "Monika said that you got angry on her because you asked her to pay for the cigarettes …"). Having realised that the relationships among the homeless mothers were quite tense, I tried to talk with each homeless mother tête-à-tête. Apart from this strategy, I did not have any special mechanism to make the homeless mothers tell me only the true facts of their lives, because I simply did not know these lives. I remember when I entered the shelter "Užuovėja", its director smiled and was fast to warn me: "Oh, they will tell you fairy-tales!" Therefore, at the end of my fieldwork I decided to check some facts of the stories told by homeless mothers with the facts about their lives known by social workers. Nevertheless, I was always aware that some of the information received from the homeless mothers should be kept only by me (e.g., their opinions about the staff). Otherwise, I could have ruined the homeless mothers' trust in me.

In the following chapters I will describe seven cases of the home-making by homeless mothers which I observed during my fieldwork in the two shelters. However, before presenting these cases I will make some remarks: 1) on the "potential environment" in the two shelters and restrictions on it (including the attitudes of the staff towards it); 2) on the common behavioural patterns of the inhabitants of the shelters.

2. The "potential environment" of the shelter

The Child and Mother Care Home "Užuovėja"

Renovated spaces of the shelter, modern furniture and the walls coloured in pastel tints gives an impression of cosiness and cleanliness. The director is proud of the conditions of the shelter and tells me: "They have their own room; they have a bathroom inside the house. I want to show the comfort for the girls. I want to tell them what home is. Most of them have never encountered such conditions. They lived in scrubby places or in the old buildings of orphanages." However, the architectural lay-out of the interior of the shelter reminds more of a school, a kindergarten than of a dwelling. On the first floor there is a cloakroom for coats and shoes. Next to the cloakroom there is an office of the director with a plate

"director" creating the atmosphere of office culture rather than of home. In front of the director's office there is a dining room where all the girls have their meals during the weekdays. The food is prepared by the cook of the shelter.

The layout of the second and the third floor is the same. These floors consist of 6 private rooms for inhabitants, one spacious living room, two bathrooms equipped with a washing machine and other facilities, a leisure room with a piano and some materials for hand crafts, a computer room, two rooms with toys for children to play or to sleep in and a kitchen. In the kitchen the inhabitants of the shelter cook for themselves during the weekends. Every woman is supplied with extra food for the weekend, which is stored in the fridge. Also, there is a cleaning lady which comes to clean the shelter once a week. However, the inhabitants of the shelter must always put in order their own room and clean some other common spaces (such as the living room, the yard, the computer room etc.) according to the time-table made by the shelter.

Every teenage mother lives with her child in a private room. The women may change the places of pieces of furniture in their room. However, they are not allowed to hang anything on the walls. The director of the shelter, Žana Aleksienė, explains this rule to me: "The walls are new and we do not want to destroy them with holes, glue or anything else. The girls may use a wall board or a mirror in their rooms for hanging photos or whatever else." Later on, one of the inhabitants of the shelter, Diana, admits to me:

> We <the inhabitants of the shelter> received the mirrors in our rooms because we asked the director
> to get them for us. Usually, we can get what we ask for, but we also have to buy something for
> ourselves, because we get some pocket money from the government.

The women are supported with baby-sitting services when they are absent due to the following reasons: attendance of school, health or juridical issues, extra-curricular activities etc. Nevertheless, they have always to arrange baby-sitting with housemothers in advance. According to the rules of the shelter, a housemother can look after no more than three babies at the same time. During weekdays homeless mothers may invite visitors (their relatives, boyfriends or friends) and meet them in a special meeting room on the first floor. The director of the shelter says: "The girls are not allowed to have visitors in their rooms due to the diseases, such as flue, which can spread." Žana Aleksienė admits, „It is not the official rule of the shelter". She specifies: "The rules of the shelter are quite abstract. Therefore, a lot of them are being developed in practice by evaluating the current situation of needs and possibilities". One of the most important official rules of the shelter is related to the temporal leaving of the shelter. The homeless mothers are allowed to leave the shelter for several days in order to visit their family members or fathers of their children. Nonetheless, they have to fulfil two requirements to be able to do this: 1) they have to write in advance a letter of request for the director of the shelter; 2) the destination place has to be safe enough for the homeless mother and her child to stay in (usually the director collaborates with SSCR and possesses the brand new information about it).

During weekends or holidays the women stay with a porter. The staff does not celebrate festivals such as Christmas or New Year's Eve with the inhabitants of the shelter. During these holidays the homeless mothers sometimes organise dinner by themselves and invite the porter, who is staying in the shelter at that time, to join them. The social worker of the shelter, Tatjana, explains that she does not feel obliged to celebrate festivals with the inhabitants of the shelter:

> I think it is above my work duties. I do believe that it is important to secure my personal space and to keep a bit of distance. Otherwise, they may 'get onto your back'. For example, Diana asked me when I would invite her to my home. And I already wanted to invite her, but then I thought for a while and stopped. I thought I need to leave the line between my personal life and the shelter. This line is necessary in order to get respect from the girls. They always know how to take, but they usually do not feel gratitude for things or services.

Nevertheless, Tatjana is fast to add:

> There should be a person like psychologist in the shelter. I was really shocked that all of them are psychologically unstable. Sometimes they are afraid even to go to gynaecologists on their own. E.g., Gintare asked me to stay next to her <…>. They are so much dependable on the mood: one day they can talk to you and the other they won't. There are lost of conflicts which one needs to resolve… Or the girls just want to talk, but neither I nor the director has enough time for this. We have to take care of other matters. <…> Well, I try to do my best and luckily I am quite good at "extinguishing" the conflicts between girls or calming down their hysterics.

The director is even clearer about her relationships with the women: "I simply do not have time to talk with them". Therefore, she seems to be pretty happy about my research in the shelter: "If you can make them talk – take all the information out of them. They are usually talkative."

Caritas Mother and Child Care Home

As it was mentioned in the introduction, the Caritas shelter is located in the old building in the old town of Vilnius. When one opens the door of the shelter, he or she gets into the dark, exiguous corridor. On the right of the corridor there is a staff room and a little bathroom. On the left of the corridor there are rooms for the women, a common kitchen and a director's office. As compared with the spacious "Užuovėja" shelter, all the spaces of Caritas shelter are quite poky. Nevertheless, they are clean and warm. The second floor of the shelter consists of one living room (with books and toys) and five more rooms for the inhabitants of the shelter. Each room is usually shared between the two women and their children. However, sometimes exceptions can be made and a woman is provided with a private room.

The director of the shelter, Vida Neverovič, admits:

Here it is lingering the spirit of a hostel. The girls are usually not very friendly with each other. All the girls are inclined to be on their own, because they are used to fight for themselves, for their existence in the environment where they come from. Sometimes two girls may develop friendly relationships. However, most of them get friends only when they are out of the shelter and start their independent life.

In spite of this, the staff of the shelter is trying to encourage the women to spend time together, to develop their social skills and to share their experience. For example, every Friday they have lunch together with the inhabitants of the shelter. (Also, during my presence at the shelter they organised several birthday parties for its inhabitants and the visit of Eminence Metropolitan Bishop of Lithuania. The homeless mothers were responsible for making pies, tea and setting a table. Both the women and the staff of the shelter seemed to be quite happy about this celebration.)

The rules of the shelter are also a bit similar to those of a hostel. E.g., the women must clean the shelter according to the time-table. There is also a schedule for lunch cooking and kitchen cleaning. Every day a different inhabitant of the shelter is obliged to cook lunch. Moreover, on weekdays the girls are awakened up by the social workers at 9 am. They have to put their rooms in order until 10 am. During the day the homeless mothers may attend vocational training or leave for the meetings. However, they must assure the baby-sitting for their babies or take them together with them. Usually, they ask one another, a social worker or a volunteer of the shelter for baby-sitting. The women always have to return to the shelter by 8 pm. Nonetheless, if they want to leave the shelter for several days, they have to hand in a request explaining the reasons for going away. 8 pm is also the deadline for visitors of the shelter. No visitors are allowed to stay any longer. Also, it is important to mention that boyfriends of the inhabitants of the shelter and even fathers of their babies are not allowed to come to the shelter. The women may arrange meetings with them in a city, in a yard, but not in the shelter. This rule, according to the social workers of the shelter, "is necessary for the safety of the inhabitants of the shelter in order to prevent thefts and also to prevent the girls from getting pregnant again." On the weekends the inhabitants of the shelter are left on their own. However, one of them is always assigned as a porter. A porter of a weekend is responsible for locking the gates and doors of the shelter or calling an ambulance. Therefore, if anybody face serious problems during the weekend (conflicts, sickness), they have to address primarily to a woman in a position of a porter.

The psychologist of the shelter tells me:

They have to adapt to the rules of the shelter and to get on with the other inhabitants here. It is good for these girls who are diligent and like to work, to do something. Those who are hectors feel bad in the shelter. The mature single mothers usually understand that you are provided with good conditions here for only 12 euros per month: you receive help from social workers, get some food products, cloths and other goods from charity, you may leave your child under the surveillance of the staff or other girls. However, if you are used, e.g., to live in an orphanage, where everything is made,

cleaned and given for you – you will feel dissatisfied in the shelter because here you will have to adapt to the rules and to get on with the others.

During my stay there was a big rotation among the inhabitants of the shelter. According to the social workers some of the women were expelled from the shelter due to their "intractable character and inappropriate behaviour". The psychologist was more precise and explained: "Most of the girls are expelled from the shelter after they have been found drunk for the third time. Some of them leave the shelter on their own will, because the rules of the shelter seem to be too strict and unbearable for them." The social worker of the shelter adds: "The girls are usually given one more try and they might be allowed to return to the shelter. Usually, this happens. For example, Irma <the name of the inhabitant of the shelter> has been accepted to the shelter for three times already.

3. Observations on the common behavioural patterns of the inhabitants of the shelters

Neither the same "potential environment" of the shelter nor the same restrictions on it can determine the sameness of the "effective environments" made by the inhabitants of the shelter. However, these factors may still cause a few similarities between the behavioural patterns of the homeless inside the shelter and a few commonalities of their connections with the outside world.

Inside world of the shelter

The layout of the both shelters and the joint activities (especially in the Caritas shelter) of homeless mothers suppose to create atmosphere favourable to the development of their sense of community. However, the inhabitants of the shelter usually do not tend to make close relationships with each other. In both shelters they are inclined to spend most of the time in their rooms. Common rooms which are supposed to be the spaces for socialising are frequently empty. The kitchens, the dining room and living rooms are usually occupied during the lunch or dinner time while cooking. Nevertheless, when the food is ready, the women usually take their plates with meals into their rooms and eat there. In the Caritas shelter the living room is usually used only during the events initiated by the staff (e.g., celebrations and meetings), while in "Užuovėja" it is basically used for baby-sitting by the housemothers. The women do not gather to drink tea or to watch TV in the common spaces. They do not visit very frequently each other's rooms as well. However, common spaces sometimes become "conflict zones". During my presence the severe fights (including physical attacks) between homeless mothers broke in the kitchen of "Užuovėja" and in the living room of the Caritas shelter.

The latter observations reveal that homeless mothers avoid contacts with other inhabitants or the staff, even though their interaction is usually encouraged by the shelters. Thus, homeless mothers partially reject the first place attachment mechanism. Furthermore, they usually feel that the social encounters with other co-inhabitants "striate" their space. Therefore, they try to spend more time in their own rooms which are treated by homeless mothers as their "smoothest" space. Aspiring for changes and renewal of their home spaces the women do not try to expand them into other spaces of the shelters. They rather apply the third place attachment mechanism in their rooms. For example, they especially like removing pieces of furniture. One of the homeless mothers, Viktorija, explains this habitude: "One gets bored very fast with the same setting of furniture in the room. It is exciting to change places of furniture in the room. It makes you feel like in a new place." As a result, replacement of furniture in the personal rooms becomes one of the ways of recreating one's room in the shelter.

Connections with the outside world

While avoiding the relationships with each other and the staff of the shelter, homeless mothers are also not very keen on making relations with the new world outside the shelter. Most of the homeless mothers leave the shelter very rarely. Although the women may leave it more often (e.g., for their leisure activities), only a few of them use this opportunity and attend a dance studio. Some of them go out only when they have to attend a school or visit a doctor. Also, they are unwilling to have a walk with their children in the open air.

The only new people, who are very welcome by some homeless mothers, are their new or 'potential' boyfriends (usually met in vocational training courses or in a new school). However, both of the shelters apply restrictions on the visits of boyfriends or fathers of the children of homeless mothers. As it was mentioned above, in the Caritas shelter the homeless mothers are not allowed to meet with them, while in "Užuovėja" they can invite them into the shelter, but not into their own rooms or the kitchen. (The women are permitted to see the guests in the special meeting room on the first floor of the shelter next to the director's room.) Some of the homeless mothers also occasionally enter into the contact with their family members or relatives (e.g., mothers, sisters, brothers, grandmothers etc.). The women are allowed to visit them at their home or to meet them in the shelter during the visit hours. However, if homeless mothers want to visit their relatives with their children, they must also have a permit by SSCR. All these restrictions affect the first place attachment mechanism and "striate" the home space of the most of the homeless mothers in the shelters.

Some of them try to overcome the barriers against their connection with the boyfriends and relatives by using mobile phones. A majority of the women do not leave them out of their hands. Moreover, they seem to be very proud when somebody calls them or sends a text message. Then they usually try to talk loudly or to announce to everybody about a person they were talking to. Thus, the phone calls and incoming messages enable the homeless mothers not only to keep the relationships, but

also to show off and to demonstrate to each other their importance to the outside world and their resources of "social capital".

4. Presentation of the seven cases

<This section of the thesis is omitted due to the embargo>

Conclusions

In this chapter the fieldwork data are summarised in regard to the main research questions: how does a homeless person cope with the loss of home?; are the homeless mothers, who live in the Caritas shelter and "Užuovėja", capable and willing to make their new home in the shelter?; if a homeless person is not capable of home-making, does it mean that her/his place attachment mechanisms are deteriorated?; what is the relationship between the place attachment mechanisms involved in home-making by homeless mothers and their self-awareness? At the end of the chapter the overall conclusion of the thesis is also provided.

1. Place attachment mechanisms and their roles in the home-making in the shelter

Having overviewed the fieldwork data, it is possible to discern all the three place attachment mechanisms in the home-making by homeless mothers in the Vilnius Archdiocese Caritas Mother and Child Care Home and the Child and Mother Care Home "Užuovėja": 1) the first place attachment mechanism based on social encounter; 2) the second place attachment mechanism based on the factor of time; 3) the third place attachment mechanism based on recreation of environmental settings. However, not all of them are equally significant for the home-making by homeless mothers. The inhabitants of the shelter frequently form an emotional bonding to the shelter's space through the second place attachment mechanism, which mainly involves mementoes referring to deceased ancestors, people, who are faraway or are not reachable any more, and significant events in the past. Also, in their home-making homeless mothers apply the third place attachment mechanism, which is based on recreation and manipulation of the environment by creating or adding some new material objects to it or by refurbishing it. The first place attachment mechanism, which enables a person to form an emotional bonding to a space through socializing with live people in the present, is hardly used by the homeless mothers in their home-making in the shelter.

The second place attachment mechanism – self-continuity

The second place attachment mechanism is most often noticed in the home spaces of the three inhabitants of the shelters: Diana and Anžela ("Užuovėja") and Jekaterina (Caritas shelter). The "potential environment" of the shelter for these homeless mothers becomes a setting where they mostly 'inscribe' memories from their life before coming to the shelter. In their home-making they use the "effectors" relating to their past: mobile material objects brought from their previous home (childhood home or an orphanage) or given as a present by their closest relatives or friends. E.g., Jekaterina chooses

38

her "biographical object" – the wooden masks which transmit the feeling of her childhood home; Anžela refers to the angel statues given as presents by her mother and sister; Diana includes the photo of her father and the postcard given by the father of her son. In all these three cases the chosen material objects form a home space which is significantly marked by kinship or love relationship. Thus, it includes close relatives or boyfriends, except for the ones who are associated with hurtful memories (e.g., the mother of Diana, the "biological mother" of Jekaterina or the boyfriend of Anžela). Also, the home spaces of these three women contain gifts (candlesticks given by classmates in the case of Diana) or self-made objects (the postcard of Anžela and the imprint of her daughter's feet on the piece of gypsum) relating to the past experiences.

The importance of bygone experiences in the home spaces of Jekaterina, Anžela and Diana primarily reveals their preference for the sense of self-continuity among other feelings in their home spaces. Moreover, their home-making aims at creating a narrative which resembles a selected pile of the most significant good people and events in their lives rather than just an orderly sequence of biographical facts. Hence, these women (despite the difference in their age) are capable of deep reflection and judgment on the past events from the present perspective. They are keen on filtering their past and including only the brightest memories into their home spaces. For example, Diana, Anžela and Jekaterina tend to exclude almost all of the events experienced or people met during their stay at the shelter. (To be more precise, Diana is the only one who resolves to include into her home space her recent past – gifts from her new boyfriend on St. Valentine's Day and common spaces of the shelter.) Their choice to exclude the period spent in the shelter could be best explained by the words of Jekaterina: "A life in the shelter is not the brightest period in one's life. You do not want to stick to it for all".

Also, it is crucial to add that all the three women have experienced family-life. Anžela and Diana lived with their mothers till they became ten years of age and Jekaterina stayed in her grandparents' family through all her childhood and adolescence. The significance of this experience is also reflected by their complaints about the strict rules of the shelter. (Jekaterina complains about the time restrictions on the visitors in the shelter. Diana is not satisfied about the domestic regulations in the shelter.) While complaining about them, the women compare a shelter with a home space where this kind of rules does not exist. Consequently, these three cases directly confirm that:

> Our memories of such settings of self-expression <like childhood home> are profoundly important reminders of self-identity, especially so at times in our lives when that very identity is weakened or threatened. Without such memories our very identity as a unique human being may be lost. (Marcus 1992: 110)

The development of the sense of self-continuity through home-making enhances their individuality, prevents their unstable behaviour and violent acts. Accordingly, Jekaterina, Anžela and Diana are

characterized by the staff as the most gentle, wisest and friendliest homeless mothers as compared with the other inhabitants of the shelter.

The third place attachment mechanism – self-expression

As it was mentioned in the previous chapter, the third place attachment mechanism is rather restricted by the rules of the shelter. Despite these restrictions, it frequently appears in the home-making by the homeless mothers. As the homeless mothers are not able to refurbish or renovate their rooms in the shelter (e.g., to repaint walls or to buy new furniture), they mostly use self-made objects for their recreation (e.g., the works from colour glue: the cow, the flower and the butterfly made by Viktorija; the birds made by Laura; the heart made by Gintarė and the mouse made by Anžela). Additionally, they like to replace the furniture in order to "refresh" their rooms.

Although this place attachment mechanism is characteristic of many home spaces of the homeless mothers, Laura and Viktorija devote most attention to it. These two women mostly include into their home spaces self-made objects or images depicting their hobbies. Viktorija expresses herself by referring to her passion for rural life (the pictures of cows and flowers made from colour glue). Also, she highlights her affection for her son's father (the picture of the rose given by him). Laura chooses for her home space only two elements present in her room: the elephant (on her son's sweater) signifying fortune and birds (made from colour glue) signifying freedom. However, she also makes the "imaginary recreation" of her home. The woman refers to the objects she would like to bring into her home space from the other parts of the shelter mainly due to their aesthetical qualities or relation to her hobby (the colourful toy-house and the blanket with dolphins).

The role of the past is not significant in the home-making by Viktorija and Laura (contrary to Anžela, Diana and Jekaterina). None of them includes pictures of material objects related to the past. Certainly, it does not mean that they simply neglect the past. On the contrary, the two women perceive their past as being alive and closely linked with the present in their hometowns. Viktorija and Laura have not lost the connection with their previous home. Their mothers, sisters and fathers of their sons are living there and they are still keeping in touch with them. Therefore, Viktorija and Laura do not feel any need to preserve the past. Furthermore, they do not have any distance to their past in order to be able to reflect on it and to filter it. The women treat their life in the shelter as forced conditions imposed on them by the Security Service of Child's Rights. Yet, they cannot resist forming a temporary home space in the shelter. Even if they want to get back to their "true home" as soon as possible, a temporary home space is necessary for them in order to mark their private territory and to separate it from the general space of the shelter.

These two cases reveal that home-making in a shelter becomes crucial for ensuring the sense of self-expression as one of the main elements of self-awareness. This is even valid in the cases when homeless mothers strongly identify with their still existing, previous living places. Self-expression closely

relates to self-pride and enables a person to distinguish himself/herself out of the other inhabitants of a shelter and to mark his/her personal territory. As a result, it also prevents a person from feeling the void which appears when one is removed from a previous living place.

The absence of the first place attachment mechanism

The "potential environment" and the rules of the shelter seem to be very favourable for the first place attachment mechanism. The layout of the both shelters resembles an interior of a usual hostel. The homeless mothers live in single or double rooms and share communal spaces. As a result, their trajectories intersect daily when they are cooking, eating, doing laundry or sitting in the computer room etc. These common activities suppose to form the sense of community. Moreover, the communal spirit in the shelter is encouraged by the social workers. They regularly try to organise birthday parties, trips, celebrations of seasonal festivals, and other activities gathering all the inhabitants of the shelter. However, the shelter does not become a space for active interpersonal communication between homeless mothers or between homeless mothers and the staff. As a result, the first place attachment mechanism hardly appears in the home-making by homeless mothers.

Diana is the only one who includes into her home space communal rooms (the living room, the kitchen, the playing room) in which the daily trajectories of homeless mothers intersect with each other. (In this context, it is important to remind that the kitchen, the living room and the bathroom, pictured in the photos of Gintare, are used only by her, as she lives alone on the upper floor.) Also, none of the inhabitants of the shelter includes into her home space material objects for common use. Furthermore, neither Diana nor the other women include any photos of the other people living in the shelter except for their own children. The children are included into the home spaces by all the women apart from Jekaterina, who says that "children are human beings who live at home but do not make it". These findings echo the results of the research on family homelessness which reveals that in many cases relationship with children is "the sole source of social support" and "a reason to keep living" for homeless mothers (Styron, Bulman & Davidson 2000: 154).

In their home spaces the homeless women avoid the elements which are characteristic of the communal shelter's life for several reasons. Firstly, it can be explained by the words of Jekaterina: "A life in the shelter is not the brightest period in one's life." Therefore, they are reluctant to 'inscribe' the meanings related to the common spaces of the shelter and to the other inhabitants into their home spaces. In spite of this, the experiences of communal life in the shelter should not be associated only with negative feelings. They also may involve positive moments. E.g., homeless mothers may make friendships with each other, as in the case of Laura and Anžela. However, friends are not considered by the homeless mothers to be a part of a family: "Friends are not really home…" (Diana). This statement reveals that a home space is strongly associated by the homeless mothers with the concept of a nuclear family. As a result, it reveals the second reason for excluding the other inhabitants and the staff of the

shelter from their home spaces. Thirdly, the restrictions on the visitors of the shelter inhibit homeless mothers from experiencing the shelter as a setting for socializing with their close people. Fourthly, the homeless mothers feel the lack of control for the communal spaces. One has to be self-confident and to possess leadership qualities in order to be able to compete for the control of these spaces. However, most of the homeless mothers feel in there like adolescents who are not in control of their rooms in the flats of their parents (Marcus 1992: 105). The women are not able to compete for or to share material objects in the communal spaces (such as dishes in the kitchen or the same washing machine in the laundry room) or relationships with people which could enable their self-extension in the space of the shelter. Consequently, communal spaces in the shelter are experienced by the homeless mothers as anonymous and transitory rooms rather than living spaces.

Mobile phones also come to the fore front here, as they help to resist the communal life of the shelter. They become one of the main means for distinguishing oneself from the others. As it was mentioned in the previous chapter, each text message or a phone call, which is received by the homeless mothers, shows their connections with the outside world. Thus, it demonstrates their "social capital" to the other homeless mothers and to the staff of the shelter. All these observations reveal that integration into the community and perception of the communal spaces of the shelter as a part of one's home signifies for homeless mothers the loss of their individuality.

The deteriorated place attachment mechanisms – problematic self-awareness

The cases of Irma and Gintarė reveal the deteriorated functions of the place attachment mechanisms which result in difficulties in home-making.

Irma does not apply any place attachment mechanism in the shelter. Moreover, she does not express any sentiments for her previous living place – her "grandmother's home" (as she puts it). It does not mean that Irma possesses no human imperative for claiming a space. She simply lacks capabilities and experience in application of any of the place attachment mechanisms. Although Irma refers to her child while talking about home, she is not capable of developing the broader sense of home-making. Irma admits that her belongings are packed in boxes, which are stored at her grandmother's home, but she does not express any need to bring them in the shelter. While the other homeless mothers actively use mobile material objects in their home-making, Irma does not find their presence in her room useful. As a result, her room in the shelter has no personal meanings and reveals her lack of self-awareness. The latter feature is confirmed by her unstable behaviour. (Irma frequently runs away from the shelter. Moreover, she is often exploited by the other inhabitants of the shelter and deceived regularly by her 'short-term' boyfriends.)

Gintarė, contrary to Irma, tries to apply all the place attachment mechanisms while making home. However, none of them is well developed. The majority of her photos of home space are devoted to dwelling activities (bathing, cooking, eating, watching TV, playing, etc.) implemented by her or her child.

Although all these functions are definitely involved in home-making, they do not make part of any of the place attachment mechanisms. Moreover, Gintarė has not got almost any resources for establishing a kinship dimension in her home space. The only one possession is the newspaper photo of her uncle whom she has seen only once. Gintarė also tries to fill the void of kinship by including her child's photos in her home space. However, they may render the sense of self-continuity only for the previous three years. What is more, the memories related to her child are not always bright and supporting ones, as he suffers from cerebral paralysis. The "effectors" reflecting the sense of self-expression are also scarce in her home space: the photo depicting a theatre performance in her orphanage and the photo of the heart made from colour glue. Consequently, it feels that the woman can assure herself neither the sense of self-continuity nor the sense of self-expression. It seems that Gintarė feels best while watching TV soaps or cartoons. This activity enables her to escape the thoughts related to complicated reality and to immerse into an imaginary world. As a result, the low level of self-awareness of Gintarė partly explains her aggressive behaviour in the shelter. According to Bovasso, self-awareness is directly related to violent behaviour: the less self-aware the person is the more violent he or she might become (1997: 213-214).

2. Final conclusions

I. If people have not got their private or rented accommodation, it does not necessarily mean that they have not got home.

The data of the fieldwork reveal that a majority of the research participants make home despite the fact that they live in the shelter and are officially treated as the homeless. These findings challenge the understanding of home in the EU and the USA where it is largely associated with the notion of a private house. Therefore, when a person has not got any housing, he/she is usually considered to have no home. Accordingly, homelessness is treated as an abnormal phenomenon and homeless people are defined as people in need for help and integration back to the society. In order to investigate the relation between home and a house further the research has to be done on the home-making of homeless people who live in the streets, non-residential buildings, drainage pits, forest, dumps etc.

II. There is a two-way relation between the self-awareness of homeless people living in a shelter and the place attachments mechanisms involved in their home-making:

1) Home-making serves a litmus paper for indication of the level of the self-awareness of a homeless person.

If a homeless person is disinterested or/and incapable of home-making in a shelter, then his or her place attachment mechanisms are deteriorated. Consequently, he or she lacks self-awareness. This kind of relation confirms the argument of the thesis that homeless people cannot regain their self-awareness, as soon as they receive new accommodation. To be more precise, home does not appear with a new house, a flat or a room. The data presented by the thesis confirms the assumption that home-making is the complex, multi-layered social psychological process. It does not consist only of physical functionality of the "potential environment" of a shelter but it also refers to psychosocial functions of "effectors": memories, relationships with close people, hobbies etc. Moreover, home becomes as if a repository for the memories of pleasant events and nice people because home-making involves filtration of good experiences from bad ones.

2) <u>The self-awareness of homeless people can be developed through home-making in a shelter.</u>

The relationship between "potential environment" of a shelter and homeless people during home-making process can indeed function as the relation between a therapist and a patient during the development of a therapeutic narrative. However, there is still a lot of untapped potential for making the former interaction more effective. As it was mentioned above, a shelter in the sense of a therapist tries to inspire its inhabitants to develop the first place attachment mechanism. Nevertheless, it still pays little attention to the second and the third place attachment mechanisms.

Communal spaces and joint activities, organized and promoted by social workers of shelters, create an environmental setting for socialization of homeless mothers. However, according to the data presented in the thesis, the homeless mothers tend to resist the communal life of the shelter thus avoiding the first place attachment mechanism. Hence, at the first sight it is possible to notice that the "potential environment" of a shelter ('a therapist') and the inhabitants of a shelter ('patients') are suggesting colliding directions for home-making ('a therapeutic narrative'). However, this collision does not result in purely negative effects on the inhabitants of a shelter. Although the common spaces of a shelter do not serve for the expansion of a territory for the home-making by homeless mothers, they set up the outside barriers which fence the home spaces of homeless mothers. To be more precise, the inhabitants of the shelter construct their home against the communal spaces and communal life, thus trying to make their own exceptional home spaces. While interacting with the "potential environment" of the shelter, most of the homeless mothers are able to feel and to perceive who and what is not included into their most intimate space and their personal life. Thus, a shelter definitely can help homeless people to build up their self-awareness by excluding the elements which do not make a part of their personality.

3. Recommendations

However, a therapeutic narrative should develop further and lead a patient to the next stage – deepening of her/his self-awareness. When homeless people find out who they are not, they have to be assisted in their home-making further in order to sense and to perceive who they are. Therefore, in this stage a shelter should try to create conditions for the application of the second and the third place attachment mechanisms. According to the data of the thesis, women, who experienced family-life and have bright memories from the past, are quite good at applying the latter place attachment mechanisms on their own. However, the homeless mothers with the least experience in application of the place attachment mechanisms face a lot of difficulties in this stage (the cases of Irma and Gintarė). As a result, this group of homeless people has to be provided with the greatest assistance in their home-making in order to gain use from its therapeutic effects. Nevertheless, the inhabitants with the better self-awareness should not be neglected but assisted further in improving their home-making skills.

First of all, the assistance of a shelter should be based on the observation of the home-making by its inhabitants. Moreover, it has to focus on the complex notion of home and not only on the development of domestic skills of homeless people. Secondly, people who do not have their own possessions and/or enough bright remembrances from the past should be supplied with some mobile material objects from charity for their home-making. Thirdly, inhabitants of a shelter may be also provided with some materials for making hand-made objects or even offered a course for hand-crafts. (The hand-made decorations from colour glue (which are included in a majority of home spaces of the research participants) illustrate best the need and the effects of this kind of materials for home-making by inhabitants of a shelter.) Fourthly, a shelter should try to balance out the application of all the three place attachment mechanisms in the home-making by homeless mothers instead of highlighting only the first place attachment mechanism.

Overall, shelters should pay more attention towards the home-making by their inhabitants and make better use of its therapeutic effects on their self-awareness.

Literature

Altman, I. & Low, S. M., eds. (1992), *Place Attachment*. New York: Plenum Press.

Ališauskienė, R. (1997), 'Human Dignity and Social Exclusion Project Report on Lithuania' online: http://www.coe.int/t/e/social_cohesion/hdse/2_hdse_reports/1_country_reports/f_report%20lithuania.asp#P303 _16700 last accessed 8th December, 2011.

Bachelard, G. (1989), *La Poétique de l'Espace*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Belk, R. W. (1992), Attachment to Possessions. In: I. Altman & S. M. Low, eds., *Place Attachment,* pp. 37-55. New York: Plenum Press.

Bollnow, O. F. (1963), *Mensch und Raum*, pp. 123-183. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer Verlag Stuttgart.

Bovasso, G. (1997), The Interaction of Depersonalisation and Deindividuation. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless* 6-3: 213-228.

Casey, E. S. (1996), How to Get from Space to Place in a Fairly Short Stretch of Time: Phenomenological Prolegomena. In: S. Feld, & K. H. Basso, eds., *Senses of Place*, pp. 13-52. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.

Child and Mother Care Home "Užuovėja", http://www.uzuoveja.lt/ last accessed 15th March, 2012.

Cieraad, I., ed. (1999), *At Home: An Anthropology of Domestic Space*. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press.

Daly, G. (1996), *Homeless: Policies, Strategies, and Lives on the Street*. London, New York: Routledge.

Dant, T. (2005), *Materiality and Society*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Deleuze, G. & Félix Guattari (2004), *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. London, New York: Continuum.

Department of Statistics of Lithuania, http://www.stat.gov.lt/lt/pages/view/?id=2815 last accessed 25th May, 2012.

Desjarlais, R. R. (1997), *Shelter Blues – Sanity and Selfhood among the Homeless*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Dzedzeviciute, A. & Navickas, D. (2008) 'Housing Solutions for People Who Are Homeless: FEANSTA Annual Theme 2008: Housing and Homelessness' online: http://www.feantsa.org/files/Housing_Annual_Theme/National_Reports/Lithuania_housing_homelessness_20 08.pdf last accessed 8th December, 2011.

Gans, H. J. (1993), *People, Plans, and Policies: Essays on Poverty, Racism, and Other National Urban Problems*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Glasser, I. & Bridgman, R. (1999), *Braving the Street: the Anthropology of Homelessness*. New York: Berghahn Books.

Guerlac, S. (2006), *Thinking in Time: An Introduction to Henri Bergson*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Hasegawa, M. (2006), *"We are not garbage!": The Homeless Movement in Tokyo, 1994-2002*. London: Routledge.

Hecht, A. (2001), Home Sweet Home: Tangible Memories of an Uprooted Childhood. In: D. Miller, ed., *Home Possessions: Material Culture behind Closed Doors*, pp. 123-148. Oxford: Berg.

Heidegger M. (1975), *Poetry, Language, Thought*, pp. 143-161. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Henare, A., Holbraad, M., Wastell, S., eds. (2007), *Thinking through Things: Theorising Artefacts Ethnographically*, pp. 1-31. Oxon, New York: Routledge.

Hoskins, J. (1998), *Biographical Objects: How Things Tell the Stories of People's Lives*. New York, London: Routledge.

Hurworth, R. (2003), Photo-Interviewing for Research. *Social Research Update* 40(1): 1–4.

Kocai, E. (2008), Socialinė benamių atskirtis ir jos formavimasis. *Sociologija. Mintis ir veiksmas* 2008/1: 105-118.

Kocai, E. (2007), *Socialinė benamių atskirtis ir jos formavimosi veiksniai (PhD Dissertation)*. Vilnius: Socialinių tyrimų institutas.

Kocai, E. (2006), Benamystė kaip socialinis reiškinys. *Filosofija. Sociologija* No. 2: 53–62.

Law of Social Services of the Republic of Lithuania, Žin., 2006, Nr. 17-589 online: http://www3.lrs.lt/pls/inter2/dokpaieska.showdoc_l?p_id=270342&p_query=&p_tr2= last access 8th December, 2011.

Low, S. M. & Lawrence-Zúñiga, D., eds. (2003), *The Anthropology of Space and Place: Locating Culture*. Malden, Oxford, Carlton: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Mattingly, Ch. (1998), *Healing Dramas and Clinical Plots: The Narrative Structure of Experience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marcoux, J. (2001), The Refurbishment of Memory. In: D. Miller, ed., *Home Possessions: Material Culture behind Closed Doors*, pp. 69-86. Oxford: Berg.

Marcus, C. C. (1992), Environmental memories. In: I. Altman & S. M. Low, eds., *Place Attachment*, pp. 87-112. New York: Plenum Press.

McFadyen, L. (2005), *Voices from the Street: An Ethnography of India's Street Children: A Case Study of Delhi*. Gurgaon: Hope India Publications.

Miller, D. (2010), *Stuff*. Cambridge, Malden: Polity Press.

Miller, D. (2008), *The Comfort of Things*. Cambridge, Malden: Polity Press.

Morley, D. (2000), *Home Territories: Media, Mobility and Identity*. London, New York: Routledge.

Pennartz, P. J. J. (1999), Home: The Experience of Atmosphere. In: Cieraad, I., ed., *At Home: An Anthropology of Domestic Space*, pp. 95-106. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press.

Pink, S. (2006), *The Future of Visual Anthropology: Engaging the Senses*. London: Routledge.

Pink, S. (2001), *Doing Visual Ethnography: Images, Media and Representation in Research*. London: Sage.

Riley, R. B. (1992), Attachment to the Ordinary Landscape. In: I. Altman & S. M. Low, eds., *Place Attachment*, pp. 13-31. New York: Plenum Press.

Rodman, M. C. (2003), Empowering Place: Multilocality and Multivocality. In: S. M. Low & D. Lawrence-Zúñiga, eds., *The Anthropology of Space and Place: Locating Culture*, pp. 204-223. Malden, Oxford, Carlton: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Seremetakis, N. C., ed. (1996), *The Senses Still: Perception and Memory as Material Culture in Modernity*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Sontag, S. (2005 [1973]), *On Photography*. New York: Rosetta Books LLC.

Styron, Th. H., Janoff-Bulman, R., Davidson L. (2000), "Please Ask Me How I Am": Experiences of Family Homelessness in the Context of Single Mothers' Lives. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless* 9-2: 143-165.

The European Federation for National Organisations Working with the Homeless (Abb. FEANSTA), http://www.feantsa.org/code/en/pg.asp?Page=21 last accessed 8th December, 2011.

Thrift, N. (2010), Fings Ain't Wot They Used T' Be: Thinking Through Material Thinking as Placing and Arranging. In: D. Hicks & M. C. Beaudry, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Material Culture Studies*, pp. 635-645. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tipple, G. & Speak, S. (2009), *The Hidden Millions: Homelessness in Developing Countries*. London [etc.]: Routledge.

Tuan, Yi-Fu (1977), *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Tucker, W. (1990), *The Excluded Americans: Homelessness and Housing Policies*. Washington: Regnery Gateway.

Urbienė, Ž. & Žaronaitė, D. (2003) 'Homelessness in Lithuania: An Outline of the Situation' online: http://www.feantsa.org/files/enlargement/ngo_lithuania.pdf last accessed 28th April, 2011.

Valado, M. T. (2006) 'Factors influencing homeless people's perception and use of urban space', PhD dissertation, Anthropology Department, University of Arizona, online: http://proquest.umi.com/pqdlink?did=1155555461&Fmt=14&VType=PQD&VInst=PROD&RQT=309&VName=PQD&TS=1344758467&clientId=79356 last accessed 25th May, 2012)

Vilnius Archdiocese Caritas, http://vn.caritas.lt/c/index.php?page=motinos-ir-vaiko-globos-namai last accessed 8th March, 2012.

West-Pavlov, R. (2009), *Space in Theory: Kristeva, Foucault, Deleuze*. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.

Woodward, I. (2007), *Understanding Material Culture*. London, New Delhi, Thousand Oaks and Singapore: SAGE Publications Ltd.