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Abstract
This thesis explores the professional and personal identity of social workers in the context of restrictive policies and procedures within housing service institutions. Social workers play a crucial role in rehousing the unhoused, alongside providing knowledge, advocacy, and emotional support. However, they often face challenges such as being overworked, underpaid, and undervalued, leading to workforce attrition. In this study, social workers grapple with the dilemma of adhering to jurisdictional boundaries or bending the rules to achieve client success, which can create a conflict between personal beliefs and professional duties. The research investigates how personal experiences influence social workers' decisions to engage in acts of everyday resistance, as theorized by James C. Scott. Interviews with 11 social workers specializing in housing services highlight the impact of previous experiences in the social services system on decision-making for clients. The concept of structural facilitation is theorized and supported by the concepts of positive deviant social workers and resistance. Structural facilitation refers to social workers strategically bending or breaking rules within the confines of their professional jurisdiction to achieve success for their clients. It recognizes the influence of personal experiences on decision-making and highlights the complexities of navigating oppressive systems while advocating for service users. The implications of these findings and future research considerations on social workers, resistance, and deviancy are discussed.
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Chapter I: Introduction

Amidst the pressing challenges of addressing homelessness, social workers emerge as vital agents, offering invaluable knowledge and compassionate care to their clients and the wider community. At the organizational level of addressing homelessness, social workers collaborate with various institutions and actors, including homeless clientele, local government housing authorities, commercialized housing properties, and local nonprofit organizations. Through these collaborations, social workers navigate the complex landscape of client needs and assistance facilities, creating a supportive environment tailored to individual circumstances amidst timesensitive chaos. However, the profession of social work is currently facing significant challenges, including a decline in practicing social workers and extreme stressors in the field (Blomberg-Kroll et al. 2014). This issue has garnered attention across media outlets, with reports highlighting social workers feeling "overworked, underpaid, and undervalued" (Social Work News, 2022). Research also details the well-known extreme lack of tangible resources available for social work practitioners that leads many to perform what Malcolm Carey coins as the “positive deviant social worker” (2011). The positive deviant social worker is defined to perform acts of resistance, subterfuge, deception, and even sabotage that are embroiled in parts of the social work labor process (Carey and Foster 2011). Although research by Carey and Foster (2011) investigated the general population of social workers, what remains to be addressed is how and if housing-specialist social workers adopt this form of positive deviancy to better navigate the restrictive policy and procedure while assisting service users obtain permanent housing.
Social workers play a critical role in society, supporting individuals and communities in need. Their position is often complex, as they navigate a bi-directional relationship between their professional roles, duties, and their individual selves with subjective beliefs. Social workers' identity is multifaceted and influenced by many factors such as their professional role, personal values, and the social context in which they operate. When there is tension in this bi-directional relationship, the self or identity of social workers can split, leading to a sense of frustration or disillusionment with the system, prompting some to engage in acts of deviancy as a response to the tension between their professional obligations and personal beliefs (Carey and Foster 2011).

Social workers also occupy a complex position when it comes to power. On the one hand, social workers do possess a certain level of power and authority within the context of their professional roles. On the other hand, however, they face limitations and challenges that can undermine their power and identity. Through the application of James C. Scott's theory on domination, subordination, and everyday forms of resistance, this research focuses on means of resistance. Previous research has examined this tension between social worker’s level of power and identity being combatted by the Radical Social Worker through forms of organized resistance, such as strikes, protests, or grassroots community service. However, research has yet to inquire further on the concept of the positive deviant social worker through the lens of Scott’s theory. Thus, this research seeks to explore how social workers navigate and negotiate their professional and personal identity amidst institutionalized policy, organizational procedure, and client interactions.

Statement of the Problem
This research aims to investigate the ways in which social workers navigate between their identity of self and institutional policy and procedure within their professional environments.
Hopefully, this study's findings will provide necessary information to propose practical and transferable objectives for future research and understanding the barriers faced by social workers and their clientele. This research seeks to answer the following research questions: (1) Do social workers describe their situations in ways that reflect James C. Scott's ideas, or not? and (2) Do social workers describe their situations in other ways, and if so, how?

Overview of Chapters
The following chapters will further flesh out these research questions, examining previous literature concerning issues facing housing specialists today, as well as introducing our city of interest, Memphis, TN. In Chapter III, the role of social workers will be investigated, including why social workers choose the profession as well as current research concerning social work practice. Chapter IV through V will discuss Scott’s (1990) theoretical framework further, introducing a key study by Carey and Foster (2011) that has influenced this research with their concept of the ‘deviant social worker and the ‘radical social worker’. Lastly, Chapters VI through VIII will discuss the results of this study, analyze findings regarding structural facilitation within our theoretical framework, and suggest future research regarding next courses of action.

Chapter II: The Crisis of Affordable Housing
The U.S. Congress passed the 1949 Housing Act and determined the national goal regarding housing to be, “a decent home and a suitable living environment for every American Family”
We now live in a society where safe, sustainable housing is too often considered a luxury. According to the National Low-Income Coalition, the United States is experiencing a shortage of approximately 7 million rental homes affordable and available to extremely low-income renters.

This crisis does not only exist at the national level and can be seen in varying degrees depending on the state. In order to afford a one-bedroom apartment at fair market rent in Tennessee, a person working at minimum wage ($7.25/hr) would need to work at least eightyfive hours a week. With the understanding that this average work week is unsustainable, what options are available for those who need low-income affordable housing? According to 2020 Tennessee housing reports, it was found that there is a shortage of 127,102 affordable rental homes available for low-income renters. Of these low-income renters, 37% are employed and work in the labor force. Focusing on our city of interest, Memphis is not excluded from this shortage of available low-income housing options. Currently, Memphis has about 36,000 fewer affordable housing units than it requires, given its number of low-income residents, according to a 2022 analysis by the National Low Income Housing Coalition (2022).

Memphis Housing Vouchers

The Memphis Housing Authority (MHA) is Memphis’ official housing authority. Established in 1935 — one year after the Federal Housing Authority (FHA) was established — the MHA has served Memphian’s under their mission, “To develop, support and maintain affordable housing options that provide stability and a sense of community for people with low to moderate income” (MHA). In collaboration with a number of partner agencies, MHA claims to provide eligible families and individuals opportunities to achieve and maintain, “…decent, safe, sanitary and affordable rental housing” (MHA n.d.).
MHA’s housing programs can be divided into two main categories: (1) Public Housing; and (2) Housing Choice Voucher (otherwise commonly known as section 8 housing). Although section 8 and public housing are both government-sponsored programs, there are two distinctions to consider. First, public housing is limited to government-operated housing units, while section 8 allows service users to rent from any landlord accepting section 8 vouchers. Second, service users can only use their section 8 voucher when renting housing. Meanwhile, public housing can be rented or bought by low-income families. The MHA website ‘Who We Are’ page lists the accomplishments of these programs, with one detailing the 26,000 low-income families and individuals served and equipped with self-sufficiency tools to both obtain and maintain their housed statuses (MHA n.d.). Though the services provided have made lifechanging impacts on recipients, the number of individuals and families that go unseen and neglected during the rehousing process offers an alternative glimpse into the reality of this system’s shortcomings.

An April 2022 Memphis news report titled “Section 8 housing sign up begins for first time since 2017” details the magnitude of Memphians in need of housing assistance and the severe lack of resources needed to serve them (Jones 2022). This 2022 waiting list for assistance had 10,000 slots, though 30,000 pre-applications were anticipated. Even as the application portal was enabled, 3,000 families were still without housing. For nearly six years, the application portal for Memphians to receive vital housing assistance was disabled. During these years, individuals and families were unable to receive the support and resources vital for survival.

**Emergency Housing Vouchers**

The agency I will focus on now relates to my firsthand experiences working with and observing social workers who serve families navigating the rapid-rehousing system. In 2021, the
MHA was awarded 190 Emergency Housing Vouchers (EHVs) as part of the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021 to help assist individuals and families. Those eligible for this assistance fall within one or more of the following categories: (1) homeless, (2) at risk of homelessness, (3) fleeing, or attempting to flee, domestic violence, dating violence, sexual assault, stalking, or human trafficking, or (4) recently homeless and for whom providing rental assistance will prevent the family’s homelessness or having high risk of housing instability (MHA). Operating under the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Community Alliance for the Homeless (CAFTH), the lead local Continuum of Care (CoC) agency, is responsible for verifying that prospective clients meet one of the four categorized situations of eligibility. At this point in this process, individuals and families who are homeless are referred to separate local organizations, officially operating under the lead CoC agency.

The Metropolitan Inter-Faith Association (MIFA) is the only facility in Memphis operating under CoC that specializes in rehousing homeless families with children under the age of eighteen. Commonly referred to as “rapid rehousing”, MIFA’s purpose in serving homeless families with underage children is to expedite the rehousing process normally executed by MHA. In this section, I will review the following I discuss (a) client perspective: homeless family rehousing process (b) internal and external challenges: housing services; and (c) effects of fragmentation.

**Client Perspective: Homeless Family Rehousing Process**

Families experiencing homelessness often have a common starting point in this rehousing procedure. This scenario starts with a family contacting the MIFA emergency hotline. On their website, MIFA states that, “Shelby County residents with minor children can access the hotline 24 hours a day for MIFA Emergency Shelter Placement screening or referrals to other
community resources” (MIFA). In day-to-day functions, this hotline normally refers those in need of services to a list of homeless shelter providers listed on the city’s CoC facility (Community Alliance for The Homeless) website. While informative, this website and the referrals made by its listed information typically leads clients to dead ends for two key reasons. First, the facilities listed on CAFTH’s website are directed towards single men or women experiencing homelessness, with seven of the ten facilities unable to serve families’ needs. Second, the three family shelter services listed are either in partnerships with MIFA or the MIFA emergency hotline itself. As the CoC grant for Emergency Housing Vouchers must be distributed under the American Rescue Plan Act, partnered facilities must receive clients through official referrals from MIFA representatives. The process to apply for MIFA referral and placement in a partnered facility begins by applying online through MIFA’s application portal.

MIFA’s application portal is listed as available for submissions from 7 AM to 2 PM; however, the page often reads, “WE HAVE REACHED OUR MAXIMUM SHELTER REFERRALS FOR THE DAY,” instead. This portal only accepts two applications for shelter referrals per day. It is known throughout the homeless serving agencies that applicants must apply every day as soon as possible. Of course, this may not be possible due to lack of internet access, work schedule, illiteracy, lack of childcare, or otherwise. If one is able to submit their application, they also must have the needed documentation. These documents include (a) picture ID for all adults, including children aged 18 and over (b) social Security cards for everyone in the household (c) verification that the children are in the custody of the applicant. If any of this documentation is missing, the application process cannot be completed. There are facilities in Memphis that specialize in helping folks secure this documentation; however, the wait time, availability of services, and reliability of transportation to the facilities often present as barriers for receiving services (See Appendix A).
**Fragmented Services**

The role of the social service system is to enhance the health, self-sufficiency, social functioning, and overall quality of life of individuals, families, and communities in need of their services. Though social services provide access to services that facilitate these processes, there remains no national social policy addressing the critical role of social services in the United States (Joyner and McClain 2021). Limitations of care within mandated policy and procedures also revealed a disconnect between institution and practitioners (Dustin 2007). There is a failure in current research surrounding social work services to address the disconnect amongst social work organizational processes across national, state, and local levels. Because of this lack of continuity, established services are regularly provided in a fragmented manner. Amongst existing homeless services, the level of service provided varies from organization to organization. This is in part due to different forms of governance between private and public social service agencies (e.g., private or nonprofit agencies versus government) and the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) lack of standardized procedures within the CoC.

Established in 1995, HUD mandated that providers form collaborative governance organizations, CoCs, and submit a combined, single application to request HUD funding (HUD 2023). HUD’s initial goal of establishing this collaborative governance was to streamline the funding application process and encourage local governments and provider agencies to coordinate the design of services for the homeless population (emergency shelters, transitional housing, supported permanent housing, etc.) However, HUD did not specify the manner in which CoCs should be constructed. This lack of specification resulted in a broad spectrum of variability amongst associated organizations by way of the scope and the model of care provided. This variability often results in shelter facilities that lack support services (e.g., employment assistance, transportation services, childcare) and subsequently affects the resident’s likelihood
of obtaining and sustaining permanent housing (Stretch and Kruger, 1992; Seltser and Miller 1993).

In Wong, Park, and Neeman’s (2006) study, researchers investigate the level to which these care facilities operate in coordination with the CoC model in the operationalization of homeless residential programs. Findings of this study identify both consistency and deviation from the CoC model and suggest proactive local community service planning and development that can assure effective and efficient delivery of services for those experiencing homelessness (Wong, Park, and Neeman 2006). Universal access to and diversity-inclusive services have been a long-standing concern for social workers. Social workers actively work to address these issues yet often find that both policy and funding pose significant barriers to eliminating unequal access and ensuring culturally competent and inclusive services (O’Hare 2005).

**Effects of Fragmentation**

Evidence demonstrating the effects of fragmentation of services can be observed through the lack of access to vital services after exiting programs. These services were deemed nontransferable after clients exited rehousing programs (Shelton 2015). This lack of access postprogram was caused and maintained through an organization’s abrupt discharges, eligibility requirements, as well as time limits and restraints. Specifically, Shelton described the particular challenge of interviewees having a thirty-day limit to stay in their shelter. This was especially difficult for more marginalized populations identifying as trans or gender-fluid (Shelton 2015).

This fragmentation continues through the usage of an organization’s “One-Size-Fits-All” approach to address client’s unique and diverse situational needs (Schanes 2010). Research focusing on the limitations of certain methodology in the context of rural or urban families, found that — while there are basic needs that are common to every family — in some instances,
“the difference between urban and rural families lies in the extent or intensity of the need” (Templeman and Mitchell 2002). Early research also identifies how relationships between organizations can greatly affect the range of care received by its service users, ultimately resulting in persons remaining unserved (Whittington 1983). The greater the knowledge they possessed about groups of a marginalized population, the closer social workers were involved with such groups (Eack and Newhill 2008).

Chapter III: The Role of the Social Worker

Why Social Work?

As early as the 1970s, students' motives for becoming social workers have been debated: is becoming a social worker a politically deviant act or do students seek personal or professional fulfillment from their achievements in their field (Pearson 1973; Uttley 1981; O'Connor et al. 1984; Solas 1994). Social work is known for being both strenuous and challenging — emotionally and physically (Blomberg et al., 2015; Lauri 2016). Despite this, social work continues to be offered at universities across the country. The motives behind why one pursues social work can influence the quality and consistency of provided services (Liedgren and Elvhage 2015), as they influence students’ ways of learning (Breen & Lindsey 2002) and allude to possible attitudes and beliefs regarding social problems (Han & Chow 2010). Pearson (1973) set the research agenda regarding student motivation to pursue the social work profession. He argued that a social worker's primary reason to become a social worker was “an explicit rejection of the 'normal' values of everyday life” (1973:223), which “represents some form of primitive political rebellion” (1973:209). Pearson went on to describe how the social worker is either
unwilling or incapable of, “extending diagnosis of his ills and their prescribed remedy to his clients and searching on his professional life for the differences between himself and clients rather than the shared features of their lives, the social worker's solution remains privatized” (1973:219).

Holme and Maizels (1978) replicated Pearson's study with 1423 social workers employed by local authority social service departments and probation services in England. Their findings supported Pearson's view that social workers are seeking some form of self-realization through their work and rejected certain aspects of social work practice, those seen as 'boring and routine'. They did not find, however, that the rejection of societal values marked social workers as politically deviant, as suggested by Pearson. Ultimately, the top reason for pursuing studies in social work is the aspiration to help individuals in need (see e.g., Alastair and Kruk 1998; Bradley et al. 2012; Campanini and Facchini 2013; Csikai and Rozensky 1997; Duschinsky and Kirk 2014; Eack and Newhill 2008; Furness 2007; Hackett et al. 2003; Lackie 1983; Liedgren and Elvhage 2015; Petersén 2022; Vincent 1996). Vincent’s (2008) study on unconscious motives for folks to pursue the social work field revealed how differences in upbringing and childhood could greatly affect one’s decision to become a social worker. The results of his study indicated that in social work, students who have, “... experienced more loss and early separations in childhood, as well as reporting less satisfactory parenting experiences than other students who were not entering a helping profession”, could be responding with defensive unconscious processes. Regarding the risks of having such a connection with one’s profession, Vincent concludes:

They may end up powerfully identifying with the neediness of others or projecting their own neediness onto others and feeling persecuted by the other person’s demands. Hoping somehow to resolve their own neediness by attending to the needs of others, they find it impossible, in today’s crisis-orientated and statute-driven practice, to get anything satisfying back from their interactions with service users. This failure may then be
compounded by a lack of nourishing supervision or by unsatisfactory relationships in their personal lives, so that the end result is sickness and burn-out (1996:67).

A study by Alastair and Kruk (1998), on the other hand, viewed having a personal experience with the social services system as a positive trait and possibly a skill (Alastair and Kruk 1998). Eack and Newhill (2008), sought to examine the relationship between social work students’ attitudes toward schizophrenia, and the degree to which this relationship was influenced by personal contact. Their findings revealed that the closer contact students had with this population, the more influence knowledge had on their attitudes. Meaning, the more knowledge they possessed about groups of a marginalized population, the closer social workers were involved with such groups (Eack and Newhill 2008).

Overworked, Underpaid, and Undervalued
When rehousing the unhoused, social workers are the primary source of knowledge, advocacy, and oftentimes emotional support. Meanwhile, the words ‘Overworked, underpaid, and undervalued…’ were often used to describe why social workers were leaving the workforce (Social Work News 2022). In an earlier study by Söderfeldt et al. (1996), researchers discovered that the top two factors that could lead to high strain in social services work were: the will of the client and the ideology of the work inside and outside the professions. Control within a situation concerns the control over which resources or instruments are used from a specific curriculum. This kind of control is often superficially high in human service professional roles but could lead to ‘lesser’ role ambiguity because of goals that lack direction and clarity alongside technological discrepancies. In this sense, having more freedom to make decisions independently in the workspace may even be regarded as a form of demand on the worker, obscuring the distinction
between demand and control. Not only role conflict, but also role ambiguity, could be considered as a job demand (Söderfeldt et al. 1996).

In research by Hussein et al. (2013), authors conducted a longitudinal study following nearly 300 social work students into social work employment. In their findings, Hussein et al. (2013) discovered that job engagement was a more influential predictor than workload and salary in determining job satisfaction. Moreover, it reveals how external constraints could be mitigated through the creation of an inclusive workplace with attention to promoting independence and shared values; all while ensuring workers feel involved. Regarding respondents intending to remain at their jobs, being surrounded by a supportive team was reported as a key factor as well (Hussein et al. 2013).

In a similar study by Livnat et al. (2023), researchers interviewed female social service providers of non-profit organizations. In their findings, the study revealed that these women were preoccupied well beyond their scheduled work hours. They also, “continually engaged — technically and mentally — with their clients, job tasks, and organizations and therefore, never stopped working” (2023:26). These points were further supported through research by Moriarty and Manthorpe (2015), where there is strong evidence for the risk of stress and burnout in the social work profession. Of these stressors, it was suggested that supportive organizational culture, attention to workloads, and increasing overall job satisfaction would help to mitigate the frequency of social workers suffering from immense stress or eventual burnout (Moriarty and Manthorpe 2015).

Research by Kramer and Son (2016) took this research a step further, by analyzing data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY) from the years 1992 to 2010. Instead of focusing on short-term outcomes such as stress or burnout, the authors were able to roughly calculate, “The relationships among working time, long-term physical health, job satisfaction,
and turnover among health care employees” (Kramer and Son 2016:15). Over the course of this eighteen-year analysis, findings revealed evidence that the long-term physical health of individuals is negatively affected by health care employees’ work schedules — especially employees who work longer hours (Kramer and Son 2016).

Social Work Research

Much of the research investigating the interactions of social workers analyzes the complexities of relationships with their clients. Researchers Authors Voorhis, Morrison, and Hostetter (2006) found the power of advocacy, emphasizing how advocacy played a vital role in the dual empowerment of both parties. In their conclusion, social worker empowerment was found to be positively associated with their commitment to client empowerment through social justice advocacy (2006). Existing discourse debates the challenges of separating the institutional from the everyday (Benwell and Stokoe 2006). Although, there is agreement that institutional interactions may vary from everyday ones in the way the institution, its goals, and its roles invoked in talk. The separation of institutions from the everyday is investigated in research by Harris (1998) and his findings suggest that “policy on the ground often bears little resemblance to formal public policy” (1998:875). In other words, the goals of the institution can shape the talk therein (Heritage 1992). Now, research demonstrates how social worker’s engagement in the institutional and every day is formed of informally constructed acts and values that typically overshadow official rules and policy (Carey and Foster 2011).

According to Whittington (1983) in America there were two models of how social work can be prioritized and organized; “some are more preoccupied with following official procedures
while others emphasize notions of client need and the provision of service” (Whittington 1977:74). Lipsky (1980) proposed that street-level bureaucrats have to navigate between the administration and the clients, and they institute de facto policy in their everyday institutional work. In research by Levine and White (1962), they described the social space social workers are part of a boundary-spanning network. The idea of this network of relationships is that it links social workers to the occupations, professions, and bureaucracies which comprise the instrument of the welfare state.

In later research, Whittington (1983) investigated the negotiation of daily practice by social workers and discovered three forms of “currency” utilized: rhetoric, human relations methods, and resources. First, rhetoric is utilized when social workers suggest a course of action and must not only convince others of the necessity or desirability of the action, but also themselves,

> All social workers have to weigh the pros and cons of conflict with others in the network. Some find it necessary to choose words carefully, to speak the language of their managers, to be ‘devious’ and ‘almost crafty in their approach’ (Whittington 1983:272).

Second, the Human Relations method refers to the relationship building in and out of one’s organization of practice and their ability to navigate different associations (Walker and Beaumont 1981). Third, relations are often transactional in the field of social work — especially cross-organizationally. The access to and control of resources such as information, skills, and discernment over services and material aid are all viewed as a valuable currency. Social workers are seen to use experience in the field to their advantage, as well as other knowledge and specialties learned throughout their careers.
Challenges in Daily Practice

Social workers often face challenges in negotiating their daily practices at work amidst restrictive policy and procedures. These challenges can arise due to various factors such as bureaucratic constraints, limited resources, and conflicting priorities (Eriksson and Johansson 2021; Wasserman 1971; Ylvisaker and Rugkåsa 2022; Zychlinski and Lev 2024). Research by Söderfeldt et al. (1996) demonstrated how the client's will and the ideology of the work can have negative effects on the worker in human services, “For instance, in human services, control in the more qualified senses can often imply control over demands. When supervision is lax, there is freedom for the human service worker to choose skills in a way that lowers demand” (1996:528). A major part of a social worker’s job is finding a balance between getting work done and interacting with a wide range of people who are neither their clients nor members of the same organization (Whittington 1983). It is vital for social workers to create the right kind of relations with other key actors in the network of social services.
Chapter IV: Theoretical Framework

Acts of Everyday Resistance
Since Scott’s (1990) work on the hidden transcripts of the subordinate class, the concept of resistance has gained considerable traction as a tool for critically exploring practices in relation to power. Resistance can be defined simply as anything done by the subordinate class to undermine the authority of the dominant class. How people resist the circumstances they are in by ways of covert resistance (Carey and Foster 2011) has demonstrated how non-organized, covert resistance can have a significant impact on social change. Scott’s contributions to alternate forms of resistance did not only affect sociology but has been utilized in a variety of disciplines; even as an analytical category within the developing academic field of Resistance Studies (Vinthagen and Johansson 2013).

Of the studies utilizing Scott’s framework, researchers have given evidence on how poor populations resist by various means such as false compliance, narrative storytelling amongst the submissive class, etc. (Campbell and Heyman 2007; Richter-Devroe 2011). Through their collective research, findings suggest that their forms of resistance both answer their needs and also act as hidden countering of dominant repressive conditions (Hutchinson 1990). Feminist and gender studies have also made strides in research through everyday resistance theory, with the body being recognized not only as a site of power but also of resistance (Johansson 1994; LeBesco 2003).

Scott’s theoretical framework is the most appropriate analysis of this research for several reasons. First, as mentioned across the scarce social work research on resistance, existing studies have urged future research to further expand collective knowledge through the application of
modern theory (Carey and Foster 2011; Johansson and Vinthagen 2016). Second, I hope to discover new connections between the theory and practice of social work while furthering collective understanding of the means by which social workers resist institutional barriers in order to better serve clients. Third, this form of investigation into the ways social workers negotiate and navigate their roles is unique to existing literature in that it has yet to be analyzed through the theory of everyday resistance. Lastly, it is hoped that the odds between academia and practice can mend through findings that demonstrate how theoretical application in crossdisciplinary fashion may impact practice-driven forms of social work in beneficial ways. The concept of everyday resistance will be woven throughout this chapter to better demonstrate how it is intended to be applied in later analysis.

The Radical Social Worker

In order to better conceptualize the application of everyday resistance theory in social work practice, the concept of the radical social worker (RSW) within the social work discipline must be included. Radical social work, originally coined by Roy Bailey and Mike Brake (1980), examines the dichotomy between the social worker as a nine-to-five state agent and social activist, “Radical social work involves understanding oppression in the context of social and economic structures rather than affixing the problems to the individuals who are oppressed” (Bailey and Brake 1980). While this concept originally gained traction by members of academia during the 1970s and 1980s, soon the connection of theory in social work practice came under fire and was deemed unsustainable, non-pragmatic, and unachievable in the day-to-day of frontline social workers (Pearson 1975; Carey and Foster 2011). Though there was support regarding the need for nurturing differing realms of theory to promote progressive, revolutionary social change, the paradoxes, and restraints soon were brought to light. As critiqued by Simkin
(1983), those practitioners participating in radical social work would eventually face the obstacles surrounding the need to earn a living while spending time and energy resisting their own exploitation. This was in part due to the disparities between theoretically driven agenda versus the reality of everyday experiences of social workers (Carey and Foster 2011). The ivory tower of academic research was dubbed a form of ‘institutionalized Marxism’. Some social work researchers took critical stances, stating that the uptick in academic involvement was more geared towards achieving tenure rather than creating palpable forms of practice in the field itself (Delante, 2005; Teater, 2017).

RSW revolved around not only the need for social change, but the forms of collective resistance needed to achieve such change. This posed further issues, with critiques drawing on the resource starved and bureaucratic environments common to social work departments of service. Given that the field lacked the legitimacy and the forms of power granted to more traditional professions such as hard sciences; requesting social workers to change society and pay their bills was “downright cruelty”. (Brewer and Lait 1980; Simpkin 1979:132). Amongst other identified issues with radical social work was the need for further focus on the lack of interconnectedness between small-scale troubles of service users and large-scale institutional issues in both theory and practice (Pearson 1975). Sociology-based theories such as Marxism and Foucauldian stances were also applied to address these issues, but also have failed to expand collective understanding and practical application of radical social work (Carey & Foster 2011).

Carey and Foster (2011) fell short for several reasons. First, Marxist and second-wave feminist-inspired radicalism would often take a reductionist approach, resulting in the compression of complex social and cultural dynamics. Marx’s analysis of labor and working was centered in a capitalist society and the gluttony of capital with attention on the role of the state
and dominating ideology. The central issue propelling the development of RSW is the antithetical character of,

Capitalist state welfare, simultaneously ensuring a healthy and compliant workforce, managing the behavior of the working class (including attempts to undermine resistance to exploitation), and also providing important material resources for working class people that often represent concessions won from the capitalist class through hard struggle (Vickers 2015:663-669).

Though vital contributions, this theoretical application falls short due to its oftentimes binary application of conflict. This binary compression of issues can be seen through research focusing on dynamics and conflict between managers and workers, women and men, social worker and institution, etc. (Lavalette and Ferguson 2018), thus, overshadowing the complex nature of social work practice and social position of the social worker. Furthermore, a divide exists amongst Marxist social workers on what method of response is best fit for such conflict. On one hand, some RSW Marxist are centered on whether the occupation of social work is simply a tool for social control with little to no contribution-potential for the sought-out change. On the other hand, some are centered on the potential to subvert the ruling class’s agenda for social work and produce sustainable and progressive means of practice under capitalist rule. (Shaw and Cooke 1996:6-25).

In the application of theorist Michel Foucault, previous studies have explored his concept of governmentality. Governmentality, contrary to Marxist perspectives, focused on the ways in which social workers, service users, etc. become entangled within normative discursive frameworks. These frameworks were seen as methods to diagnose, shape, or restrict one’s roles, attitudes, and purpose—especially within codified spaces such as governmental, organizational, or professional traditionally defined discourse. A core critique of this theoretical application by Ackroyd and Thompson (1999, pp. 155–8) questions the dependent relationship between
conservatism and neo-Foucauldian analysis, “...when they draw attention to the relatively widespread presence of employee resistance and misbehavior within work organizations”. This focus greatly differs from many post-structural theories that focus on the concepts of the brainwashed corporate-induced ‘creation of obedient bodies’ and ‘colonized consciousness’(Taylor and Bain 2003). Thus, this attempt at Foucauldian application fell short of addressing and defining the small-scale acts of resistance covertly scattered throughout the social work labor process. It was not until Carey and Foster introduced the concept of the positive deviant social worker and revealed how, though similar in nature, are both distinguishable in their qualities, attributes, and/or practices (2011).

First, Carey and Foster’s (2011) concept of the deviant social worker shares similarities with the radical social worker. First, the deviant social worker seems to hold similar cultural and ideological beliefs such as distrust for authority, a questioning of officialdom and cultural norms, and general disdain from statutory legislation, policy, and procedure. Though there are similarities, the notable differences distinguished between the radical and deviant social worker include:

- Pioneering sense of individualism
- A lack of explicit dedication or engagement with any formal models or practice
- Commitment to a series of ‘hidden’ activities (and sometimes values) that contrast with any collective-based or class-based struggles emphasized by radial social work
- Motives are not compelled by career, ego, or other power-centered drives
- A practice-based questioning of legally enshrined policy or professionally defined norms and traditions
- Non-idealistic influence of expectations
- An adept understanding of service user and sincere and personal yearning to provide immediate *practical* and *tangible* forms of support to vulnerable populations
- Sense of skepticism and/or cynicism; academically enhanced rhetoric that stresses grandiose, emotionally exploitative and idealistic themes such as empowerment, promoting equality, participation, fighting oppression, among others (Carey and Foster 2011:590)

Second, while these attributes allow the DSW to keep a sense of covertness among other more outward RSW, there are still limitations to be considered in this practice. When the dominant class practices their domination, as James C. Scott put it, “the practice of domination *creates* hidden transcripts” (Scott 1990:27). Without one primary group of rebels to dismantle (such as RSW), the dominant class continues to reign while hidden transcripts transpire among the submissive class. That is not to suggest that hidden transcripts do not cross over into the public transcript. These, then, are the everyday forms of covert, solo acts of rebellion performed by the submissive class. There is no guarantee these acts will go unnoticed. They must be successful in masking their feelings, controlling their natural impulses, and responding in cadence, “Power means not having to act, or, more accurately, the capacity to be more negligent and casual about any single performance” (1990:29).

*Domination, Subordination, And Deviant Social Work*

This research examines the so-called deviance of social workers through the theoretical lens of domination, subordination, and everyday forms of resistance. Current research on resistance is varied across a broad scope of subject matter, from formal and organized to more informal and
individual forms of resistance. Everyday resistance is a theoretical concept introduced by James C. Scott in 1985 that is said to bridge the gap in knowledge between large and small-scale resistance literature through identifying the discourse exclusive to and between the dominant and subordinate class.

Resistance studies are understood as primarily addressing two forms of resistance, everyday resistance, or organized resistance, and are commonly found in sociology, psychology, and communication journals. Through the research of Carey and Foster (2011), the relationship between everyday resistance theory and their concept of deviant social work was observed and served as inspiration for this research. I advance Carey and Foster’s (2011) work on the deviant social worker by applying the theoretical framework of Scott (1990) to reveal how social workers occupy both the dominant and subordinate; and further develop the concept and functions of the positive deviant social worker. To develop this argument, I draw on my time interviewing a specific work-type of social workers: Memphis, TN housing specialists. Moreover, this paper will apply a theoretical framework not yet utilized within this scope of cross-disciplinary research.

Chapter V: Methods and Data
In this chapter, I discuss the data collection and analyses process. Interviewees provided their personal accounts of how they navigated their professional and personal identity as they moved through their day-to-day practice. The interviews were semi-structured to allow the LCSW to give detailed observations, feelings, and opinions. In this chapter, methods of recruitment, interviews, and participation data will be discussed.
Why Memphis?
The decision to focus this investigation within the city of Memphis, Tennessee was made for several reasons. From the perspective of local news and data collection reporting, Memphis has experienced a dramatic rise in individuals and families needing shelter, with local shelters reporting a deficit of beds compared to community need (Cook 2022). Though this claim does not align with recent reports of homeless populations decreasing (CAFTH 2022), the method used to calculate these statistics is skewed. Due to the limitations of the point-in-time count method, garnered data overshadows more covert cases of relative homelessness and accounts for more overt cases of street level or emergency sheltered homeless groups. Moreover, since the end of the eviction moratorium provided during the Covid-19 pandemic, an increase in utilization of these services was anticipated and later confirmed in the coming years (Wilborn 2020; Steimer 2022).

My own expertise working within the homeless sector of the Memphis nonprofit community has greatly influenced this research endeavor. During the three years of my employment with a local housing service provider, I have witnessed the revolving door of chronic poverty in action and the impact it has on social workers. From my observations, I found that the internal and external organizational communications across providers for the homeless population is fragmented. This fragmentation has caused prolonged distress for those who use services and the social workers and their ability to advocate and assist their clients. Furthermore, the guidelines held by organizations depend heavily on the internal functionality of the facility rather than adherence to an across-the-board operation standard. Thus, guidelines are observed on a spectrum from extremely rigid to laissez-faire.

Why Social Workers?
For this study, I chose to narrow my area of interest to the narratives of social workers assisting homeless individuals and families in obtaining and sustaining permanent housing. The decision to study “up” rather than “down” serves the purpose of this research best for several reasons. First, due to the oftentimes turbulent nature of the rehousing process, those navigating the path are assumed to be under copious amounts of stress. This strategy avoids the risk of retraumatizing an already fragile and marginalized population. Second, the authoritative role held by social workers is considered an opportunity to propose practical courses of action to resolutions. Given that social workers have academic training, organizational knowledge, and real-world experience, the opportunity to expand on previous knowledge of transitional housing barriers through narrative storytelling becomes possible. Third, while the current literature on homelessness provides a wealth of information on micro-level interactions of society, the narratives of social workers have yet to be considered a hub of applicable knowledge on multidirectional interactions. Lastly, interviewees will have an in-depth understanding of the rehousing process from their role embedded within multiple social and structural perspectives.

Recruitment and Interviews
I recruited participants from a variety of organizations that cater to rehousing assistance in the Memphis Metropolitan Area to circulate my recruitment flier (See Appendix F). To participate in this study, volunteers must have completed their MSW degree and have had experience working with the Memphis housing system through their services. Recruitment was conducted in several ways. First, as I have connections with local social workers across most organizations in the Memphis area, the most practical method for recruiting participants was to rely on snowball sampling. Second, I distributed my flier and requested that colleagues, friends, acquaintances, and community members circulate the flier as well. Research flyers were also distributed locally
to organizations that do not specifically cater to homeless populations but may employ social
workers with previous experience in rehousing practice. Third, recruitment relied on a publicized
call for participation through organizations in Memphis that specialize in rehousing services.
This was in the form of including the call for participants in the monthly newsletters of Memphis
housing organizations. Lastly, professional social media sites and local housing service webpages
were used to recruit participants. Originally, I had hoped “snowball sampling” would occur,
however, I found that reaching out to participants through websites such as LinkedIn proved
much more successful in recruitment. Before interviews began, participants were asked to
complete a basic demographic survey (see Appendix C) regarding age, race, sex, length of time
in the social work profession and length of time working within the rehousing sector of social
work.

Interviews were performed in private spaces most convenient for the interviewees; some
in their work office and others in meeting spaces. There were several interviewees unable to meet
in person, so the Zoom video and audio platform was utilized as a space to conduct data
collection. Using the Glaser and Strauss grounded theory approach (1968), interviews were
gathered until there was “saturation” and no new themes occurred. In total, nine volunteers for
this study were recruited and interviewed. Those who decided to participate via Zoom or phone
call were made aware that the researcher could not control or prevent any breach of
confidentiality or privacy that happened in the physical environment of the participant. The
purpose behind choosing these locations was for convenience, comfort, and to prevent
eavesdropping. The length of each interview was between thirty minutes and two hours. An
interview guide (Appendix D) was used to help the participants open up about their experiences
as a social services worker.
The reasoning behind this study and its overall purpose was explained to each participant in detail. Before moving forward, understanding of the study's purpose was confirmed by the interviewee. Verbal consent was recorded. A copy of the Informed Consent Form (Appendix B) was then offered to participants to keep and review. To ensure identities remained confidential, the informed consent forms were entirely waived. I found that, due to my first-hand observations of the environment fostered by housing organizations and employees, owning a document with the names of the social workers I interview alongside their signatures could be a deterrent in recruitment. By having the names attached to the opinions of social workers, this research could risk causing harm within their workplace. This decision is made to increase the chances of social workers organically sharing personal information about their experiences and reduce any worry they might have regarding privacy.

After receiving or declining their copy of the Informed Consent form, participants were reminded of their freedom to terminate the interview at any time and choose not to respond to questions. Upon confirmation, research began. Participants were asked questions regarding their day-to-day thoughts, opinions, and interactions while performing their social work duties. Each interview was recorded and later transcribed. While specific names of cities, regions, and identifying traits of organizations were used by participants in the audio recording, corresponding transcriptions were disidentified to further protect study participants' identities. Respondent’s accounts were deconstructed into categories or ‘codes’. Open coding was used to reveal themes that may not be directly associated with this study’s theoretical orientation and in hopes of preventing ‘cherry-picking’ patterns.

Participant Data

Table 1 — Age, Gender ID
### Table 2: Number of years practicing social work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total (N=)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-60</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3: Number of years working with homeless populations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total (N=)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># years working with homeless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-29</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Number of years practicing social work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total (N=)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># years practicing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-29</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter VI: Results

The results of this study indicate that social workers utilize different means of resistance in their roles. First, a social worker’s personal experience are explored; alongside its impact, implications, and connections amongst social workers and resistance. Next, I extend Scott’s (1990) theoretical framework through examining how social workers perform structural facilitation to overcome obstacles affecting themselves and their clients. Through this analysis, neither the radical social worker nor the positive deviant social worker are found to fully encompass the unique roles social workers of this study occupy. The typology of structural facilitation will be based on the characteristics of the barriers faced by social workers. Lastly, how participants of this study performed structural facilitation will be analyzed alongside their respective typology.

Personal Experience

Since the 1970s, there has been ongoing debates regarding the motivations of students who choose to become social workers. (Pearson 1973; Uttley 1981; Holme and Maizels 1978, O'Connor et al. 1984; Solas 1994) The ways some social workers are predisposed to their professions has been studied and supported across literature (Lackie 1983; Vincent 1996; Eack and Newhill 2008; Petersén 2022; Alastair and Kruk 1998). This study’s findings contribute to this literature, with eight out of the eleven total (73%) participants having personal experiences within the social services systems which led them to their current profession. Shara was one of the most long-standing social workers who participated in this study, with twenty-four years of experience in the field. Here, she described how these experiences influenced her decision to become a social worker:
I guess it started when I was very young. My mother died when I was three of Lupus. My father died at the age of 33, on the Fourth of July in my arms, from a heart attack. And so becoming an orphan, even though I had a whole family technically, in our term, I was an orphan. And so I got to see firsthand how people treat you. I got to see firsthand how the burnout of social workers affects you. So I got to see that and then me being a teenage parent at age 17. I got to see all the avenues of it.

Here, Shara describes her bi-directional experience in the social service system and highlights how differently a person in these marginalized groups are treated. This distinction of groups can also be observed in Scott’s dichotomy between the dominant and subordinate class. Unlike Pearson’s (1975) concept of “industrial deviance”, social workers of this study did not see their lives and client lives as separate (Pearson 1973:219). Instead, social workers of this study demonstrate how their responses stray from the common patient and practitioner “script”; and becomes more relational. As with Scott’s ideas of private and public transcripts, participant responses ebbed between the micro and macro, caught within the same web of socialized roles and behavior often expressed without any explicit or conscious intent (Scott 1992). Participants connected their hardships to the ones faced by their clients. This finding is reinforced through Alastair and Kruk (1998) research, with the experience one had to their work being seen as a positive trait and possibly a skill. Participants of this study who possess this connection drew upon these experiences throughout my time listening to their stories; often connecting their own experiences to the ones they now observe through their roles. Judy was also one of these social workers, describing how she is not only giving back to others, but also to her younger self.
Social work is... is my passion. I believe that when you work when you're working in any type of social services, or social work field, it's something that... sparks the inside. Like you just can't one day wake up and say, “hey, I want to work in social services” No, because it goes beyond that. So for me, it's...it's me giving back. But it's giving back to the part of my life that I once had to experience. So I'm trying to be the person that people can come to, because me and my family didn't have that.

For Judy, she positions herself in the circumstances of her clients; viewing her own unmet needs as a child as an advantage in her profession and not simply as trauma. Shara and Judy’s responses represent the ways these participants viewed their role as more than just a job or means to generate income. Judy’s self-proclaimed connection to help her child-self adds weight to the depths of her work. The collective response demonstrates a shared experience existing between practitioner and client, with both understanding the types of barriers faced on either side. Scott’s theory posits the dominant and subordinate class as the two actors of this social conflict. However, through this perceived level of sameness between client and social worker amidst barriers to service, social workers both have and lack power simultaneously.

*Radical or Positive Deviance?*

While radical social work could be used to characterize the micro and macro practices of social workers amidst barriers, this description falls short regarding this study’s findings. Radical social work is the idea that social work challenges the culture and status quo and aims to bring systems of oppression to an end through advocacy, community planning, and direct action (Bailey and Brake 1980). Though participants challenged and resisted mandated procedure, none of the seven participants who resisted authority performed these acts in unison with others. Most practitioners interviewed identified such acts as carrying significant risks, such as a damaged reputation or ethical concerns.
Further on in the interviews, participants became more reflective on how their deviant practice was not simply going against procedure. Rather, they supported their actions by describing how the restrictive policies of organizations are preventing their clients from escaping poverty and subsequently homelessness. Unlike Scott’s theory, the acts of deviance performed by participants were not in the form of sabotage or subterfuge. Instead, the acts performed were described as for the benefit of their clients. Everyday resistance can be described as foot dragging, non-compliance, pilfering, desertion, feigned ignorance, slander, arson, sabotage, and other forms of covert deviance (Scott 1990). While Scott identifies the dominant and subordinate class alongside the forms of dialogue shared and/or hidden, the positionality of the positive deviant social worker fits into neither category exclusively. In occupying this unique position, social workers were found to take part in varying degrees of what I have termed structural facilitation.

**Structural Facilitation amidst Barriers to Service**

Previous literature has highlighted several barriers affecting marginalized groups within the already stigmatized homeless population (Shelton 2015, Grunberg and Eagle 1990; Gwendolyn 1996; Mulder 2004) The effects of these barriers was captured in almost all participants' responses to identifying them; often followed by a short snort or apathetic “yeah”. Responses from this study echo that of the previous, with the mentioning of barriers associated with for-profit and faith-based service providers, and time restraints on housing vouchers. Maddie, a social worker with over eight years of work experience, highlighted her perception on the status of Memphis housing services:
I think that we are not meeting right now the true needs of the population that we serve. Yes, by the shelter. But in terms of housing and childcare, I think that we need to move towards focusing on jumping over those hurdles. And using the resources, we have to do that. I think that we can do a better job with it. Because even with the people that make it through the 30 day housing program isn't sustainable.

As with Scott’s theory, the barriers facing social workers act as the dominant group, controlling the subordinate class through their means of power. Power here can be observed through the daily interactions social workers engage in, such as funding, or rules within their workplace policy. Maddie described in our conversation how facilities in charge of coordinating core city programs aiding service users such as rapid rehousing need change. This was common amongst responses and often followed by stories of how they or their clients have been affected. When asked what participants would like to change about the housing system, nearly all commented on the unrealistic time restraints placed on clients versus the actual amount of time it takes one to navigate the housing system. When inquired further on what the ‘root’ of their frustrations with this system was, interviewees indicated that their frustrations lie in their limited capacity to support clients when they feel they should be able to. Yivonne, a social worker with twenty-one years of experience in the field, described how her ability to relate to her clients on a personal level allows for ease and encouragement in times of extreme frustration:

I have one client that is very, very emotional. She jumped off the handle a lot. Yeah. And very quickly, and she thinks the world is out to get her. So sometimes, I'll say, “Can we take a walk, you want to walk?” And I may tell her something that she's going through or in our life, that I went through what not, I'll tell her I told her that she reminds me of me. So I try to have a lot of personal conversations with individuals because sometimes they see you as a success story.

For many of these professionals, having a shared experience with their clients means they can connect with them on a deeper, more authentic level and be less clinical. This was reported to often create a space where their clients felt able to discuss topics that
otherwise stigmatize them. Scott has a culturally and psychologically influenced view of hegemony and sees it as subconscious and internalized through transcripts rather than as willful, coordinated acts of domination. But with resistance, he sees power as lying somewhere between structure and agency. Participants typically reported finding it difficult to adhere to organizational or federal policy and procedure while addressing their clients' needs. This imbalance between professional rules and personal beliefs due to barriers may lead social workers to perform structural facilitation. Structural facilitation involves the covert resistance of structural barriers. This resistance includes bending or breaking rules of their professional jurisdictions to ensure the success of their clients.

The fragmented execution of policy and procedure was described as a stressor amongst respondents. General disdain for not only aspects of formal policy, but also organizational cultures, was seen across these participants' responses; with some stating they felt as failed by the system as the clients they serve. Shara described this, drawing on her knowledge on the day-to-day functions of some Memphis shelters:

I had a family last year, was able to go to one of the Christian shelters, she had a daughter...that shelter put them out at five in the morning. It was 21 degrees. This was a young mother, with a child on her, just walking. Nothing was open for her to sit in because it had snowed, and it was 21 degrees. Remember, the community just brought it back to us and said, “We don't have anybody there during the daytime”, you cannot set up things like that.

Most participants felt that they often had little choice but to preform structural facilitation in order to overcome organizational or legal restraints that restricted their capacity to assist their clients. Unlike Scott’s comments on the form of acts performed in resistance (subterfuge, sabotage, etc.), the acts here are in the interest of their clients; not selfmotivated. As with research by Spreitzer and Soneshein (2004), a myriad of deviant acts within organizational settings were identified and, the deviant acts of this study were
done with the betterment of clients at their forefront. These consisted of intentional behaviors meant to depart from norms of negative deviance in honorable ways. One difference between the findings of this study and Spreitzer and Soneshein (2004) is that the participants of this study performed these acts of resistance with no ulterior motive nor acts of subterfuge. There was no indication that some of these acts performed by participants of this study were ever meant to counter service users' interest. Rather, resistance was done with the overall intention of increasing their client’s likelihood of escaping the housing system. Carey and Foster’s (2011) concept of the positive deviant social worker describes the qualities of the acts performed by qualifying social workers in this study.

Through the lens of Scott’s theory, one can observe social workers with this personal connection to their work as neither in a position of complete power nor submission (1990). Both works have highlighted the tension between individual agency and structural constraints. Social workers in between these two distinct levels of power have a deeper understanding of the frustrations of clients and how macro-institutions affect their ability to serve them. Those who engage in structural facilitation can be seen as challenging or resisting the institutional structures and policies that they perceive as hindrances to effective practice. By identifying with clients on such a personal level and having experienced these situations themselves, the stakes can be as high to social workers as they are to their clients. Not all participants connected on this level of intimacy, with an issue surrounding ethics of practice mentioned by 36% of respondents. This percentage of participants also did not report having a personal connection to social work, with the primary reason for choosing social work rooted in previous community service.
When inquired further on participant’s criterion for clients they either would or would not perform structural facilitation for, decisions were found to be weighted on their perceived relationship with their clients. Most notably, clients must demonstrate how they possess “buy in” to their own journey to housing. Denim’s history with the social services system starts from an early age, with their uncle who suffered from schizophrenia and homelessness rotating in and out of the system. Denim described the barriers facing clients who are suffering from mental illness, as well as explained the circumstances needed to perform services outside their training for clientele:

There are times when...doing this for as long as I did, by working in crisis care, you get to know certain individuals, you know, the ones that are really trying, and just... things are not working out for their betterment. You get to learn who is actually trying, and who's just frustrated with the whole process... so, trying to make sure that people get to their appointments on time, and those kinds of things. Or having food to eat. Yeah, I'm guilty of that.

Throughout responses, participants who performed structural facilitation did so with the view that they and their client must be equally yoked in their efforts in order to justify their rule-bending. Janna quote: “If I am making calls at 6AM, they need to be going out and applying for places (housing). I need to see that effort because a lot of people who come in are tired of it already”.

As with the subordinate class, the structural facilitation performed must be covert and wisely executed. Though this study does not study the rebellion of serfs as in Scott’s writings, the risks associated with such actions could be classified as malpractice and could even go as far as revoking one’s license. Despite the associated risks, Denim saw the ways the system has failed their clients and chose to take matters into their own hands. Shara echoed this response with her story:
I have a young man, a wonderful young man who's graduated now. Has a family of three…Way back when, he failed his drug test for the military. I was hot. I was like, "I did all this to get this recruiter, da-da-da"....And the recruiter said, "You can pee for him and I'll put him in." And I said, "what? I hadn't heard of that…", and yeah, I did. This kid, his mom, had died, his senior year in high school. He had gone out, first time smoking weed, and you know, weed in the south, we still think that's like crack to us. He was not gonna have a chance. If I hadn't peed for him, he would still be stuck in the same place he was that day.

Shara then went on to reveal that her motive to perform structural facilitation was a responsibility to help those, like her, who are in this vulnerable and unpredictable position. Understanding the implications of a failed drug test through her profession and the functions of the child service system through her own experiences, Shara made a decision in the name of helping her client while risking her own livelihood.

**Chapter VII: Discussion**

In this study, I argue that social workers preform varying degrees of structural facilitation while navigating restrictive organizational policy and procedure, as described by James C. Scott’s theoretical framework. The social workers of this study also demonstrated ways in which possessing a personal history with the social services system can affect their likelihood of performing these acts of resistance. Unlike the deviant social worker or the radical social worker (Bailey and Brake1980), participants of this study performed acts of positive deviance, where the forms of resistance taken are done so in honorable ways; and meant to fulfill their roles in serving clients (Carey and Foster 2011). Thus, this study's major contribution is revealing the ways in which social workers can adopt applied resistance as described by Scott and observe how structural facilitation can occur in the workplace. This is an important and unique contribution to existing literature on social work, which has tended to focus on the positive
deviant social worker or interactions between client and practitioner. Findings of this study reveal the unique position social workers often find themselves in-between possessing and lacking power in their roles as social workers. Posited between structure and agency, social workers in this position are expected to service the needs of clients but are regularly met with restrictions that prevent them from providing such aid. Previous research by Templeman and Mitchell (2002) showed the negative outcomes with a “One-Size-Fits-All” methodological approach to practice at facilities, with findings of this study reiterating the lack of focus on the true needs of housing service users. 

The results of this study extend Scott’s (1990) theory to show how it offers new sociological knowledge about resistance and the reasoning behind why they choose to engage or not. As social workers are met with barriers affecting their clients that they themselves have also experienced in the past, social workers are likely to engage in structural facilitation for their clients. The levels of structural facilitation have been categorized into three typologies: (1) creative solutions and rule-bending (2) underground operations and covert tactics (3) ethical dilemmas and advocacy.

First, social workers in the creative solutions and rule-bending typology employ innovative and unconventional strategies to navigate restrictive policies and procedures. They understand the limitations of the system, and, in certain cases, may engage in rule bending or finding loopholes to achieve positive outcomes for their clients. While these actions deviate from the established norms, they are driven by the intention to support their clients’ success within the constraints of the housing system. Second, the underground operations and covert tactics typology focuses on social workers who operate in a clandestine manner, employing covert tactics to navigate restrictive policies and provide additional resources to their clients. These social workers also work independently and discreetly, utilizing their knowledge of the system to
access hidden channels and exploit loopholes. They may go to great lengths to gather information, forge relationships, or manipulate the system to secure necessary resources for their clients, even if their actions are considered illegal. Their primary objective is to ensure the wellbeing and success of their clients, even if it means operating outside the boundaries of the law. Lastly, the ethical dilemmas and advocacy typology face complex ethical dilemmas as they navigate their day-to-day restrictions while still advocating for clients. They may encounter situations where the only way to effectively advocate for their clients is by engaging in actions that are illegal and outlines as unethical in the social worker code of conduct. These social workers continuously balance their ethical obligations with their commitment to supporting their clients’ success.

It is important to note that while these typologies acknowledge the deviancy aspect of the actions performed by social workers, they should be understood within the context of the systemic challenges and constraints they face. The intention of these social workers is to advocate for their clients and ensure their well-being, even if it means operating in morally gray areas. However, it is essential for social workers to be aware of the legal and ethical boundaries and to continually reflect on their actions' impact on their clients and the broader social service system. Recall Shara and her story surrounding her decision to use her clean urine in place of her clients. Through examining the different typologies, Shara’s actions fit within the ethical dilemmas and advocacy typology. Shara understood the risk and punishments associated with this decision; however, due to her experiences navigating this system early on in their life, as well as conviction in serving her clients who have buy-in. She both committed a crime while also ensuring that her client had a chance at escaping poverty through enrolling in the US armed forces. Shara is left feeling no regret nor remorse for her actions and is positive that, through her
bidirectional understanding of the macro and micro proceedings of social work, she made a wellinformed, ethical decision.

Taylor, a social worker from this study, was relatively new in the field with three years of experience. Taylor performed structural facilitation typology of creative solutions and rule bending by lying to a landlord for their client; falsely confirming they had a reliable form of transportation. By doing so, Taylor was covertly bending the rules related to apartment applications for their client’s housing needs, recognizing that lack of reliable transportation could be a barrier to securing housing. These solo and covert acts of everyday resistance are often driven by a deep commitment to social justice and the well-being of marginalized individuals. It is also not uncommon for those engaging in structural facilitation to have a personal connection to their client’s situations. Seven of the original eight participants who reported having a personal experience with the social service system also reported preforming varying levels of structural facilitation. They may be involved in bending or breaking rules, deceptive tactics, strategic manipulation of information, or even illegal activity.

The results of this study identify important aspects of social work that can be categorized into three categories: Understanding the root causes of structural facilitation, flaws of housing programs, and how we can be doing things differently. First, understanding structural facilitation highlights the importance of critical reflection and systematic awareness within social work practice. By understanding the role structural facilitation in perpetuating or challenging oppressive systems, social workers can provide valuable insight into the underlying reasons and motivation behind acts of everyday resistance within social work practice. In examining the barriers that contribute to these acts of resistance, we can gain a deeper understanding of the root causes and systemic injustices that drive social workers to engage in these acts. This understanding allows social workers to develop more effective interventions and strategies that
address underlying issues and promote positive change. Second, when the deviance is, instead, framed as structural facilitation, it is then that we can see how the flaws in the system generate this form of resistance. These flaws include how these programs may not adequately address the true needs of marginalized individuals and communities. This pushes for the reevaluation of housing program policies and programs to ensure they are inclusive, address the root causes of housing insecurity, and that they are responsive to the true needs of service users. For instance, recall Maddie’s comments on the sustainability issue of a thirty-day limit to find and secure housing. By understanding other needs that remain to be addressed outside of housing insecurity, such as reliable transportation or childcare services, the thirty-day limit on housing voucher programs might not have such a negative impact on client success.

Lastly, structural facilitation urges us to rethink traditional approaches and practices in social work—specifically housing programs. It calls for a shift towards an intersectional and person-centered approach that acknowledges and addresses the structural barriers faced by both social workers and their clients (Crenshaw 1991). Although this altered view of occupational deviance, structural facilitation offers valuable insights into the understanding of deviancy and its multifaceted forms.

The findings of this study also raise questions about the long-term effects of structural facilitation on social workers and their clients. Four out of eleven participants (36%) of this study, who did not partake in acts that are seen as everyday resistance, often cited ethical concerns and the issue of favoritism amongst clients. A key issue amongst participants was the selective nature of when, or when not, social workers performed acts outside their scope of practice. In doing so, Structural Facilitators may also take away the opportunity of advancement within the housing system from another service user in the process. The impact of stress and the many barriers that face social workers is also a matter of concern, given the number of studies
confirming the short- and long-term negative health impact of overworking and burnout (Hussein et al. 2013; Moriarty and Manthorpe 2015; Livnat et al. 2023). The findings of this study can also have implications for identifying once overlooked hidden acts of structural facilitation within existing literature. For example, those who report having firsthand experiences of being in the social services system may have a higher likelihood of bending rules for clients due to their ability to share in their clients' experiences in such a profound way.

Chapter VIII: Limitations and Future Considerations
There were several limitations in this study, including but not limited to: time restraint, number of participants, sensitivity of materials, and the time of year. The time restraints on this research subsequently affected the total number of qualifying participants. As my interviews began later in the semester, I found myself recruiting during major holidays. In addition to this, the sensitivity of materials, stigma surrounding deviancy, and risk involved in relaying acts of structural facilitation (such as with the ethical dilemmas and advocacy typology), could deter participants from divulging such details in their narratives.

This study gives rise to additional areas for future research through raising questions on what factors influence a social worker’s willingness to perform structural facilitation. Why do some social workers feel like they can deviate from rules, but others do not? How are some clients receiving structural facilitation, but others do not? If social workers have limits to the extent of deviancy preformed, why? What are the occupational consequences for workers caught performing unauthorized advocacy? Does unauthorized advocacy help or hinder clients in the long term? Research has shown that social workers can experience marginalization based on their race and/or gender (Aykanian, Dentato, and Khoury 2018; Laszloffy 2018) (Obasi 2022). In
the case of this research, six of the eight participants who performed unauthorized advocacy identified as Black, with the remainder being white. As previously stated, with race and gender not at the forefront of this study, further research is needed. This study demonstrated the ways in which social workers’ resistance can be understood in their day-to-day bidirectional interactions with clients and colleagues. However, more research is needed to better conceptualize unauthorized advocacy through intersectional approaches that incorporate race, class, gender, and other associated branches of the social services systems.
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APPENDIX A: Figure 1 Flow Chart

Figure 1: Flow Chart of Family Navigating Rehousing System
APPENDIX B: Interview Guide

Thank you for participating in this study. Just as a reminder, if you do not want to answer any of the questions, just let me know and we can move on to the next one.

Interview Questions

1. Thank you for taking the time to meet with me. Let’s start with learning more about you—Tell me a bit about yourself?
   i. Are you originally from Memphis?
   ii. Where did you go to school for your degree in social work?
2. Tell me about how you got into social work?
3. Could you describe to me what it means to you to be a social worker?
   i. From your time in school until now as a practicing social worker, has this definition changed? Stayed the same?
      1. If yes, could you tell me a story as to why your definition has changed?
4. Tell me how you got involved in working with the homeless, specifically?
5. Would you advise others to go into this line of work?
   i. If so, why?
   ii. If not, why?
6. What are the goals you have as a social worker for your clients?
7. Can you tell me a story of a client successfully obtaining housing?
   i. How do you think this was made possible?
8. Can you tell me a story of a client who was unable to obtain permanent housing?
   i. Why do you think this happened?
   ii. If so, why? What supports you making change in your role as a social worker?
iii. If not, could you explain a bit more
9. Do you feel like you have the ability to create change? What restricts this change? How do you feel about it considering your position?
10. Were things different in the past, in terms of providing services for the homeless?
   i. In what ways (if any)?
   ii. Are things better or worse now? Tell me more about that.
11. Do you think the rehousing in Memphis should change?
   i. If so, how? ii. If not, tell me more.
12. Could you describe to me what makes a “good social worker”?
   i. What are some of these qualities? Could you tell me a story about some of these qualities in action? You don't need to name any names if they were through someone you observed.
13. Could you describe to me what makes a “bad social worker”?
14. Tell me about a typical day at work? What kinds of things happen?
15. Tell me a story about a really bad day at work?
   a. What could have prevented it?
   b. Could you pinpoint the root cause of this bad day?
      i. Are there other bad stories you are willing to share?
14. You don’t need to name names, but tell me a story about a colleague who does this job really well. What makes them good at their job?
15. You don’t need to name names, but tell me a story about a colleague who is not so good at this job? Why do you think they are this way?
16. What really works well about your organization?
   a. If leaning towards negative– How does your role of work in this organization feel? For example, supported? Neglected? Neither? Could you elaborate more on why?
17. Is there any information you shared with a client and later regretted it? Tell me the story about that?
18. When working with clients, do you ever do things outside of your training?
   a. If so, could you give me an example or tell me a story about a time when you did?
   b. If not, why not? Could you tell me a story where a situation like this occurred?
19. Do you think policy surrounding the housing system should change?
   a. If so, how? Is there a specific policy or procedure that comes to mind?
b. If not, could you tell me about why current policy should remain the same? 20. What do you think the social work system working with homeless clients will look like in 10 years?

21. What are some questions that you expected me to ask today that I did not ask?

APPENDIX C: Coversheet

Please feel free to pass on answering any of these questions for any reason. You may also choose to disengage from this interview, at any time.

1. Pseudonym: ________________________________
2. Age: ________________________________
3. Gender Identification: ________________________________
4. What race(s) best describe you: ________________________________
5. What ethnicity(s) best describe you: ________________________________
6. Education: ________________________________
7. City of birth: ________________________________
8. State of birth: ________________________________
9. Number of years practicing in social work: ________________________________
   a. Number of years working with homeless population: __________________
**APPENDIX D: Informed Consent Form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Occupational Deviance: Deconstructing Social Workers’ Narratives of the Rehousing System in Memphis, TN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Researcher(s)</td>
<td>Kelsey E. Hill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Researchers Contact Information | Email: khill15@memphis.edu  
Phone: (662) 279- 4085 |

You are being asked to participate in a research study. The box below highlights key information for you to consider when deciding if you want to participate. More detailed information is provided below the box. Please ask the researcher(s) any questions about the study before you make your decision. If you volunteer, you will be one of about 30 people to do so.

**Key Information for You to Consider**
**Voluntary Consent:** You are being asked to volunteer for a research study. It is up to you whether you choose to participate or not. There will be no penalty or loss of benefit to which you are otherwise entitled if you choose not to participate or discontinue participation.

**Purpose:**
To broaden our social scientific knowledge regarding how social workers who work with those experiencing homelessness to achieve housing navigate their personal and professional identities amidst institutional barriers. You are volunteering to participate because you are a licensed social worker who has worked with persons experiencing homelessness navigate rehousing.

**Duration:** It is expected that your participation will last between 1.5 and 2 hours in a one-time recorded interview, either in-person or over the Zoom video platform.

**Procedures and Activities:** You will be asked to participate in a recorded one-time in-person or Zoom interview to discuss your experiences.

**Risk:** You may experience stress, emotional distress, inconvenience and possible loss of privacy and confidentiality associated with participating in a research study. This research is believed to be low-risk.

**Benefits:** Participating in this research study has no direct benefits to participants. However, we do believe this study will fill gaps in knowledge on how social workers perceive and mitigate their personal and professional identities amidst institutionally mandated policy and procedure.

**Alternatives:** If you do not wish to be in the study, there are no other choices except not to take part in the study.

**Who is conducting this research?**
Kelsey E. Hill of the University of Memphis, Department of Sociology is in charge of the study. Her faculty advisor is Dr. SunAh Laybourn.

**What happens if I agree to participate in this Research?**
Once the Principal Investigator (PI) has been contacted by the participant, the PI will then respond to their email with dates and times to schedule an interview in-person or over Zoom. When the interview begins recording will start, and participants will be asked if they have read and understood the Informed Consent for Research Participation form and to have their consent recorded. It is expected that your participation will last between 1.5 and 2 hours in a one-time recorded interview in-person or over Zoom. With the participant’s permission, interviews will be audio recorded. If the participant does not consent to being audio recorded, they will not be able to participate in the research, and their contact information will be destroyed.

You will be asked demographic questions, such as gender identification, age, and race. After you have answered those questions, you will be asked questions about your experiences practicing social work in facilities dedicated to serving homeless populations obtain permanent housing. For instance, you may be asked questions similar to, “Could you describe to me how/why you decided to become a social worker?” and/or, “How would you describe your typical work day?”
If at any point you would like to skip a question, you may do so without worry or repercussion. If you would like a copy of the questions that you will be asked, please email Kelsey E. Hill at khill15@memphis.edu.

**What happens to the information collected for this research?**

We may publish the results of this study; however, we will keep your name and other identifying information private. The PI will make transcriptions for each recorded interview. The PI will deidentify (change or remove) any identifiable information during the transcription process. Any identifying information that might come up during the interview, such as an organization name or address will be replaced with a broad description. An example is instead of Voices Outreach, something along the lines of Urban Rehousing or Rural Rehousing Facility will be substituted.

When the transcriptions have been completed, all the recordings will be destroyed. Participants will have the opportunity to review their own transcription for accuracy if they request to do so. Once the recordings have been transcribed, de-identified, and corrected if the participant chooses, the contact information will be destroyed, and the transcription will be coded.

The research team includes the PI Kelsey E. Hill and their supervisor Dr. SunAh Laybourn. The information will not be shared with anyone outside of the research team. The only person who will have access to identifiable information will be the PI. The PI will change and remove all identifiable information from the transcriptions. Contact information will be destroyed immediately after the interview unless the participant has requested to review the transcript of their interview. Those that wish to review their interview transcript will have their contact information stored until the participant has reviewed the transcript for accuracy, after which it will be immediately destroyed. The de-identified information will be stored on an encrypted flash drive accessible to the PI and their Faculty Advisor to give them adequate time to write up the results and publish the findings. After three years, this de-identified data will be permanently deleted from the flash drive.

**How will my privacy and data confidentiality be protected?**

We promise to protect your privacy and security of your personal information to the best of our ability. You need to know about various limits to this promise. If you choose to participate in an in-person or Zoom interview, it is not within the PI’s ability to control the privacy within your physical location during the interview. The PI will ensure that their side of the interview will be conducted in a private setting without interruption or distraction.

We will make every effort to prevent anyone who is not on the research team from knowing that you gave us information or what that information is. The recordings will be kept in a secure file in an application on the investigator’s phone and laptop. Only the principal investigator and the faculty advisor, Dr. SunAh Laybourn, will have access to the transcriptions. All recordings will be transcribed by the PI.
Your information will be combined with information from other people taking part in the study. When we write about the study to share it with other researchers, we will write about the combined information we have gathered.

We will make every effort to keep private all research records that identify you to the extent allowed by law. However, there are some circumstances in which we may have to show your information to other people. We may be required to show information which identifies you to people who need to be sure we have done the research correctly; this would include people from organizations such as the University of Memphis.

The Institutional Review Board may be permitted access to inspect the research records. This monitoring may include access to your private information, if they so require.

Research team members are required to report if a team member suspects child abuse or neglect, or suicidal thoughts. TN Laws may require this suspicion be reported. In such cases, the research team may be obligated to breach confidentiality and may be required to disclose personal information.

**What if I want to stop participating in this research?**

It is up to you to decide whether you want to volunteer for this study. It is also acceptable to decide to end your participation at any time. There is no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled if you decided to withdraw your participation. Your decision about participating will not affect your relationship with the researchers. The individuals conducting the study may need to withdraw you from the study. This may occur if you are not able to follow the directions they give you, if they find that your being in the study is more risk than benefit to you, or if the PI decides to stop the study early for a variety of social scientific reasons.

If you would like to stop participating in this research, please communicate that with the PI immediately. If suddenly during the interview you change your mind, communicate that to the PI and the interview will be stopped. Any information that you already gave will not be used if you request. If at any point after the interview you want to withdraw from the research, email the PI at khill15@memphis.edu. If you are to withdraw from participating in the research after the interview, all your information will be destroyed and will not be used in the study.

**Will it cost me money to take part in this research?**

There are no costs associated with participation in this research study.

**What if I am injured due to participating in this research?**

It is important for you to understand that the University of Memphis does not have funds set aside to pay for the cost of any care or treatment that might be necessary because you get hurt or sick while taking part in this study. Also, the University of Memphis will not pay for any wages you may lose if you are harmed by this study. You do not give up your legal rights by participating in this study.
Will I receive any compensation for participating in this research?

You will not be compensated for taking part in this research.

Who can answer my question about this research?

Before you decide to volunteer for this study, please ask any questions that might come to mind. Later, if you have questions, suggestions, concerns, or complaints about the study, you can contact the investigator, Kelsey E. Hill, (662) 279-4085 or khill15@memphis.edu, or Dr. SunAh Laybourn, sunah.laybourn@memphis.edu. If you have any questions about your rights as a volunteer in this research, contact the Institutional Review Board staff at the University of Memphis at (901) 678-2705 or email irb@memphis.edu.

Instead of asking you to sign this Informed Consent for Research Participation, we requested that the signature be waived in order to protect your identity. We have shared this form with you and request recorded verbal consent before proceeding with the interview.
APPENDIX E: Waiver of Signed Consent

Waiver of Documentation of Informed Consent

45 CFR 46.117(c)

The Institutional Review Board (IRB) may consider waiving the requirement for obtaining documentation of informed consent if the following conditions are met.

To request a waiver, justification for the waiver should be included in the IRB submission and should address each of the criteria listed below.

1. IRB may waive requirement to obtain a signed consent form for some or all of subjects if:
   a. the only record linking the subject and the research would be the consent document and the principal risk would be harm resulting from breach of confidentiality; each subject must be asked whether subject wants documentation; or
   b. the research presents no more than minimal risk and involves no procedures for which written consent is normally required.

2. In cases where documentation is waived, the IRB may require investigator to provide subjects with written statement regarding the research.

[Note that 1a above is not included in FDA. 1b is included in FDA and HHS regulations 21 CFR 56.109(c)]

REQUESTING WAIVER OF DOCUMENTATION OF INFORMED CONSENT

45 CFR 46.117(c)
I am requesting that the Institutional Review Board (IRB) consider waiving the requirement for obtaining documentation of informed consent in order to protect the privacy and confidentiality of the respondents. Before meeting for interviews, I will share the consent form (see Appendix B) with respondents and request audio-recorded verbal consent before proceeding with the interview.

If the respondent would like to inspect a copy of the transcription, their contact information will be saved until they have been given the opportunity to review the transcription. Once the transcript has been reviewed, the contact information will be destroyed. For those who do not wish to inspect a copy of the transcript, their contact information will be destroyed immediately after the interview. Given that the contact information will be destroyed, and the transcription deidentified, a signed version of the informed consent form would be the only identifiable information remaining. The only record linking the subject and the research would be the consent document and the principal risk would be harm resulting from breach of confidentiality. If documentation of informed consent was waived, informed consent would still be recorded and each subject would be provided a written statement regarding the research.
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Approval of this project is given with the following obligations:

1. When the project is finished a completion submission is required
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