Homelessness & Activism in Toronto & Montréal: Toward Community-Based Participatory Research & Emergent Strategy

Sarah Lynn LaCroix

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts

Graduate Program in Gender, Feminist, and Women's Studies

York University
Toronto, Ontario

October 2024

Abstract

This research explores generating a community-based participatory research (CBPR) project on technology, broadly construed, with housing justice and anti-poverty activist communities in Canada. This research employs stratified purposive sampling and semi-structured open-ended interviewing methods with Toronto and Montréal activists and is approached from the perspective of a CBPR methodology. 12 activists were interviewed for this research. Interviews indicate that barriers and access to technology centre on education, trustworthiness, usability, and dependability. However, activists also desire systemic and structural change grounded in communities. Activists indicate that elite academic researchers, people who represent the state, and corporations cannot solve issues surrounding homelessness and the Canadian housing market. Instead, activists recommend emergent project creation anchored in community as a possible avenue for mitigating aspects of these phenomena. As such, this research provides an appropriate foundation for multiple community projects beyond this text.

Acknowledgements

Thank you so very much to all of my co-researchers and friends for your careful and compassionate guidance throughout this research, without you this research simply would not have been possible. Thank you specifically to Jay Walls, who has been an important mentor from the start (Resilience days) and has been there all along the way with kindness and humility. Thank you also to Kevin Healey, who has been my teacher in the streets and who keeps me honest when it comes to the bollox of the academy. A special thank you to Travis LaCroix for always supporting me in so many ways, which I cannot enumerate here, but could possibly be explained in part through references to good home cooking. As well as, a special thank you to Fatemeh Gharibi for being my confidant and co-resistor in the academy and beyond. Thank you also to Jeff Gordon for keeping me grounded in our roots, our upbringing, and the island, while also moving us toward the future. A particularly appreciative thank you to my supervisor, Rachel da Silveira Gorman, who has helped me on multiple occasions with decrypting and navigating the bureaucracy and requirements of the academy; and who has helped me to build trust and feel safe. As well as, my committee member, AJ Withers, who has supported me through completing this thesis, who has given me considered advice inside and outside the academy, and who forgave me that one time I walked them to the Subway instead of the TTC. Thank you to the thesis examiner, Luisa Sotomayor, who engaged generously with this work. I also want to thank Jessica Vorstermans for seeing something in me and for your unwavering support, even when I have doubted myself. Thank you also to Viviane Namaste who has always propped me up and made things feel possible since beginning my education.

Rest in Peace, Nancy, Lamb, Mia, and Drew. Thank you, love you.

Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

1   Introduction

This research explores creating a community-based participatory research (CBPR) project with Toronto and Montréal-based housing justice and anti-poverty activist communities. All the activists involved in this research are people who have lived/living experiences with poverty, homelessness, and street cultures.[1] Initially, this research endeavoured to understand if these activists desire a "live updating" shelter bed database. As I detail in the following chapter, activist communities I am a part of indicated a need for a live updating shelter bed database prior to the commencement of this research. As such, this research began by focusing on creating a foundation for a community project on database creation. However, later, through research interviews, activists increasingly focused on the structural and systemic factors underpinning homelessness and the Canadian housing market.[2] Specifically, activists often described a recurring problem with elite research, state representative, and corporate solutions to these issues. Activists were clear that solutions arising from these entities often fall short of impacting meaningful change. Alternatively, activists advanced collaboration with various people who have lived/living experiences of poverty, homelessness, and street cultures as

---

[1]This research does not collect demographic data. However, people who identify as having intersectional identities are involved in this research. I speak to this more in the Methodologies chapter of this text (Chapter 3).

[2]Following Ricardo Tranjan (2023), I do not use the term "housing crisis". According to Tranjan (2023, 1-12), a "crisis" can imply a no fault temporary event. However, the colonial housing system in Canada is the ongoing and direct result of governmental policy, politics, and landlords. As such, in this text, I describe the Canadian housing situation as the "Canadian housing market" to denote that it is not an elusory event, rather it is a market choice premised on Canadian state politics.

paramount to effective organising around homelessness and the Canadian housing market. These sentiments are broadly shared by researchers and activists with lived/living experiences of poverty, homelessness, and street cultures. Often, these researchers and activists have called for increased community organising around poverty, homelessness, and the Canadian housing market (see Withers (2021); Desmond (2024); GoPaul (2023); Jackson (2023); Clark (2024); da Silveira Gorman (2024)). In this way, the present research is situated within a common orientation toward lived/living experience-led research and community organising, and, more broadly, this research endeavours to support lived/living experience activists, researchers, and communities through collaborative project creation, such as CBPR.

Stratified purposive sampling and semi-structured open-ended interviewing were implemented to discuss database and technology creation with 12 activists (7 in Toronto and 5 in Montréal). During this research, activists co-developed five research questions asking, 1) Is technology beneficial to lived/living experience peoples? 2) Are there barriers to lived/living experience peoples using technology? 3) How can technology be made accessible for lived/living experience peoples? 4) What kinds of technology tools or projects are desired by lived/living experience peoples? And 5) What kind of advice do lived/living experience peoples recommend for collaborative project creation? From these community-determined research questions, a framework for technology development with lived/living experience peoples began to take shape. This framework broadly indicates concerns centring on technology *education*, *trustworthiness*, *usability*, and *dependability*.

Such a framework can constitute an appropriate foundation for a CBPR project, or projects, with these housing justice and anti-poverty activist communities. As before, this research aims to explore creating a CBPR project on a live updating shelter bed database with activist communities in Toronto and Montréal. Notably, however, the ethos underpinning this research recognises that project desires often change or diversify over time and that meaningful community collaboration requires being receptive to changes during the course of the research process.

As such, this research has also come to provide a potential foundation for many additional projects, some of which are not necessarily grounded in database or technology development *per se* but may be connected in other ways. For instance, activists developed several project ideas including those centring on *art*, *stories*, *education & skills*, *political actions*, *supports*, *space*, *programmes*, *information*, *general technology*, and *systemic changes & intangibles*. Discussing these ideas in conversation with database and technology development decenters technology as a solution to homelessness and the Canadian housing market and affirms that technology development does not—or ought not—operate in a vacuum divorced from social, political, economic, and racial considerations. In other words, technology development ought not supersede other forms of organising nor become decontextualised from the materialities in which it is implicated. Rather, technology is seen as one organising tool among many by lived/living experience activists; and, like any tool, technology has limits and is context dependent. In other words, for lived/living experience activists, technology is meaningful only if it is situated within a broader set of considerations.

How activists speak about these broader considerations unearths a potential affiliation with a form of organising called "emergent strategy" elaborated by Black feminist abolitionist, adrienne marie brown. In broad strokes, emergent strategy describes a mode of organising that focuses on many smaller, enduring, and networked forms of systems change (brown, 2017). By focusing on these smaller relational forms of change, an emergent strategy perspective says that, together, individuals can affect the whole of a system. Activists similarly echoed this kind of systems change during interviews as they described project creation. Building on knowledge gained in lived/living experience organising, activists recapitulated the kind of change that is often experienced in community—that is, more intimate and interconnected forms of change. Most notably, activists were concerned about collaborating with variously situated lived/living experience peoples, especially when it comes to potentially larger forms of project development (such as CBPR projects). As such, any project or projects that may result from this research ought to consider emergent strategy or similar perspectives as potentially viable organising strategies.

This text is written with three considerations in mind. First, I wrote this text as though activists from my communies may read it. I have attempted to limit my use of academic jargon in this text for this reason. Additionally, this text emphasises explaining research concepts, such as the differences and similarities between "methods" and "methodologies", their uses, and their implications. I explain these concepts to make the text easier to understand and to conduct an exploratory analysis of how research might work in future iterations of this project

or projects. In other words, the second reason I wrote this text in the way that I did was to sort through my thoughts and figure out what research practices could inform a CBPR project. That is, this text is for learning. If someone from my communities reads it, all the better; they can learn with me.

Bearing this in mind, however, I also wrote considering the structural requirements my university expects from me—this is the necessary third consideration. As such, this text has undergone various formatting, stylistic, and output-based requirements for this reason. I have made some stylistic adjustments to aid anyone wanting to bypass these structures.

Specifically, the text is written such that it need not be read linearly or in its entirety. The Conclusion (Chapter 8) is the most concise recapitulation of the entire text and can be read without consulting any other sections—it also includes an "Accessible Summary" of the research. However, the Findings chapter (Chapter 5), in its own way, can also be read as a "stand alone". This chapter explains in detail "what research I did and how I did it", "how I represent research data and why I represent them in the way that I do", and "what the research data say". Additionally, I include five visualisations to facilitate data representation in this chapter, I also include descriptions of the visualisations and discussions about the research in general. Further elaborations of the data in the Findings chapter (Chapter 5) can also be found in the Appendices which provide screen-readable lists of all data appearing in the visualisations. The Emergent Strategy chapter (Chapter 7) discusses some limitations and future research directions.

A more holistic reading of this text includes reading the chapter immediately

following this Introduction chapter (Chapter 1), i.e., the Context chapter (Chapter 2). In this chapter, I situate the research in the context of the Canadian housing market and homelessness in Canada and discuss the origins of this research. Next, in the Methodologies chapter (Chapter 3), I discuss community-based participatory research in relatively plain-language and summarise the pertinent components of this methodology for ease of potential use in a future project with lived/living experience activists. In the Methods chapter (Chapter 4), I explain the differentiations between "methodologies" and "methods", and provide descriptions of the methods I employed for this research. I do this to explain how I conducted this research; but also as a preparatory measure for understanding and using methods more generally, and the inevitable co-deciding of which methods may be used in a project with activists. I do not proffer methods for a project in this research as these are more appropriately determined in consultation with activists engaged in a CBPR project. Next, in the Findings chapter (Chapter 5), I discuss the data that resulted from this research and which may provide a framework for a CBPR live updating shelter bed database project with activists. Then, in the Design Justice chapter (Chapter 6), I consider whether a design justice perspective can appropriately inform a shelter bed database CBPR project with lived/living experience activists. Through an in-depth analysis of design justice, I identify an inconsistency in how design justice conceptualises systems change and how systems change appears to operate on the ground in activist communities. Through my reading of design justice, I proffer emergent strategy as more closely approximating how systems change occurs in activist communities. In the Emergent Strategy chapter

(Chapter 7), I explain how emergent strategy is operating in conjunction with this research, some limitations, and where this research may go next. Finally, in the Conclusion chapter (Chapter 8), I summarise the research presented in this text and give a condensed "Accessible Summary".

2 Context

In the introduction to this text, I explained that this research explores creating a CBPR project with Toronto and Montréal-based housing justice and anti-poverty activist communities. The project of interest began with a live updating shelter bed database, and activists identified a potential framework that could inform such a project. However, activists also indicated several other considerations which ought to inform such a project or, indeed, any other projects, whether they are technology-based or not. I also gave a brief overview of a possible activist orientation toward a form of organising called emergent strategy—which I will explain in depth in the Emergent Strategy chapter of this text. In the current chapter, I discuss aspects of Canadian state privatisation relative to homelessness and the Canadian housing market. Specifically, I discuss the shifting roles of the Canadian state and its supposed "citizenry" in conjunction with the privatisation of social services.[3] I provide a cursory overview of how contemporary social services are now impacted and bound up with market forces following increasing neoliberalisation. Additionally, I discuss the origins of this research while providing some contextualising reflections. I situate myself and the two activist communities I am involved with on the ground and relative to the overall research discussed in this text.

Canadian homelessness is the outcome of many ongoing systemic, struc-

---

[3]What constitutes or is assumed a "citizen" in Canada is restricted by a multitude of considerations. Non-exhaustively, citizenry is influenced by patriarchal ideologies, the violence of war, colonisation, enslavement, and immigration policy and many other forms of exclusion and privilege (Fraser, 1997; Lewis, 1998; Korpi, 1998; Muszynski, 1996; Sharma, 2000; Satzewich, 1991).

tural, and institutional injustices, such as (and non-exhaustively) imperial/settler colonialism, enslavement and the transatlantic slave trade, racial capitalism, cisheteropatriarchy, and neoliberal biopolitics that mark some bodies—often racialised, disabled, impaired, or poor peoples—for death. Certainly, a thorough understanding of homelessness and the Canadian housing market ought to consider these deeper systemic, structural, and institutional factors. Indeed, some scholars and activists are speaking to these issues presently (see Maynard (2017); Thistle (2017). However, a proper discussion of these processes is beyond the scope of this specific text. Rather, this research aims to analyse and theorise these mechanisms with lived/living experience activists during a fully constituted CBPR project. As such, for the moment, I do not elaborate on these larger aspects of homelessness and the Canadian housing market. This research places emphasis on theorising with lived/living experience activists because theorising is viewed as fundamental to liberatory research. However, because the current research aims to lay a foundation for a CBPR project, I will offer some preliminary considerations on privatisation that could, in part, inform a future CBPR project on a live updating shelter bed database.

In Canada, injustices pertaining to homelessness and the Canadian housing market hinge on federal, provincial, territorial, and municipal failings. A brief overview of the word "homelessness" is instructive in this regard. Indeed, as pointed out by Hulchanski et al. (2009), the term "homelessness" did not exist before the 1980s; and, it did not exist in the Oxford English Dictionary until sometime after 2009 (Hulchanski, 2009, 4). The word did not exist because the

phenomenon did not exist—at least as it is now generally understood. Before the 1980s, there was no "homelessness" in Canada. However, the word "homeless" did exist prior to the 1980s in North America; yet, it was not a designator for a widespread state of existence for hundreds of thousands of people. Even the term "homeless" no longer resembles its initial definitive use. Before the 1980s, "homeless" specified relatively marginal numbers of predominantly "transient single men" without a normative domestic home life (Hulchanski, 2009). Homeless meant just that—no home, not *unhoused*.

This definition is reflected in pre-1980s literature. For instance, in 1960, the Social Council of Metro Toronto released a report titled "Homeless and Transient Men" that specified its criterion for "the homeless". According to the report, a homeless man is without substantive ties to a family unit and, therefore, deprived of the economic or social supports a normative 1960s family home would provide (Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto, 1960, 1, 5, 8). Instead of being *unhoused*, Hulchanski et al. (2009) describe homeless men as residing in flophouses, cheap skid-row rooming houses, and accommodations provided by charities. If an emergency unhoused situation did occur, hostels, welfare agencies, missions, and churches were available. Such as it was, social programmes existed in *relatively* comparable ratios to those who had fallen on hard times, tempering the mass social, political, racial, material, and economic phenomenon we know today as *homelessness*. Now, following the 1980s, "homelessness" has come to designate a "catch all term" (Hulchanski, 2009, 6) for the lives of several differentiated peoples.

Before the 1980s, Canadian politics aligned with Keynesian welfare ideas—i.e., a set of state policies adopted by the "Organization of Economic and Co-operation Development" countries following the Depression and Second World War (Bakker and Scott, 1996). According to Brenda Cossman and Judy Fudge (2002, 10-13), adopting Keynesian social assistance policies meant the Canadian state had to accept new "Keynesian roles" in conjunction with building new institutional powers to implement these policies. Here, according to David Harvey (1989, 133), corporate capital and the reformatting of organised labour entered into the equation to secure profitability in Canada through ensuring performance in labour markets and production processes. The use of such Keynesian management techniques ensured supply and demand jointly with state social assistance to form what could be considered a "virtuous circle" (Cossman and Fudge, 2002, 10). In other words, income was to be kept in the hands of consumers through employment, state welfare benefits, and income supplements in order to sustain consumer demand and, therefore, economic production. In the event of recession and high unemployment, state monetary policy could be used to counteract unemployment; and spending power and taxation could be used to restrain the loss of private income (Bakker and Scott, 1996, 287). In the event of "prosperity", surpluses could be accumulated in preparation for possible economic downturn by any temporary reduction in state social activity (Cossman and Fudge, 2002). In this way, the "risk of economic insecurity was socialized" (Cossman and Fudge, 2002, 10). As such, the Canadian-Keynesian welfare state's role consisted of direct involvement with the economy and responsibility for its supposed "citizenry".

Keynesian economic roles and responsibilities made it such that social assistance programmes were predominantly implemented by and fell under the purview of the Canadian federal government—not principally the provinces, territories, or municipalities. For instance, according to Hulchanski (2009), a major federal tenet of the post-Depression and post-Second World War period was stimulating adequate housing for all Canadian citizens. Before this time, the Depression and wartime life had been marked by a significant reduction in building new homes, leaving many people to live in poorer conditions. As such, federal Keynesian powers corralled the Canadian citizenry to revive the housing market with their tax dollars and elected governments (Hulchanski, 2009, 2). A mortgage system was formed with government insurance, social housing was built, and private-sector housing was subsidised (Hulchanski, 2009, 2). In addition to focusing on adequate housing, the federal government implemented several social assistance measures for those facing economic hardship, older age, and illness; for instance, Unemployment Insurance, Old Age Pensions, the Canadian Assistance Plan, and Universal Health Insurance. Moreover, there was a federal urban renewal program, a Neighbourhood Improvement Program, and a federal Ministry of State for Urban Affairs. These federal state-building processes made it such that, as public and private rental housing and suburbs were being constructed, citizens living in overcrowded and dilapidated conditions were beginning to obtain adequate housing. According to Hulchanski (2009, 3), approximately 20,000 social housing units were made every year following the 1973 amendments to the *National Housing Act* (Hulchanski, 2009, 3). This shift away from inadequate housing following the

post-Depression and post-war periods was, to varying degrees, on the rise until roughly the 1980s.

However, the Keynesian welfare state began to decline in the late 1960s when reductions in profitability prompted capitalists towards new accumulation strategies (Workman, 1999; Tshuma, 2000). Monetary policy was increasingly used to perpetuate the post-war boom, especially in response to rising inflation and slower growth (Gill and Law, 1988; Vosko, 2000). In the 1970s, pressure intensified following the world property crash, the increase in energy prices, the dissolution of the *Bretton Woods Agreement* in favour of floating exchange rates, and emerging debt crises (Harvey, 1989, 145). Soon, technologies that liberated productive and finance capital from the state increased global competition and generated mounting pressures for national restructuring and neoliberalising processes (Cossman and Fudge, 2002, 13). Moreover, according to Jane Jenson (1989), since the Canadian state is dependent on exports, it has been historically vulnerable to global business conditions. As anxieties increased over economic recessions, the globalisation of production, and government deficits, the primacy of market relations began to replace the key tenets of the Keynesian welfare state as the arbiter in economic policy (Cossman and Fudge, 2002, 13). According to Cossman and Fudge (2002, 13-14), by the 1970s, the fight against unemployment to raise demand was replaced by the fight against inflation as monetary policy was reformatted, and focus was placed predominantly on supply and production. This shift resulted in lowered wages and intensified demands on various labour processes. At the same time, this coincided with the subordination of social assistance and increas-

ingly resonated with the individualistic responsibility emphasised by various more controversial social policies such as workfare (Jessop, 1993; Peck, 1996; Vosko, 2000).

The 1984 landslide election of the conservative Mulroney government most prominently marks the splintering of government power and the eruption of homelessness. The 1980s virtually signified the end of Keynesian policy and, therefore, the related roles and responsibilities of the Canadian state to its supposed citizenry. Indeed, a major supposition of the time was that the "invisible hand" of the free market would "trickle down" to the less fortunate, instead of financial security being furnished by the federal government (Hulchanski et al., 2009, 5), in order to secure profitability. Increased marketisation in Canada predominantly consisted of decentralisation, reregulation, privatisation, public spending cuts, and tax cuts for the well-off. For instance, in 1984, the federal government began significantly cutting back spending on social housing and related programmes. Later, in 1993, all spending on the construction of new social housing was terminated. Eventually, in 1996, a final blow came as the federal government effectively removed its involvement with low-income housing by transferring existing federal social housing powers to the provinces and territories in an act of decentralisation. This move aligns with the erasure of the former Canadian Assistance Plan that was eventually subsumed under the Canada Health and Social Transfer in 1996 and then eventually terminated wholesale in 2000. The Canadian Assistance Plan was, for all intents and purposes, an insurance policy that consisted of a cost-sharing arrangement between the federal government, provinces, territories, and

municipalities to fund social assistance programmes. The erasure of the Canadian Assistance Plan in addition to three of the five central Keynesian tenets—Adequate Housing, Unemployment Insurance, and Old Age Pensions—marks a major point of dissolution in social responsibility between the federal, provincial, and territorial governments.

According to Cossman and Fudge (2002, 20), decentralisation and reregulation are key components of privatisation. Decentralisation of government power involves the ceding or selling-off of federal social assistance programmes and policies to the territories, provinces, and municipalities. Decentralisation gives the impression of diffusing decision-making power to various governmental actors in order to promote a democratic ideal. However, the supposed diffusion of power involves cuts in social spending and the erosion of various federal social policies. A greater individual responsibility is thereby placed on territories, provinces, and municipalities to manage social spending and policy.

Additionally, individualising responsibility has also echoed through the Canadian imagination. As Cossman and Fudge (2002, 16-17) point out, the ideal contemporary neo-liberal subject is increasingly individualistic by way of reacting to evolving neo-liberal norms and assumptions instantiated by the state. For instance, Hunt (1999) notes that following the changing political and social order, governments are no longer responsible for their citizens' social welfare but only for aiding those who help themselves. As such, the contemporary citizen is not a social one but a market citizen—i.e., one who is cognisant of the limits and liabilities of state provision by openly embracing an obligation to become increas-

ingly self-reliant (Brodie, 1996, 131). The market citizen takes responsibility for themselves and their family, thereby creating possibilities for new markets and becoming an "agent for social well-being" (Cossman and Fudge, 2002, 16). According to Jenson (1997, 637), citizenship is becoming "stripped of its notions of social justice and an active state". Rather, citizenship is based on "a wholly privatised and marketised notion of rights" (Mooers, 1998, 9). This decentralisation of individual roles coincides with a form of governance whereby the state creates the conditions under which individuals govern themselves (Hunt, 1999; Cossman and Fudge, 2002). Here, "self-reliance, rather than dependency, is the keyword" (Cossman and Fudge, 2002, 16).

Moreover, decentralisation presupposes *restructuring*. Restructuring involves the state's newly supposed role to respond with force to the evolving social order. Here, the role of the Canadian state is no longer ensuring social responsibility under Keynesian policies but rather enforcing national security, legal regulation, and surveillance under privatisation. As Cossman and Fudge point out, "*reregulation* allows us to highlight better the ways in which privatisation is a highly selective process of shifting some public responsibilities to the private sphere while diligently protecting and intensifying the role of the state to regulate in other areas" (Cossman and Fudge, 2002, 20)

Like decentralisation, reregulation is reflected in norms surrounding the Canadian citizenry. For instance, Cossman and Fudge (2002, 16) point out that restructuring and privatisation processes imply cultural change and social transformation by producing moral panic and nostalgic appeals to a better and purer past.

Moral panic is prominently reflected in the anxious market citizenry (Cossman and Fudge, 2002, 16). Here, "moral panic occurs in complex societies when deep rooted and difficult to resolve social anxieties become focused on symbolic agents which can be easily targeted" (Weeks, 1981, 118). Indeed, following the dissolution of the Keynesian welfare state, a series of anxious outcries have proliferated, including the assertion of rising crime rates, chaotic and uncontrollable immigration, and attacks on conservative family values (Cossman and Fudge, 2002, 16). These anxieties are among the most prominent, however, they are also statistically unsubstantiated (Cossman and Fudge, 2002, 16). More often than not, these anxieties increasingly bolster the coercive role of the state. Broadly, concerns over rising crime rates justify the state's criminalising power, anxieties over immigration justify restrictive immigration policy and the increased policing of borders, and fears regarding the decline of conservative family values justify the ongoing regulation and surveillance of identity and relationship structures (Cossman and Fudge, 2002, 16). Moreover, these forms of moral regulation are deeply contradictory (Sears, 1999, 105) especially since the state is called on to enforce a stable social order on market citizens who are increasingly subject to individualised social responsibilities and decreases in social supports. In Cossman and Fudge's incisive words, "[t]he ideological effects of these discourses of anxiety and risk are in turn partially constitutive of the neo-liberal project of privatisation since they produce a range of 'social problems' to which the neo-liberal state and its experts must respond" (2002, 16). That is, in short, state violence is circular; it both manifests *and* responds to violence.

Processes of privatisation have also become more prominent in the social services and non-profit sectors. Here, greater need is placed on social services grappling with the decentralisation of governments and the ceding or elimination of services previously supported by the federal government. Additionally, increased investments in market forces have forced many social services to balance financial considerations in order to remain operational while also providing care work that is increasingly devalued under individualistic neoliberalism. Indeed, in their analysis of social service spaces, Peter Dauvergne and Genevieve LeBaron (2014) note internal negotiations between offering care and engaging in "quasi-business ideologies" or moving toward increased corporatisation, essential traits, they say, of a growing "non-profit industrial complex" (Dauvergne and LeBaron, 2014). Similarly, some scholars have described this process as resulting in increased "professionalisation" and the creation of "quasi-total institutions" (Snow and Anderson, 1993; Stark, 1994; Bogard, 1998; Armaline, 2005). Others have noted that, in conjunction with these changes, processes of reregulation have resulted in increased violence, surveillance, and the policing of people who access social services (Maynard, 2017; Voices for Unhoused Liberation, 2023).

For instance, the research discussed in this text later unearthed how emergency shelters often collect data on people who call for services but are turned away for lack of space or service availability. In turn, these social services use "calls for service data" to lobby governments for increased funding. Such a process is a highly exploitative form of surveillance—resulting in repeated calls to multiple shelters—and could reasonably be called a form of institutional violence. In ef-

fect, the outcome is that shelters have little incentive to support the live updating database project forwarded in this text. Nonetheless, this was neither apparent at the start of this research nor a hindrance to the outcomes of this research. What I mean by this will become more evident in the following chapters.

The research discussed in this text originates from within a small grassroots street outreach group that I was a part of in Montréal, Canada. For purposes of anonymity, I will call this group "X". Initially, X was modelled after the Indigenous-led Bear Clan Patrol, based in Winnipeg. However, it is significantly distinctive. Specifically, X primarily composes and centres peoples with lived/living experiences of poverty, homelessness, and street cultures; the group does not collaborate with the police; it is structurally decentralised and premised on consensus-based decision-making. With roots in Indigenous and queer anarchist knowledges, the foremost organising principles of X are survival and relational forms of healing (if appropriate). As such, much of X's work involves spending time with people on the street in a supportive capacity. My role with X often involved organising our harm reduction materials. For instance, I created accounts with Santé Publique du Québec to order various harm reduction materials, I made kits with the materials in my kitchen, and then dispersed them out of a backpack while doing street outreach at night. During the day, I often created kits while attending online lectures since I was undertaking my undergraduate degree during the COVID-19 pandemic lockdowns in Montréal at this time.

After completing my undergraduate degree and gaining admittance into a master's degree programme at York University in Toronto, I began working

with a lived/living experience-led drop-in centre and kitchen. This lived/living experience-led organisation has since dissolved. However, it was operating out of what is now known as the Trinity Community Hub ("TCH"), housed within the Holy Trinity Church in downtown Toronto. I will also refer to this former organisation as "TCH", even though it went by another name at the time. TCH now collaborates with several grassroots organisations based in Toronto, such as Maggie's Toronto Sex Workers Project and Voices for Unhoused Liberation. However, it has also organised with various other local Toronto-based organisations over the years. During the time I have known TCH, it has also centred peoples with lived/living experiences of poverty, homelessness, and street cultures; it has advocated for lived/living experience leadership within the collective and decision-making in the greater Toronto community. As such, TCH's foremost value is cultivating community. My time with TCH primarily involved co-support and event participation, such as engaging in various community-led workshops.

X and TCH prompted me to get involved with community-based research. Before my relocation to Toronto from Montréal, X was discussing a live updating shelter bed database, and it seemed like a community-based project might manifest. Our issue was, and remains, an inability to adequately address the requests of people seeking shelter beds. At present, X depends on its shared knowledge of the shelter network in Montréal to secure shelter space. If anyone asks X to call around to shelters for a bed, we do so. Yet, this is often a fruitless endeavour for several reasons—one obvious limitation is the inaccessibility of collated and regularly updated social services information. Specifically, Montréal has no cu-

rated shelter or social services database. In Toronto, however, there is a city-wide social services database called 211. While 211 does not live update shelter bed space, X perceived such a database to be a promising means of mitigating aspects of our problem. Moreover, using 211 as a symbolic "jumping off point", X began to imagine some form of database tool that involves live updates on shelter bed space.

Since beginning graduate school, I have revisited the idea with a growing inclination toward CBPR methodologies and practices. This inclination is significantly informed by TCH's collaborative workshops and community events. Workshops and events at TCH practically foreground the transgressive potential of lived/living experience-led project development and community-based learning. Without knowledge of this practical foundation, I would not have pursued CBPR as an area of interest during my graduate studies. As such, while working at TCH, I began talking with activists about community-based research, database creation, and general technology use. TCH activists were engaged with the ideas and prompted me to begin contacting X activists about a potential project; they also suggested that Toronto-based activists become involved, if such a project were to manifest. In this way, I began this research by talking with Toronto activists and consulting with Montréal activists. I discuss this process further in the Findings chapter of this text (Chapter 5). In this chapter, I discussed privatisation relative to the Canadian state and social services. Specifically, I discussed the decentralisation and reregulation processes of privatisation and their effects on the co-constituted roles of the Canadian government, the citizenry, and social ser-

vices. Then, I explained the origins of this research in order to situate the research in Toronto and Montréal activist communities. Next, I will discuss the methodology I used to implement this research.

3   Methodology

In the last chapter, I discussed Canadian state privatisation relative to home-lessness and the Canadian housing market. I also discussed the origins of this research, while providing some contextualising reflections. Recall, as indicated in the introduction, that this research explores creating a CBPR project with lived/living experience activists. As such, in the current chapter, I begin by describing some commonly held CBPR components. I then discuss how this research conceives of and utilises various forms of terminology—i.e., information that is pertinent to a CBPR project. I also recapitulate the origins of this project and its subsequent growth up until the time of writing, thereby further situating it in a CBPR methodology. I conclude by explaining how the current research aligns with the CBPR components identified at the beginning of this chapter.

Communities engaged in research should determine their methodologies. However, I can offer a cursory view into a possible candidate. Indeed, it could be said that the current project is grounded in a community-based participatory research (CBPR) methodology. Notably, the findings of this research provide an appropriate foundation for a future CBPR project or projects to be undertaken beyond the writing of this text. However, the on-going quality of the research discussed here may be understood as aligning with the spirit of CBPR as well—or, at least, an iterative step within a longer-term CBPR project. According to Coughlin et al. (2017, 8), "[c]ommunity-based participatory research is not a specific qualitative or quantitative research method but rather an orientation to research; there

is no single approach to CBPR". As an orientation, CBPR informs the cyclical growth of a given project over time. As such, although this project can lay a possible foundation for a more definitive CBPR project to be undertaken at a later time, I will discuss the present research as though it adheres to a CBPR methodology. At a minimum, the origins of this research may be described as aligning with a more conventionally understood CBPR methodology.

An overview of the recent social sciences literature on CBPR appears to foreground three components that inform the various "nuts and bolts" of any given CBPR project (See, e.g., Atalay, 2012; Coughlin et al., 2017; Leavy, 2017; Hacker, 2017; MacKinnon, 2018). That said, the literature on CBPR also indicates that several principles can comprise this methodology. These principles are varied and constantly in flux, changing across various CBPR projects. With this in mind, my aim is not to give a reductive or monolithic depiction of CBPR. Certainly, Jackson et al. (1980, 41) assert that reductionist analyses are unsuitable within the context of CBPR and its cognate methodologies, given the complex dynamics these methodologies host. As such, one might think that a reductionist view of the methodology is inappropriate. However, according to Atalay (2012), paraphrasing Wilmsen (2008), "trying to define an exact process for conducting a CBPR project is not as productive as putting forward some foundational principles and examples of how they have been applied in specific contexts" (63). Wilmsen and Atalay's thinking on this matter is appropriate for the present research, given that this research represents an initial step within a longer-term CBPR project or projects. In other words, the CBPR components I forward are not deterministic or unchange-

able; they are cursory. Rather, I intend to offer an accessible and capacious set of foundational components that may facilitate further iterations of research. Paraphrasing Smith et al. (2016), Coughlin et al. (2017, 56) notes "that several sets of principles have been developed to guide the conduct of CBPR. They tend to be written in language that is most appropriate for academics and other research professionals and may not help lay people from the community understand CBPR". As such, this project attempts to mitigate the issue that Smith et al. (2016) and Coughlin et al. (2017) identify.

I noted three components in the CBPR literature. These three components are 1) a community-identified *problem* or issue, 2) a community's orientation toward mitigating the issue through some form of *change*, and 3) a *collaborative* effort to achieve this change. Most CBPR literature seems to understand components one and two as robustly grounded in communities. That is, the "problem" arises from the perspective of the community and the "change" occurs from within the community. Meanwhile, the "collaboration" component appears more dispersed, involving a broader conception of a community or communities. "Collaboration" invites persons involved in a community "writ large" to become co-researchers within a given project.

Often, a larger community of co-researchers involves those somehow invested in the problem of interest (Leavy, 2017, 245-247). For instance, co-researchers who compose a larger community may be invested because the issue is currently impacting them, they were impacted once before, they are intermittently impacted, or they are indirectly impacted. Concerning the present research, activists are ei-

ther 1) people who are currently impacted by homelessness and the Canadian housing market, 2) people who are intermittently impacted by these phenomena, 3) people whom these phenomena have impacted in the past, and 4) people who are indirectly impacted by this phenomena, for example, people who acknowledge the various negative implications of these phenomena.

Notably, these four categories are a heuristic to explain the "collaboration" component identified within CBPR methodologies. However, these categories overlap to a large degree and are anything but discreet. For instance, someone whom these phenomena have impacted in the past may affirm that they now oscillate between being intermittently and indirectly impacted—such a case is my own present disposition. Moreover, these categories simply may not describe the full range of experiences of some activists. Instead, these categories serve as temporary identifiers in place of a more nuanced discussion about identificatory terminology. Discussions about identification are ongoing within various communities and are vastly stratified along various axes of social, political, economic, and racialised disposition, situatedness, and privilege (Voronka, 2016; Thistle, 2017; Canadian Lived Experience Leadership Network (CLELN), 2023; LiveEx, 2023). As such, though this phase of the research does not aim to discuss identificatory terminology, further iterations of CBPR projects will require engagement on this front. Certainly, according to Patricia Leavy (2017, 229), a CBPR project should centre discussions about terminology use. Notably, however, Brigit McWade (2020, 130) asserts that '[a] central critique of identity politics is that by participating in such processes of identification, and therefore classification,

we become complicit in practices that actively (re)produce hierarchies of difference, and therefore inequalities' (see also Voronka, 2016; Tyler, 2015; Brown, 1993). As such, future discussions about terminology—specifically concerning identity—should be approached with caution.

Terminology directly concerning "homelessness" and the "Canadian housing market" was not factored into the initial research design because this project had assumed an open-ended consultative structure instead of a decidedly CBPR methodology. As such, I was not focused on terminology at the start of this research. Nonetheless, discussions about terminology often arose in the context of consulting activists regardless. No consensus was gained however, especially given that this was not the aim of the research and activists varied vastly in their conceptions of identification and terminology use. As such, this research uses several terms interchangeably. Primarily, I implement "activists" and "co-researchers" interchangeably throughout this text. Activists/co-researchers also often used the terms "peoples with lived/living experiences", or "lived/living experience peoples" during interviews. As such, I implement this terminology throughout this text as well because of its common use. It is also worth noting that it became useful—if not somewhat vexing, absent a direct conversation—to invoke the metaphor of a "spectrum of housing" to facilitate the easing of discussions around experiences of homelessness and with the Canadian housing market.

Of the terms used, "co-researcher" was the most readily adopted. Co-researchers immediately affiliated with this term, leading to a stronger affirmation that a CBPR methodology is an appropriate descriptor for this research. Indeed,

there are at least three possible reasons why co-researchers readily adopted this terminology. The first was that co-researchers had already agreed to be part of a research project that would develop over time. Within this context, it makes sense to identify as a co-researcher involved in a research project. Second, all co-researchers are relatively project-oriented. That is, every co-researcher is invested in cultivating initiatives within what I will broadly refer to as the "housing justice" and "anti-poverty" movements. Certainly, I have been involved in previous projects with all of the co-researchers before the instantiation of this specific research programme. Additionally, several co-researchers have been involved in initiatives with each other and beyond our immediate contexts. As such, these pre-existing relationships also easily lend themselves to the term "activism" or "activist", which are both used throughout this text. Finally, some activists may view the role of "co-researcher" as a natural next step in the ongoing progression of an initiative that definitively arose from these communities before any formalised academic acknowledgement.

I have been transparent about this project's foundation during ongoing dialogue with co-researchers. Montréal and Toronto-based activist communities agree that this foundation constitutes the origin of this CBPR project and any subsequent projects that are directly related. As before, this project arises out of a collective desire to streamline access to services for undertaking street outreach. Before beginning graduate school, I was engaging in support work with the activist street outreach group, "X", in Montréal. A foremost barrier to our work was accessing services in a centralised manner. Specifically, no Montréal-

centric database provides live updates on available emergency shelter beds from night-to-night. Additionally, once entering graduate school, I began working at a lived/living experience-led drop-in centre and kitchen called "TCH", where I participated in various workshops and events. The culture of TCH impressed upon me the practical relevance of engaging in community-based initiatives for social change. Specifically, activists are often explicit that a lack of community-oriented engagements contributes to the material austerity that many people face. As such, I am encouraged to pursue CBPR through TCH's ethos of community-based practice and have started transitioning away from open-ended consultative research. This process can be likened to what McIntyre (2008, 5-7) describes as a recursive 'spiral of adaptable steps' or a 'braided process', involving 'exploration, reflection, and action'.

This "spiral of adaptable steps" inevitably led to identifying a commonly held problem that Toronto and Montréal co-researchers face—this common issue is the first component of a CBPR project. Phenomenologically, the common problem consisted of two components, 1) a concern with addressing need through technology-based service access and 2) a need for increased community-based initiatives in the face of societal austerity. However, through subsequent interviews, I found that the epistemological grounding of these concerns is a perceived failing of elite academic researchers, state representatives, and corporations to address homelessness and the Canadian housing market. Specifically, co-researchers identified these entities as illegitimate and incapable of exacting expertise to counteract these phenomena. In other words, a phenomenological seeming problem

is also a form of relational knowledge apparent in distinctive locales and what could be considered an emergent approach to systems change. More explicitly, co-researchers in Montréal and Toronto indicate that lived/living experience peoples can enact change relative to homelessness and the Canadian housing market and they affirm that lived/living experience knowledge is legitimate. In this way, this project is grounded in a community-identified issue and an orientation toward change—the second component of a CBPR project. This orientation toward change has proliferated through subsequent conversations and engagement under the auspices of a research programme. I discuss the ongoing quality of this change in greater detail in the Emergent Strategy chapter of this text.

This project is premised on the first two foundational components of CBPR. That is, 1) a community-identified problem or issue and 2) a community's orientation toward mitigating the issue through some change. However, what about the third, though distinctly more dispersed, foundational component *collaboration*? Many community-based participatory researchers agree that collaboration should be based on communities' concerns with the first two components (Strand et al., 2003; Atalay, 2012; Leavy, 2017). That is, collaboration must be anchored in a shared receptiveness to a community-identified issue and an orientation toward change. CBPR advances this perspective on collaboration because it is concerned with attending to systemic and structural power disparities (Leavy, 2017; Atalay, 2012). Specifically, CBPR arose from a concern with democratising knowledge (Strand et al., 2003; Atalay, 2012) and acknowledging prior histories of harmful research (Atalay, 2012, 224; Leavy, 2017, 51). As such, community-based par-

ticipatory researchers emphasise the necessity of multiple knowledge holders and practising ideas conceived within a robust theoretical foundation (Atalay, 2012, 51).

According to a CBPR methodology, knowledge holders can contribute to shifting the social, political, economic, and racial order through knowledge exchange and production (13 Wilmsen, 2008; Atalay, 2012, 57). Collaborators may be any number of people invested in the issue under scrutiny. As before, for example, this can include those currently impacted by the issue, those who were once impacted, those who are intermittently impacted, or those who are indirectly impacted. However, what is important is that the issue cannot be addressed or mitigated without meaningful input from community members who are directly impacted (Murphree, 2008; Atalay, 2012; Mertens, 2005, 2009). Given that this quantifier is premised on a community-identified issue and an orientation toward change, there is little room for research that is not properly grounded in community. In other words, CBPR specifically centres communities from the "get-go" and is particularly concerned with a robust conception of community-based knowledge.

CBPR also hosts a rigorous theoretical foundation arising from many critical interconnected lineages. According to Leavy (2017, 233), CBPR draws from "critical theory, critical pedagogy, action research, feminism, critical race theory, [and] [I]ndigenous theory". These areas of thought are particularly concerned with power dynamics and form CBPR's historical lineage. Donna Mertens calls this foundation "the transformative paradigm" (2005; 2009). In her words, "[t]he transformative paradigm's central tenet is that power is an issue that must be ad-

dressed at each stage of the research process" (Mertens, 2007, 213). The transformative paradigm and CBPR are concerned with power because certain research histories have often been implicated in exclusionary or exploitative practices (Mertens, 2007). Communities know the historical vestiges of harmful research practices and knowledge deprivation and are actively working to acknowledge these power disparities collaboratively and through various means.

Indeed, during interviews conducted for this research, co-researchers often indicated a desire for multiplicity—i.e., "bringing more people in" who can contribute meaningfully to a project. Conversations often circulated around including others within the context of encouraging long-term relationality and interdependence. Often these desires involved including more peoples with lived/living experiences in the project, including a computer programmer with lived experience.

Conversations about multiplicity were also couched within a broader criticism of harmful research histories. Specifically, many co-researchers spoke openly about research harms inflicted on Indigenous and lived/living experience communities. Discussions often focused on historical systemic or structural analyses of harmful research, including intergenerational traumas resulting from Imperial-settler colonialism, anti-Indigenous racism, anti-Black racism, white supremacy, homophobia, transphobia, queerphobia, ableism, sanism, capitalism, and classism (specifically). Co-researchers also spoke about their own experiences with research and researchers. Indeed, many co-researchers, including myself, have been participants or subjects in various research programmes; some of which have been more harmful than others. As such, many co-researchers have research experience

and various apt perspectives on research practices.

The present research appears to act within the philosophical spirit of a CBPR methodology. However, co-researchers will ultimately need to determine the appropriate methodologies for their forwarded projects. CBPR seems like an appropriate methodology because it aligns with the origins of this research and the values that co-researchers hold. Specifically, this research arises from a community-identified problem, an orientation toward change, and a collaborative effort to achieve this change. Additionally, co-researchers are concerned with histories of harmful research and advance theoretical and practical insights in conjunction with these analyses. Currently, co-researchers are indicating that "top-down" elite research, state, and corporate solutions to the Canadian housing market and homelessness are insufficient to mitigate the effects of these phenomena. Rather, co-researchers hold that lived/living experience and community-based initiatives can have far-reaching and meaningful impacts on these complex problems.

In this chapter, I discussed some commonly held CBPR components and how the current research appears to align with these components. I also recapitulated this project's origins and how the project has grown over time, including a discussion of terminology use. In the next chapter, I describe the methods used in this research. I offer relatively robust descriptions of the methods implemented so that activists from my communities can understand how methods operate. I also explain how some methods were adapted to accommodate the research process.

4 Methods

In the last chapter, I discussed how the current research appears to align with a CBPR methodology. As before, the aim of this research is to explore creating a CBPR project on a live updating shelter bed database with lived/living experience activists/co-researchers in Montréal and Toronto. As such, in the following, I will discuss the methods implemented and adapted during this research with this objective in mind. To begin, and for the purposes of facilitating project creation, it is notable that research methods are different from research methodologies. However, the two do overlap and are sometimes less distinct. Often, a methodology will guide the structure of a given research project (Browne and Nash, 2016; Coughlin et al., 2017). A research project's methodology could be considered its overarching design. The methodology used in this text is CBPR. However, methods are the tools and practices used to undertake research or collect data within the parameters of a methodology (Browne and Nash, 2016; Coughlin et al., 2017). In other words, methods are the practical components of a research programme. As such, methods can change over time to suit the needs of researchers engaged in a given methodology (Smith, 2022), and researchers may adjust them to align with the chosen methodology (Smith, 2022). Often a methodology is selected based on the needs of the researchers. Therefore, adjusting a study's methods to align with a chosen methodology makes pragmatic sense. The methods utilised in this research include a *literature review*, *purposive sampling*—specifically *stratified purposive* sampling—and *semi-structured open-ended interviewing*.

First, I will discuss the literature review conducted for this research. The trajectory of this research made it such that I conducted a thorough reading and analysis of a perspective called "design justice". Initially, I expected that design justice may provide an apt theoretical or methodological framework for future iterations of this project. However, I soon realised that design justice is not an appropriate framework for reasons I will explain in the Design Justice chapter of this text (Chapter 6). For the moment, however, it is notable that my literature review amounts to an argument against the uncritical use of design justice in some community research contexts, including the present research.

My analysis focuses on current sources that discuss design justice, with a few integrated adjacent ideas. Sources range from information on the Design Justice Network's web page to academic articles and popular press books. Even though design justice is a relatively recent development, the readily available source material is comparatively multiform. Indeed, the dispersal of sources seems to be designed so that they are correspondingly accessible. For instance, many organisations work differently with design justice ideas, including art installations, digital visualisations, interactive pieces, maker spaces, and project zines. However, the short analysis I provide primarily concerns articles, books, and web page content.

Significantly, due to the relative novelty of design justice, or its recent articulation to the public, the availability of text-based literature is notably scarce. For instance, a search of two databases, Scholars Portal and Sociological Abstracts, yielded a mere 20 articles. Of these, Scholars Portal referenced 16, and Sociological Abstracts referenced five. However, two of the articles were duplicates,

meaning Sociological Abstracts only yielded four unique articles. There were no overlapping articles that appeared between the two databases during my search, underscoring the limited availability of critical texts on design justice. Indeed, many of the articles I found did not critically engage with design justice or apply design justice principles rigorously. Rather, many articles cite design justice "in passing", giving it a "proxy-like status" for indicating that design can be harmful or that there are histories of harmful design research. This makes sense within the bubble of academic publishing since journals have page limits, and scholars often want to advance the point of their research. However, this can mean that a deeper analysis of systemic injustice(s) is bypassed, becoming absorbed into an uncritical application of design justice. Additionally, it may be the case that design justice has become inaccessible insofar as its principles and ideas are manifold and so difficult to attain, depending on the positionalities of those who practise design justice. This inaccessibility is, perhaps, a problem for design justice since it is currently gaining popularity, and reductive or partial applications of its ideas appear to result in shallow analyses and depictions of design justice as trivial.

Elsewhere, design justice is combined with differing research programmes. Some of these engagements understand design justice as comprehensive enough to carry out their goals. However, some do not, adding various additions, commentary, and amendments to either design justice or their accompanying research programme. In this text, I engage with these "combination-research" sources. Although I was only able to analyse four of the 20 articles I found during my search, these articles more robustly engage with design justice and, therefore, serve my

purposes. My preoccupation is primarily with understanding what design justice *is* and how it *operates* to determine if it may be used in future iterations of this research. This objective requires me to study sources that critically engage with design justice. A short analysis of four design justice articles, four books, a published conference proceeding, an interview, and the Design Justice Network web page does some of this work, especially since there are few critical texts on the topic. In the Design Justice chapter of this text, I more thoroughly discuss this analysis.

Another method I implemented during this research is stratified purposive sampling. However, in order to explain stratified purposive sampling, or even "regular" purposive sampling, it is worthwhile to first explain *non-probability sampling*. According to Adler and Clark (2003), non-probability sampling is useful for exploratory forms of research. For example, non-probability sampling can offer a view into "whether a problem exists or about the nature of a problem, assuming it exists" (130). Non-probability sampling can also be a useful data collection method when researchers have limited resources or are unable to identify members of a given group who are difficult to reach. That is, this sampling method is qualitatively exploratory and dependent on the availability of subsections of a given population. As such, non-probability sampling can provide more variable results than *probability sampling*, which involves larger sample groups and is intended to represent a given population more uniformly. Non-probability sampling is an appropriate sampling method for the present study because this research aims to align with a CBPR methodology. Remember, a CBPR methodology is

concerned with 1) a community-identified *problem* or issue, 2) a community's orientation toward mitigating the issue through some *change*, and 3) a *collaborative* effort to achieve the change identified. Non-probability sampling may not provide a uniform representation of the perspectives of all housing justice and anti-poverty activists. Yet, it appears appropriate for exploratory research focusing on smaller, more collaborative groups like those involved in the present research programme.

Certainly, non-probability sampling's exploratory components are manifest in the current research insofar as this project initially arose from conversations and practices occurring within Montréal and Toronto activist communities. These unstructured conversations and practices are the original context underpinning this research programme and the subsequent motivation for employing a form of non-probability sampling called *purposive sampling*. Adler and Clark assert that, during purposive sampling, a researcher selects sampling units based on their judgement of which units will facilitate an investigation (Adler and Clark, 2003, 130). Given this research's original context, I employed purposive sampling by reapproaching Toronto and Montréal activist communities and engaging in follow-up conversations under the pretence of interviewing. I judged that the communities originally identifying issues are best suited to undertake an investigation.

I specifically used a form of purposive sampling called *stratified purposive sampling*, which "involves sampling from subgroups to facilitate comparisons between or among them" (Adler and Clark, 2003, 130). That is, I interviewed co-researchers in both Montréal and Toronto and found commonalities. Notably, I did not "pick-up" problems from one community and transpose them onto an-

other. For example, I did not ask Toronto activists directly about a shelter bed database. Rather, I focused on Toronto-specific issues and asked co-researchers about technology more generally and related topics. I interviewed in this way to understand the relationships between activists and technologies in Toronto and Montréal and mitigate potential issues that may arise from syphoning one community's knowledge and artificially transposing it onto another. Recall, however, that Toronto activists were also aware of the shelter bed database project and were those who initially suggested initiating a project with Montréal co-researchers. For this reason, Toronto activists were aware of the shelter bed database project. Nonetheless, the project was not treated as a monolithic and only about database creation.

Initially, I did not intend to employ stratified purposive sampling for comparison purposes. However, this method soon made its way into the rhythm of the project's CBPR methodology through recognising and subsequently sharing activist information and knowledge between the two communities—anonymously, that is. Here, I could share information with Toronto co-researchers (whom I interviewed first) from Montréal activists. Later, I could share information with Montréal co-researchers (whom I interviewed second) from Toronto activists. In this way, stratified purposive sampling became a means of political engagement across geographical distances and a way to mitigate some of the research harms discussed by activists, such as issues with knowledge deprivation and democratisation. Moreover, stratified purposive sampling mitigated against some of the barriers set by my institutional Research Ethics Board (REB). My institutional REB,

concerned with individual protections and privacy, views the present research project as made-up of discrete anonymous informers to an inquiring researcher, not activist communities engaged in solidarity and struggle.

However, co-researchers were often eager to understand the perspectives of activists in other contexts, and the sharing of comparative or contrastive dialogue became a means of attending to this desire. For instance, one activist I spoke with in Toronto was particularly interested in the structurally flexible and grassroots ethos of the street outreach group X that I am a part of in Montréal. Their over-arching curiosity was preoccupied with relational and non-institutionalised forms of community outreach—a less common occurrence in their experience within the Toronto context. As such, stratified purposive sampling was not the form of sampling originally chosen for this research. However, in practice, it certainly was the form of sampling that was utilised during dialogue.

Sharing anonymous comparative information was facilitated by *one-on-one semi-structured open-ended interviewing*, i.e., the final method used in this research. This interviewing method involves using questions loosely based on a specified topic without adhering to a fixed or rigid structure. Semi-structured open-ended interviewing is stylistically conversational. This style provides co-researchers with the choice to seek or volunteer further information, interpret and reinterpret questions and answers, and participate in guiding the interview outcome (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998; Esterberg, 2002; Hesse-Biber and Leavy, 2011). The conversational quality of semi-structured open-ended interviewing provides an "interviewee" with increased opportunities to participate in some interview-

ing dynamics. Therefore, they can blur the distinction between "interviewer" or "interviewee", "researcher" or "researched", "expert" or "non-expert". As such, semi-structured open-ended interviewing provided an opportune context whereby activists could inquire about organising information in a contrastive manner. Co-researchers often sought information about what activists were doing in different locales. Because of the differing geographic locations of Montréal and Toronto, this information was often discussed through a comparative form of dialogue. In this way, semi-structured open-ended interviewing brought stratified purposive sampling to fruition as an appropriate research method. And, in turn, stratified purposive sampling also facilitated the conversational quality of semi-structured open-ended interviewing. In the next chapter, I will elaborate on the questions that were discussed during interviews and the interviewing process itself. The present chapter, however, has aimed to lay the groundwork for the next chapter by explaining the distinctions between methodologies and methods and the three central methods used in this research, i.e., a literature review, stratified purposive sampling, and semi-structured open-ended interviewing.

5 Findings

5.1 What I Did & How I Did it

In the last chapter, I discussed the methods used in this research—i.e, a literature review, stratified purposive sampling, and semi-structured open-ended interviewing. In this chapter, I discuss how these methods were used practically. Specifically, I detail how I conducted this research, the way that I represent data in this text, and what the data gathered during this research represents. Here, a potential framework is also depicted for a possible CBPR project on database creation. The components comprising this framework are *education, dependability, usability, and trust*. Additionally, ten interconnected themes are presented that focus on *art, stories, education & skills, political actions, supports, space, programmes, information, general technology, and systemic changes & intangibles*. I conclude this chapter with a summary of five additional and central themes that were commonly held by co-researchers involved in this research.

For this research, I conducted 12 semi-structured, open-ended interviews. My rationale for conducting 12 interviews depends on my relationships with activists; all 12 interviews were conducted with activists I work with on an ongoing basis. Six in-person interviews occurred in Toronto between May and June 2023. The remaining six interviews were conducted online while I was in Halifax, using Zoom conferencing software between September and October 2023. My relocation to Halifax from Toronto during July and August necessitated this shift. My housing,

located in the student residences at York University, had become uninhabitable[4] and lease-precarious as the first year of my graduate programme came to a close. At the same time, my partner was struggling to secure safe and adequate[5] housing while in Halifax. As such, we decided I would relocate and attempt to find stable housing together. Under these conditions, I conducted as many in-person interviews with Toronto activists as possible during my narrowing timeline. I conducted six interviews between the time that I received ethics approval from York University's Research Ethics Board ("REB") and the time that York Housing necessitated my relocation to Halifax. The seventh interview I conducted with a Toronto activist occurred over Zoom.

The locations of the in-person interviews were not arbitrary but rather a result of collaborative decision-making. Co-researcher need was foremost, and activists either chose a preferred location or I made context-dependent suggestions. For instance, sometimes locations were chosen based on the time of day or a location's proximity to TCH. The interview locations included the Church of the Holy Trinity in downtown Toronto, where our lived/living experience-led kitchen and drop-in centre was located; the busy but sunny nearby Nathan Phillips Square; a bourgeois third-wave coffee shop called Dispatch Coffee around the corner; the unwelcoming and "seat-meagre" Toronto Public Library, in Nathan Phillips Square, that kicked us out; and a noisy but unassuming dive bar called Ronnie's

---

[4]York student residences are expensive, lack running hot water, are moldy, filthy, dilapidated, and overrun with cockroaches and carpet beetles leading to health problems.

[5]My partner's rental in Halifax had become a "revolving door" of various roommates and the roof of the building caved in.

Local 069 in the Kensington area of downtown Toronto.

In-person interviews were audio recorded on my cell phone and took about one hour on average. Notably, one of the earliest interviews was not fully recorded due to the age and quality of my cell phone. However, my supportive co-researcher agreed to re-record a subsequent interview, and we decided to head to the bar a few days later. Additionally, one Toronto activist indicated they preferred to interview in September when they would be less busy. As such, the seventh and final interview with Toronto co-researchers was finalised online over Zoom. By this time, I had relocated to Halifax, and this seventh interview constituted a befitting transition toward conducting online interviews with Montréal activists.

All five interviews with Montréal co-researchers occurred over Zoom and took approximately one hour. The six Zoom interviews (one Toronto-based and five Montréal-based) were audio recorded with "live caption" transcription turned on. The ability to use Zoom's audio recording and captioning functionality greatly expedited the transcription process I was undertaking at the time. This was poignantly pointed out by one Montréal activist who had previous experience transcribing interviews and conducting research with a community in their nation. Talking through processes of transcription with this co-researcher inevitably helped motivate me through the remainder of an otherwise arduous task.

Before conducting Zoom interviews, I had been manually transcribing full interviews. This choice was against reasonable and well-informed advice from my thesis committee, who suggested that I transcribe only part of the interviews. Transcribing full interviews takes significant time and endurance and can hinder any

researcher. Nonetheless, I was committed to giving some interim research back to activists. As such, I sent individual transcripts to each co-researcher so that they could review the content, provide feedback, and make any interpretations or changes. Additionally, I was hopeful that fully transcribed interviews may facilitate the analysis stage of the project. However, while I was content with the ability to offer something to activists and potentially ease the analysis that was soon to come, transcription proved to be the arduous task that I had been warned about. Moreover, private transcription services are expensive and free software services are data-compromising and so "off the table". Therefore, I resolved to play the interviews recorded on my cell phone for Microsoft Word's voice-to-text software on my laptop. However, the predominantly, though non-exhaustively, class-based and disability-based bias and discrimination existing within Word's software made it such that voice-to-text transcription revealed several garbled pages of incoherence. The apparent classism and ableism existing within Word's software was later discussed with one Montréal co-researcher who raised several concerns about the bias and discrimination that underpins digital technologies. Given Word's classism and ableism I was set to listen and re-listen to several hours of audio and undertake copious amounts of piece-by-piece manual transcription.

When it finally came time to conduct Zoom interviews, the transcription software was significantly more adept at capturing the accuracy of the conversation between myself and each activist. Some editing work was required; however, I could continue transcribing full interviews and providing the transcripts to co-researchers—a task I may not have completed with manual transcription alone. In

general, activists seemed pleased to receive transcripts. However, none gave sub-
stantive feedback, recommended changes, or provided interpretations. Two co-
researchers did not want to see their transcripts, and one received only portions
of their transcript because the interview took place over several hours at a noisy
bar that interfered with the audio recording. In retrospect, limited transcript en-
gagement is unsurprising given that housing justice and anti-poverty activists are
generally busy and overworked. However, it is also possible that co-researchers
did not see an immediate need to interact given the ongoing nature of our rela-
tionships. It is also possible that some activists may have felt that they could not
change transcripts significantly. However, this seems less likely since I informed
co-researchers that changes could be made.

5.2   How I Represent Data & Why

The semi-structured open-ended interviews conducted for this research
yielded a wide array of results. Representing these results necessitated providing
usable data to co-researchers without exploiting their knowledge. I also wanted to
depict interview data so that it would be accessible and remain anonymous. As
such, I did not default to using interview block quotes in this text, which can be
identity-revealing and require a certain degree of neurotypicality to read. That is,
presenting data to activists I know identify as neurodivergent requires a non-text
heavy form of data presentation. Therefore, I created a series of visual represen-
tations to facilitate the contextualisation of data for co-researchers. I also provide
image descriptions of these visualisations, provide screen-readable data lists in the

appendices of this text, engage in discussions about the results overall, and provide an "Accessible Summary" in this text's Conclusion chapter (Chapter 8). The visualisations in this text consist of a colour-coded table depicting condensed-form answers activists gave to the first interview question and four colour-coded diagrams representing data from four additional co-researcher-determined questions. I used Overleaf software to create the table and Canva software for the diagrams.

Notably, my REB required me to create an interview guide with more questions than those depicted in this text. However, I did not ask every activist all of the questions in this guide during each interview. This is because the project utilised a semi-structured open-ended interviewing method, which is collaborative and conversational in quality. As such, co-researchers ultimately determined the course of the interview, meaning not all questions were applicable in every case and, therefore, were not asked. In the following, I will focus on the five questions activists are most interested in discussing.

Each co-researchers' answers are colour-coded and represented anonymously. Across all five visual representations, the same unique colour represents each activist's contributions. I represent each co-researcher's contribution with colour to preserve anonymity and highlight that interview dialogue was incredibly differentiated and nuanced despite a common topic of interest. While activist knowledge is highly discerning, it is also deeply interconnected and constitutive of a shared form of dialogue. The blending of colours illustrates this nuance in some cases. In other cases, textual discussions provide another level of specificity to the data. For example, I often found common "running threads" of dialogue interwoven be-

tween each interview that pertain to community affairs. However, because many of these "threads" of conversation are of an intimate quality, and not particularly relevant to this specific research, I have chosen to keep them out of this text. Suffice it to say, some more relevant commonalities are included and readily visible within the diagrams. These are differentiated by colour but are loosely grouped together or near to each other and sometimes overlap within the visualisations. Additionally, all of the data is discussed in-text at a conceptual level, which may provide an increasingly holistic understanding of the collective conversation, albeit at a differentiated register. Notably, while all visualisations are largely colour-dependent, every idea they represent is labelled. Moreover, labelled data are ordered, collated, and screen reader-friendly in this text's appendices.

5.3   What The Data Say

As before, this research originates with a desire for a shelter bed database in conjunction with increased community-based initiatives. As such, I sought to determine if technology projects or tools are a desire of anti-poverty and housing justice communities, more generally. Theoretically, a database project would directly respond to a small and specified community—which is enough. However, a live updating database could also affect the larger Montréal community (or communities) for better or worse. It could also have implications for other nearby and surrounding communities involved in housing justice and anti-poverty activism. Therefore, the perspective with which I came to this research is that technology or technology-based tools are not necessarily a net good in every case. As such,

I aimed to gauge co-researchers' perspectives on technology in general. More specifically, I endeavoured to understand the parameters of the initial desire for a database project. A such, the initial question I posed to activists is *whether or not technology is beneficial to lived/living experience peoples.* My hope was that by asking this relatively open question, I could prompt co-researchers' intuitions about their general feelings toward technology.

Notably, this research aims to be desire-based (Tuck, 2009) within a context of increasing homelessness. In some instances, questioning whether technology is desirable outright could be considered "out of touch". Certainly, to say that technology is desirable in the present context is, at best, insensitive and, at worst, incorrect. What is truly desired is housing—among other interconnected social supports. As such, I focused on asking whether technology is beneficial or whether it could be beneficial. I wanted to steer away from positioning technology as a solution. Rather, I posed it as something that could yield potential benefits while couching it within our larger conversations about structural and systemic factors.

Responses to the question of whether or not technology is beneficial were variable and given in a matter of degree. They were also given holistically within the context of the entire interview, not to mention years of ongoing dialogue in community and before this specific project. Nonetheless, I have presented responses in the following table as either a generalised "yes" or a generalised "no" to provide a collective of average answers. This method of presentation is intended to facilitate an accessible understanding of the answers activists gave. However, it is admittedly reductive insofar as results are displayed within a strict "yes" or "no"

dichotomy and imperfectly representative of a host of shared moments, feelings, and experiences that surround the question posed.

Generally speaking, eight co-researchers indicated that technology is beneficial for lived/living experience peoples—with caveats. That is, overall, eight activists 'leaned' more *toward* technology as a possible benefit to lived/living experience peoples. However, three co-researchers I spoke with were more cautious about whether or not technology is a possible benefit. Yet, in some regard, these activists also expressed a tempered interest in exploring technology tools or projects as beneficial. Nonetheless, I have indicated these three activists' responses as "leaning" slightly *away* from technology as beneficial. One co-researcher seemed to neither "lean" toward or away from the potential benefits technology may host. Like all other activists, this co-researcher saw technology's "pros" and "cons". However, they were more indeterminate about whether technology is a benefit. As such, I have indicated their response in the following table as "both". I have provided a standard table with coloured paint splatters used to represent each individual activist. Under each paint spatter in the table a "yes", "no", or "both" is depicted. A total count is also depicted. The count is eight "yesses", three "nos", and one "both".

Apart from an easy answer, the more proximate outcome to the question of whether or not technology is beneficial to lived/living experience peoples is that *it depends*. According to co-researchers, what it depends on comes down to an individual's situatedness or circumstance within a context of structural and systemic considerations. Certainly, common to all activists was a conviction that the causes

Is Technology Beneficial To Lived/Living Experience Peoples?

Co-researcher	Response	Co-researcher	Response
	Yes		Yes
	Yes		No
	No		Yes
	Both		Yes
	No		Yes
	Yes		Yes
Total	8 yes, 3 no, 1 both		

Table 1: Co-researcher Responses

and effects of homelessness and the Canadian housing market are structural and systemic. Similarly, the benefits of technology depend on such considerations. As such, given that technology can be beneficial to lived/living experience peoples depending on these conditions, I aimed to know more about the tangible ways this is the case. I focused on asking co-researchers about the accessibility of technology itself. Or lived/living experience peoples' ability to access technology generally. In other words, I asked activists *if there are barriers to lived/living experience peoples using technology?*

Again, responses were variable, with some commonalities. The commonalities begin with the aforementioned conviction that most or all barriers are structural or systemic. I have not represented this common conviction in the following visual representation. However, it is ubiquitous in all co-researchers' responses. Concerning variability in other areas, I organised answers into four broad categories to ease conceptual understanding. According to activists, the barriers to technology that lived/living experience peoples commonly face predominantly centre on *education, trust, usability, and dependability*. Of course, these are non-exhaustive categories. Similar to the dichotomy I presented in the previous table, these categories are a heuristic to facilitate the comprehension of information. However, categories can sometimes be reductive, offering generalised and partial information. My hope is that visual representations, in conjunction with written explanations, may mitigate potentially reductive representations of co-researchers' responses. Here, the goal is to create accessibility to information while retaining some nuance.

Given the complexity of discussions, visually representing answers about barriers with answers about *access* also seems to make sense. Indeed, when speaking with activists, considerations surrounding barriers and access often arose simultaneously and in an interwoven manner. The interdependence of thoughts around these topics, perhaps, can be explained by the commonly held assertion that structural and systemic factors influence the realities of lived/living experience peoples. Since co-researchers' responses about access seemed to trail or happen concurrently with barrier responses, I rarely posed questions about access. When I did

ask, I questioned *how we can make technology accessible for lived/living experience peoples?* Activist responses about technology accessibility are grouped into the same four broad categories as data about technology barriers. That is, access to technology or technology accessibility hinges on *education*, *trust*, *usability*, and *dependability*. Given that these categories are the same, a visual representation of access mirroring a representation of barriers seems to capture activist responses with a stronger degree of acuity than textual explanations alone. Nonetheless, I have included all co-researcher responses about access in the appendices of this text, especially since visual representations are not accessible to everyone.

The following two pages include visualisations depicting co-researchers' thoughts surrounding technology barriers and accessibility. Both visualisations combined appear as an amorphous and bulbous snaking image overall. The two stacked images appear "snake-like" in form because they mirror each other. However, there are some small deviations within them. More specifically, each separate visualisation appears as four category labels—*education*, *trust*, *usability*, and *dependability*—with colour-coded paint splatters arranged around the labels in a cluster. These clusters around each label give the overall snaking image a bulbous appearance. Each paint splatter represents an individual activist, and their various responses are given with smaller individual labels. Within each cluster, paint splatters sometimes overlap, representing that more than one co-researcher had the labelled idea.

Everyone At A
Different Place In
Life

Focusing On
Immediate Needs

General Digital
Literacy

Education

Internet
Availability

Lack Of Available
Data

Technology
Not Giving Feedback
(i.e. no learning occurring)

Dependability

Devices Are
Expensive

General Lack Of
Devices

Data Not
Convincing

Lack Of Secondary
Technology
(e.g. Printers)

Theft Of Devices
On The Street

Outdated Devices

Loss Of Devices
On The Street

Technology
Overwhelming
(e.g. 211)

People In Crisis
Mode

Websites Hard
To Understand

Overcomplicated

Can't Transfer
Technology
Between Devices

Resource Lists
Unusable

Not User
Friendly

Basic Information
Is Poor Quality

Usability

People Are
Burnt Out

Hard To Coordinate
Resource Updates

Not Based On The People
Who Know The Needs

Too Much
Data

Over Designed

Not Localised

Bad Data Framing
& Interpretation

Not Nuanced

Not On People's
Terms

Lived Experience People
Not Consulted

Trust

Rarely 'By & For'

Information Not
In People's Hands

Lack Of Trust
(e.g. Conspiracies)

Programmer
s Biased

Fear Of Surveillance
From The City

Not Peer
Reviewed

Fear Of
Surveillance
From 'Big
Tech'

Biased Toward
Programmers &
Service Providers

Fear Of
Data
Mining

People Are
Private

Non-Democratic

Fig. 1: Barriers

Teaching People How
To Do Things

Interpersonal
Components

Education

Education A
Human Right

Spaces For Interacting
With Technology

Putting Tools Into
Someone's Hands

Spaces For Connecting
People with Technology

Non-Digital Written
Components

Physical
Components

Dependability

Not An App

Stable

Different Methods
Of Communications

Non-Time
Consuming

Transferable
To Other
Devices

Consistent

Self Sufficient

Sharing
Technology

Interpersonal
Components

Giving People
Equipment

'By & For' With
External Support

Exchanging
Knowledge

Lived
Experience-
Oriented

User
Friendly
For Low
Tech Skills

Consulting
People

Usability

Understandable
Information

Quality
Information

For Connecting

Keeping
Things
Simple

Focus On
Immediate Needs

Providing
Information In
Different
Languages

Helping
People Feel
Human

Very Clear

Practical

Localised Within
The Non-Local

Basic Stuff

Non-Generalised
Solutions

Made By
Us

Nuanced

Give
Autonomy

Spending Time
With People

Physical Space

Give People
Control

Less Time Jumping
Through Hoops

Collaborate On
People's Terms

Safe Space
To Access
Technology

Trust

Removing
Restrictions

Representative

Non-Commercialised
Third Spaces

Ethical
Considerations

Knowledge Of
Who Is In
Control

Relatable

Fig. 2: Access

Conversations about barriers and access led activists to speak about their own ideas of what constitutes an accessible project or tool. Certainly, because conversations about barriers and access were interwoven, discussions concerning project ideas came about with relative fluidity and were interwoven too. What often followed from dialogue about "what makes something accessible", were examples of "something that *is* accessible". Overall, I have interpreted co-researcher engagement on this front as advancing qualitative project adaptations grounded in a community research context.

However, it also bears mentioning that activists may have been prompted toward questions about accessible projects or tools by the "project description" given in my REB's consent form—which co-researchers were required to sign before being interviewed. Although I did create the "project description" myself, which was then inserted into the consent form, it was largely subject to REB formatting and regulations, changing the material quality of the research programme itself. This "project description" included the possibility of creating a community-based project that may be technology-based, and may have appeared more official or definitive than our conversations prior to interviewing or, indeed, under the shifting and contingent conditions of semi-structured open-ended interviewing.

Moreover, I was required to submit an interview guide with "sample questions" to my REB. Given that this research does implement a semi-structured open-ended interviewing method, I often found these "sample questions" to be counterproductive to the goals of this research. Recall that semi-structured open-ended interviewing is stylistically conversational to increase activist involvement

and control. As such, I did not depend on the "sample questions" I had produced to appease the REB. Nonetheless, when two co-researchers asked for a list of questions in preparation for our interview, I obliged by giving them the same "sample questions" I had made for the REB. At the time, I had not fully thought through the potential effects of the "sample questions" and I saw no reason to not give activists the same questions. However, regretably, they included prompts about a community-based project, technology, and accessibility which may have interferred with co-researcher control.

The reason I raise this issue is because REB application materials have their own stylistically reductive limitations and interviewing was intended to be as collaboratively led as possible. I have residual concerns that this project's results are somewhat scripted, structured from afar by my university's REB, instead of being grounded in the epistemic-ontology of co-researchers. As such, though I have attempted to create an ethically capacious research programme grounded in Toronto and Montréal communities, ironically, I may have been forced to concede many of the finer ethically-oriented details of my research to the REB.

At the time of interviewing, I had not yet realised the full implications of my REB's consent form or the "sample questions". Rather, I more readily noticed that activists seemed to want to talk about technology barriers, access, and project creation. I interpreted this interest as stemming from previous conversations about database creation and community initiatives. As such, although I am now cognisant of the structural dominance of the REB, I will continue to take interview responses with X and TCH activists at "face value" for these reasons.

Co-researcher engagement about accessible projects or tools still seem predominantly grounded in ongoing conversations, especially in the Montréal context where activists have recapitulated the idea of a shelter bed database. Given that co-researcher's were forthright about ideas, I often did not ask what an accessible project or tool might be. Instead, activists often led the topic of *what kinds of technology tools or projects are desired by lived/living experience peoples*.

Co-researchers are unanimous that what lived/living experience peoples desire are structural and systemic changes. Activists posited a plethora of tangible changes premised on structural and systemic analyses. Many of these recommendations diverge between various co-researchers. However, there are also some overlapping similarities. Recommendations are represented in the following visualisation as groupings around some commonly identified themes. The ten common themes that appeared during this research are *art*, *stories*, *education & skills*, *political actions*, *supports*, *space*, *programmes*, *information*, *general technology*, and *systemic changes & intangibles*. The theme "systemic changes & intangibles" appears as a label in the centre of the diagram because it is interconnected with every other recommendation, and it is the foremost form of change desired by activists. All other labelled themes are circularly arranged around "systemic changes & intangibles". Additionally, each labelled theme has several smaller colour-coded labelled recommendations arranged around it. The entire shape of the image appears similar to a daisy flower with "systemic changes & intangibles" forming the centre and other themes with multi-coloured recommendations forming the petals. All of these recommendations are also listed in the appendices of this text.

Centralised Website
Website — Media-Based — Non- Video
Digital Service

General Technology
Uploading Police Footage
Police Footage — TikTok — YouTube
Podcast — Documentary
Radio Station

Central Shelter Intake
Centralised Services — for Affordable Housing
An Argument — Budgets
Central Shelter Intake — Police
City Budgets
Organisation Budgets

Information
Something People Can Populate Themselves
Active Resource List — Affordable Place List — Bad Landlord List

Programmes
Reference Letter Programme — Find Group — Safe Supply
Unhoused Rental — Focus on Immediate Needs
Support Hotline — Not a Support Hotline — Giving Refurbished Phones — Basic Services Van

ART
Art Programmes — Art Programmes — Zines / Zines
Art Programmes — Non- Non- Arts- Based Based — Video, Art, & Writing
Art Programmes — Stories About People's Interests

Stories
Stories in General — Real Stories
Stories About How Homelessness Can Happen To Anyone
Changing Perceptions of Who is Homeless
Recreation Skills — Resume Support
Books — Proper Interpretation of Statistics

Education Skills
Employment Skills — Job Retention Support
Digital Literacy — Digital Literacy
Digital Literacy
Fighting — Campaigning
Non-Profit — Web Political Actions
Statistical Actions — Postering
Protests & Marches

Healing
Humanising — Ending Austerity
Collective — Giving A Shit — Caring
Accountability To Power — Caring Politicians
Enduring — Ending Politicians

Community-Based
Learning To Live Together — Building Relationships
Mutual Support — Grassroots
Realistic Support — Movement Building — Addressing Middle- Class Fears
Starting Over

Systemic Changes
Intangibles — Ending Corrupt Government, Private Sector, Non-Profits
A Revolution — Ending Status Quo
Politically — Investing In Young People
Ending Middle-Class Homeowner Ideology

Fighting Goals
Non-Profit Statistical — Goals Fighting
Non-Profit Statistical Goals — Non-Profit Statistical Goals

Political Actions
Fighting Goals — Ending
Non-Profit Statistical — Pressure — Institutional
Actions — Elected Officials — Referrals
Lived Experience — Informed Policy

LANDBACK
Address Climate Change (Floods & Fires)
Ending Social Capital-Based Housing
A Welcoming Space — A Welcoming Space — Low-Barrier Housing — Low-Barrier Housing
Land Activities — A Welcoming Space
Outdoor Events — Bus With Term Rentals — Investing In Home Building
Indoor Events — Computers Inside
Free Transportation — A Phone — Drop-In Centres
Available Transportation — Charging Space — Drop-In Centres

People Believing Me — People Seeing
Renter & Housless Solidarity — My Perspective — Spending Time With People
Organisational Networking — **Supports** — Spending Time With People
More Livable Forged Between Construction Shelters — Connections
Jobs

Fig. 3: Changes

The final set of co-researcher responses, included in this iteration of the research, respond to the question *What advice do you have for me (or anyone) doing a project of the kind you have suggested?* This question is significant because I am asking activists to trust me with their ideas or the ideas we cultivated together during interviews. It is important that these ideas are understood and that their intent does not become distorted. Discussions about advice may help to mitigate some of these issues. However, any implementation of the ideas depicted in this text should also necessarily require the input of the idea's authors.

Instantiating some preliminary advice is made all the more pertinent given my own transience between Montréal, Toronto, and Halifax and the fact that some co-researchers can be difficult to contact. This is not to say that advice serves as a "stand-in" or proxy for ongoing dialogue. Indeed, activists agree that any uses of data beyond the writing of this text will be discussed in an informed and ongoing consensual manner—even if this occurs over the course of large "chunks" of time in which I may be required to travel, or when I must wait several months for a direct message response. Nonetheless, the ability to refer back to co-researcher advice over the last few months has substantially aided in guiding this project.

Activists were equipped with a veritable array of advice which was carefully shared with me throughout our conversations, instead of being question-based dependent. This advice is represented in the following as a stylised list, instead of a conventionally understood data visualisation. Co-researcher responses were highly differentiated and did not organise into neat conceptual categories. As such, in this instance, a list was the most efficient means of representing data. However,

I have also colour-coded the data in addition to providing a screen-readable list in the appendices to make them available to varied neurotypes and bodies. Advice is listed as segments of coloured text that are stacked and shaped into a winding column. Each coloured segment represents a given activist's responses. In part, the column winds because several lengths of segmented text are represented. These text lengths give the column a rainbow "tree-like" appearance composed of several textual "branches". I have made tiered adjustments throughout the column to enhance the "branches", emphasising the overall "tree-like" appearance. A few similarities exist between co-researchers' responses, which are grouped together, creating small deviations in coloured segments.

Consider Non-Hierarchical
Consider Non-Colonial
Titles and Ranks Make People Uncomfortable
Tell People What You're Going to Do With the Information
Be Patient
Don't Scrutinise or Judge
Something Collective
Make Connections
Create a Network
Bring More People in
Bring More People in
Bring More People in
Bring More People From The Outside in
Get People to Start Talking to Each Other
Talk to More People
Find a Programmer
Make Connections With a Programmer
Find a Programmer
You Don't Need Money
Don't be Afraid to Create an Existing Tool
Don't be Afraid to Recreate The Wheel (People Have Different Perspectives)
Different Models for Different Areas
Professionalism at the Policy Level
Build Something People Actually Need
Listen to People
Consider Lived Experience
Talk to Lived Experience People Before Creating Something
Talk to More People With Lived Experience
Keep Considering Lived Experience Folks First
Another List of Resources Not Helpful
Lists Make People Feel Better But Are Not Accessible
Technology Can't Save Us
Big Things are Impersonal
Something Localised
Share Technology Around For Innovation
Keep Things Simple
Team-Up With Organisations
Have a Theme
Have Structure
Start Small
Keep it Open
Some People May Not Want to Share Their Story
Help People Feel Included
Manage Expectations Around it Being Co-Opted
Don't Put People on a Pedestal as Knowledge Holders
People Deserve to Get Paid, but There are People Out There Who Want to Contribute to Community and Volunteer
Keep Things Grounded in the People it's for
Give People the Respect and Dignity They Deserve to Have Their Own Supports
Technology Often Goes Wrong Unless it's for Building Community
Don't Make Technology the Thing, Make it the Thing That Supports the Human Thing
Do We Just go Along With Technology, or do We Actually Think About How We Can Use This for Good
Technology is an Enabler for Bringing More People in
There is an Agreement About the Problem, but a Disagreement About What Would be Helpful
Lots of People Want to Participate but They Can't Necessarily Take it on Themselves
People are Burnt Out
Consider That People are Tired
You Don't Need a Lot of People for a Project
Find the Lightest Possible Form of Production
Consider the Most Doable Licencing
Audio is Smaller File Sizes
Video Files are a Nightmare
Radio Requires a Lot of Airtime
Websites are Versatile
If You Can't Help Homeless People, You Aren't Getting Anywhere in Life
Keep Caring About People
You Must Have The Supplies and Willingness to do it
Duration is Important for Impact
Stay Focused, Don't Get Distracted
Check Your Biases
Surround Yourself With People Who Point Out When You are Doing Something Incorrect
Being Aware of Differences
Different Things Work for Different People
Good to Stay in Conversation With People
Keep a Clear Idea Once You Have Set on it
Don't Get Distracted and Pulled in Different Directions
If You Create Something too Broad it Won't be Useful
If You Try to Meet all of the Needs it Won't be Effective
Helpful to Have One Thing Consistently
People Need to be Motivated to Help Others, Rather Than Desiring to Look or Behave in a Certain Way
Stay With a Smaller Group You Trust
Don't Get Bogged Down
People Make Mistakes
It's Hard to Start Things Without Financial Capital but Technology is Inexpensive
Talk to People and Find Out What Works for Them
Only Helping a Few People is ok
Just do it
Have a More Measured Idea When Working With Folks
Focus on Improving Quality of Life, Ensuring as Much Safety as Possible
Never Stop Thinking About Moving into Cycles of Healing
Be Pragmatic About Outcomes and Seeing Where to go from There
Things Won't Change Today but There are Steps We can Take Today
There are Ways to Make Non-Harmful Technology
We May Not Have Everything We Want but How do We Get Closer to What We Want
Communities are Resilient
Absolute Pessimism is not Where Change Happens
Recognise Our Privilege
Understanding Privilege at Different Rates to Build Interdependence
We are not all in This Together
Need to do Some of the Hard Work
Consult Indigenous People
Ask People Who Have Been Around
Be Honest

Fig. 4: Advice

5.4 Themes

Five definitive and central themes arose through this research that deserve mention before moving on to the subsequent chapter of this text. All activists spoke about these themes in some manner or another. However, they are not immediately apparent in the visual representations presented above. As such, I will simply state these themes here. First, co-researchers advanced that *all lived/living experience peoples are different and have different needs*. Second, they agreed that, although different people have different needs, *what is common to all lived/living experience peoples is that they need to be able to access or do things for themselves*. Third, all activists expressed a desire for either 1) increased community involvement, 2) cross-solidarity between renters and those who are unhoused, or 3) bringing more people into project and community building. In other words, co-researchers indicated *a desire to deepen existing bonds and build community between differently situated peoples*. Fourth, activists hold and advocate for *a holistic and integrated view of systems change*. That is, co-researchers identified that complex issues may be addressed through smaller, more individuated efforts in collaboration with others. In conjunction with this fourth theme, all activists expressed *a problem with elite research, state, and corporate solutions to homelessness and the Canadian housing market*.

This chapter began with a discussion of how I conducted this research, including a focus on interview contexts and transcription processes. Then, I went on to explain how I represent the data generated during interviews. I also explained what the data represent and included discussions about the questions focused on

during interviews, co-researcher responses, and some ethical considerations surrounding institutional REBs. Here, a potential framework—comprising *education*, *dependability*, *usability*, and *trust*—also arises for a possible CBPR project on database creation. Additionally, I discuss ten interconnected themes that focus on project changes or creation, including *art*, *stories*, *education & skills*, *political actions*, *supports*, *space*, *programmes*, *information*, *general technology*, and *systemic changes & intangibles*. Then, finally, I ended the chapter with a summary of five additional and central themes that were common to activists. In the subsequent chapter, I will discuss design justice before moving on to a discussion about emergent strategy.

6   Design Justice

In the last chapter, I discussed how I conducted research for this project. I explained what research questions occurred and how I represent answers to these questions with data visualisations. Through interviews, a potential technology framework—depending on *education*, *dependability*, *usability*, and *trust*—becomes apparent which could be used for a CBPR project with activists. Additionally, several themes arose that can be implemented in such a project. In this chapter, I give a historical overview and analysis of design justice, drawing from the Design Justice Network web page. I begin with this source because it appears to act as a collective hub and provides a thorough representation of the ongoing ethos and history of design justice. I also integrate historical details derived from Sasha Costanza-Chock's work on design justice. At present, Costanza-Chock is the foremost intellect discussing design justice in written form. As such, I engage in a sustained review and analysis of their perspectives throughout various sections of this chapter. After providing a historical outline, I discuss how design justice operates within the four articles I found during my database search. Drawing from these articles, I give some differing definitions of design justice before explaining how design justice, in conjunction with theory, broadly construed, operates. Then, I discuss methods and methodologies, and finalise by critically analysing design justice's conceptualisation of systems change and "community".

6.1   Design Justice History

The Design Justice Network ("the Network") represents a central confluence in design justice as a phenomenon. The Network describes design justice as a social movement. This social movement appears to be predominantly structured around a collective set of ten principles which the Network web page hosts and advocates for. Indeed, according to the web page (Design Justice Network, 2024), the Network acts as a "home for people who are committed to embodying and practicing the Design Justice Network Principles" (Design Justice Network, 2024). At the time of writing, the Network advances these ten principles of design justice:

> **Principle 1**: We use design to **sustain, heal, and empower** our communities, as well as to seek liberation from exploitative and oppressive systems.
>
> **Principle 2**: We **center the voices of those who are directly impacted** by the outcomes of the design process.
>
> **Principle 3**: We **prioritize design's impact on the community** over the intentions of the designer.
>
> **Principle 4**: We view **change as emergent from an accountable, accessible, and collaborative process**, rather than as a point at the end of a process.[6]

---

[6]The Network's web page notes that "[t]his principle was inspired by and adapted from https://www.alliedmedia.org/about/network-principles" (Design Justice Network, 2024)—i.e., from the Allied Media "Network Principles".

Principle 5: We see the role of the **designer as a facilitator rather than an expert**.

Principle 6: We believe that **everyone is an expert based on their own lived experience**, and that we all have unique and brilliant contributions to bring to a design process.

Principle 7: We *share design knowledge and tools* with our communities.

Principle 8: We work towards **sustainable, community-led and -controlled** outcomes.

Principle 9: We work towards **non-exploitative solutions** that reconnect us to the earth and to each other.

Principle 10: Before seeking new design solutions, **we look for what is already working** at the community level. We honor and uplift traditional, [I]ndigenous, and local knowledge and practices (Design Justice Network, 2024).

Recognising their roots, the Network suggests collaborations at the Allied Media Conference, such as the Future Design Lab,[7] provided fertile ground for forming design justice. Specifically, the 2015 Allied Media Conference hosted thirty collaborators—identifying as designers, artists, technologists, and community organisers—who convened at a Future Design Lab session called "Generating Shared Principles for Design Justice". According to the Network, this session was inspired by the Allied Media Project (AMP) Network Principles, the Detroit Dig-

---

[7]The Future Design Lab was coordinated by Nina Bianchi, Una Lee, Andy Gunn, Victoria Barnett, and Ben Leon.

ital Justice Principles, and Detroit Future Youth's story-building activities.

Costanza-Chock, a foremost advocate for design justice and a current Network Steering Committee Member, also provides us with some insight into the origins of design justice. Like the Network, they (2018; 2020) also identify the 2015 Allied Media Conference as a formative moment for design justice as a social movement. However, they are also careful to pay tribute to many distinct contributors to design justice's history—some of which may not necessarily identify with its processes but engage in "closely allied practices" (2020, 8) nonetheless. Instances Costanza-Chock cites include several cooperatives, artist collectives, community groups, laboratories, institutes, researchers, computer scientists, individual designers, and advocates (2020). In a 2023 interview, Costanza-Chock also attributes design justice to insights arising from the Detroit area, not unlike the Network. Specifically, they reference the Detroit Digital Justice Coalition's DiscoTechs and the Media a Go-Go Lab as contributors to design justice's lineage. In their words, "there's a long history of extraordinary tech, community-building, and community-organizing work that's rooted in Detroit" (Rose et al., 2023).

Despite roots in the 2015 Allied Media Conference, the Network claims that it was officially established at the same conference in 2016. At this time, the ten design justice principles were iterated, shared, and reimagined (Design Justice Network, 2024), predominantly by way of a Feathers of Hope activity—"[a] youth-led initiative to facilitate a dialogue between youth, First Nations leadership and government stakeholders" (Feathers of Hope Inc., 2024). In 2016, the Network asserted that "no one individual should define Design Justice, it [is] critical for the

network principles to be created and edited by the community that...promote[s] and apply[s] them" (Design Justice Network, 2024). However, later in 2018, the principles were edited and shared with the Network at the Design Justice Track at the Allied Media Conference, yet the Network web page does not say who edited the principles. Currently, the principles exist on the Design Justice Network website, under a creative commons licence, and individuals and groups can become signatories to them as paid "DJN members" (Design Justice Network, 2024).

As of 2019, according to the Network web page, design justice is now structured according to how "people and organizations engage with the network—as signatories, members, working group participants, and local nodes" (Design Justice Network, 2024). This structured engagement has since led to translating the principles into several languages, multiple community events, projects, member stories, zines, and a "mission, vision, and intentions statement" (Design Justice Network, 2024). At present, the Network utilises and advocates for this "mission, vision, and intentions statement:"

Mission

We wield our collective power and experiences to bring forth worlds that are safer, more just, more accessible, and more sustainable. We uplift liberatory experiences, practices, and tools, and critically question the role of design and designers. Rooted in a sense of abundance, possibility, and joy, we provide connection, care, and community for design justice practitioners.

Vision

We envision futures where design is used to support care, healing, liberation, joy, and deep sustainability.

We dream of worlds in which design is truly led by the experiences and brilliance of those who are marginalized by interlocking systems of oppression. We also know that birthing dreams requires discomfort and moving beyond good intentions.

Intentions

- **Cultivate a deeply interconnected network.** We do this by decentralizing power, sharing resources, and remaining adaptable enough to dismantle systems of oppression.

- **Advance and embody the design justice principles in practice.** We do this by practicing community-led design and sharing stories and critical reflections.

- **Amplify experiences of joy throughout the network**. We do this by convening and collaborating as a growing community (Design Justice Network, 2024).

6.2   Design Justice Definitions

Descriptively, the Network and Costanza-Chock primarily understand design justice as a social movement. Within this social movement, practitioners are encouraged to shape the meaning and application of design justice—seemingly,

whether this be the ideas, principles, or the Network itself (Design Justice Network, 2024). In practice, however, many of the design justice definitions that academic researchers use to inform their design justice work stem from either 1) partial articulations of Costanza-Chock's stated "provisional" definitions or 2) various descriptions of design justice processes that Costanza-Chock provides. Presently, their most complete "provisional" definition of design justice is as follows:

> Design justice is a framework for analysis of how design distributes benefits and burdens between various groups of people. Design justice focuses explicitly on the ways that design reproduces and or challenges the matrix of domination (white supremacy, heteropatriarchy, capitalism, ableism, settler colonialism, and other forms of structural inequality). Design justice is also a growing community of practice that aims to ensure a more equitable distribution of design's benefits and burdens; meaningful participation in design decisions; and recognition of community-based, Indigenous, and diasporic design traditions, knowledge, and practices (Costanza-Chock, 2020, 23).

However, in a recent 2023 interview, Costanza-Chock also recapitulated aspects of this definition, claiming that they "started off by saying design justice is a framework for analysis—of how design distributes benefits and burdens between various groups of people—[that] explicitly focuses on how design can reproduce or challenge the 'matrix of domination'". And that "[i]n addition to being a frame-

work for analysis, design justice is a growing community of practice" (Rose et al., 2023).

In their paper "Auditing design justice: The impact of social movements on design pedagogy at a technology institution", Madhurima Das et al. (2023) also use part of this description. I.e., "design justice is a framework for analysis and a community of practice", and they incorporate aspects of the 2020 definition shown above, drawing from an earlier 2018 version. Specifically, they advance design justice as "ensuring a more equitable distribution of design's benefits and burdens; meaningful participation in design decisions; and recognition of community-based, Indigenous, and diasporic design traditions, knowledge, and practices". However, in practice, they understand design justice as equivalent to advancing "equity" and "justice" (Das et al., 2023, 2) but do not elaborate on what these terms entail. Rather, their research details how they audited engineering design pedagogy at the Massachusetts Institute for Technology (MIT) to measure engagement with design justice ideas. Auditing takes the form of analysing syllabi and course materials at MIT to "inform and stimulate the creation of design pedagogy that creates engineers, who through their design practice, aspire to advance equity and justice" (Das et al., 2023, 2).

Floegel and Costello (2021) also use design justice as a pedagogical auditing mechanism in their paper "Methods for a feminist technoscience of information practice: Design Justice and speculative futurities". Specifically, they develop a feminist technoscience metatheory for Library and Information Science (LIS) using speculative futurities and design justice ideas. That is, Floegel and Costello use

design justice descriptively. For them, design justice is primarily a methodology Floegel and Costello (2021, 5). Specifically, a methodology 'that seeks to reconsider the place of a scholar and their university in research that centres technology and, by extension, design' (Floegel and Costello, 2021, 5, paraphrasing Costanza-Chock (2020)). In other words, Floegel and Costello centre the scholar and their university in conceptualising design justice. This centring is curious since they also define design justice as a "community-led movement" that works with people who are "most impacted by technologies' harms' (2021, 5). Moreover, they point out that the term "community" is ubiquitous to design justice as a concept. In their words, "'community' appears in 5 of 10 [design justice] principles" (2021, 50).

Hanna Huffstetler et al. (2021) also recognise design justice's orientation toward "equity" and "community" in their paper "Beyond Virtue-Signaling: Advancing Equity Through Design Justice and Public Health Critical Race Praxis". They discuss how Public Health Critical Race Praxis (PHCRP) and design justice can advance equity in public health initiatives. According to them, "[PHCRP] is an antiracist approach to public health research" (Huffstetler et al., 2021, 22). Using a descriptive definition of design justice, they claim it "is an approach for empowering communities to lead design and social transformation" (Huffstetler et al., 2021, 22). Although the language of "empowerment" has been troubled by some for its neoliberal orientations (Floegel and Costello, 2021; Banet-Weiser, 2018) Huffstetler et al. (2021) appear to welcome design justice's generalised centring of communities. As they put it, "both [PHCRP and design justice] provide

tools for the development of effective community-centred solutions to otherwise intractable public health challenges" (Huffstetler et al., 2021, 22). Notably, however, they hold that while communities ought to be in leadership roles concerning public health decisions, public health providers still have a part to play. In their words,

> As public health practitioners we must actively engage as coproducers of antiracist solutions by examining our positionality (i.e., social position and power) within institutions, communities, and systems; disrupting our own spheres of power and privilege; and ensuring that communities have the resources they need not only to lead but also to implement and sustain solutions they create (Huffstetler et al., 2021, 2).

Similarly, in their paper "What design for Urban Design Justice?", Francesca Piazzoni et al. (2022) are concerned with distinctions between supposed "experts" and "non-experts" when it comes to matters of justice—especially regarding multiple human and non-human knowledges and agencies. Piazzoni et al. (2022); Escobar (2017); Bennett (2010); Yaneva (2022, 2). Complicating these dynamics amounts to rejecting what they determine to be a form of relativism. In their words, professional designers are only one component of the larger move toward spatial justice, and they ought to get involved and "take sides" (Piazzoni et al., 2022, 14).

Piazzoni et al. (2022) are concerned with spatial justice because they want to elaborate an "Urban Design Justice" framework by responding to design justice.

For them, theorists preceding design justice "have urged architects and planners to facilitate the spatial practices that edge-populations deploy in order to counter exclusion" (Piazzoni et al., 2022, 14, quoting Goh et al. (2022); Vasudevan and Novoa (2021)). Here, design justice is conceptualised as an auxiliary piece of a longer lineage of design theory and practice. While constituting its own unique area, design justice earmarks many interconnected efforts within Urban Design Justice thinking. Taking cues from the Network and Costanza-Chock, Piazzoni et al. (2022) understand design justice as a social movement. However, they use "design justice" descriptively, following Costanza-Chock (2020). For them, design justice, as a social movement, recently brought "debates together, opening new spaces for action through an intersectional, [I]ndigenous, queer-feminist lens" (Piazzoni et al., 2022, 4). They also reference design justice as generally shedding light on how design processes reify oppression through the intersections of white supremacy, heteropatriarchy, capitalism, and settler colonialism (Piazzoni et al., 2022, 4). However, they do not provide an analysis of these systemic issues relative to their work.

6.3 Design Justice & Theory

Costanza-Chock's (2018, 2020) focus on the intersections of white supremacy, heteropatriarchy, capitalism, and settler colonialism is theorised in conjunction with predominantly Black feminist "intersectionality" and the "matrix of domination". Indeed, Black feminist theory appears central to design justice. To date, a particular focus on Black feminist analyses, intersectionality and the matrix of

domination is apparent in all of Costanza-Chock's work on design justice. Additionally, all of the sources I review in this chapter engage with these analyses to varying degrees.

In brief, intersectionality describes the sometimes invisibilised yet overlapping and reinforcing experiences of primarily Black women who are situated within racialised, classed, and gendered positionalities. That is, individuals do not experience race, class, and gender separately—or as "single-axis" (Crenshaw, 1991) constructs—but, rather, simultaneously together. Although intersectionality has its own robust, predominantly Black feminist lineage (Collins and Bilge, 2016, 91), legal scholar Kimberlé Crenshaw is credited with introducing the concept to academic and legal communities in her 1989 article "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics" (Crenshaw, 1989). Since Crenshaw's introduction, intersectionality has been used by some to describe further intersecting, situated experiences, such as disability, sexuality, ethnicity, and so forth.

Closely aligned with intersectionality is the matrix of domination, developed by Black feminist sociologist Patricia Hill Collins in her 1990 book *Black Feminist Thought*. While race, class, and gender are the foremost experiences shaping the lives of many Black women (Collins, 1990), the matrix of domination describes how all systems of oppression are mutually constituted for various people. That is, systems of oppression are networked together, intricately dispersing benefits and harms—or penalties and privileges—to individuals who are simultaneously members of both dominant and subordinate groups.

Partially Following Costanza-Chock, Floegel and Costello (2021), theorise a feminist technoscience metatheory for LIS that incorporates Black feminist analyses. Specifically, they are concerned with moving LIS methodologies and methods beyond their current neoliberal limitations by advancing a feminist technoscience that aligns with intersectionality, the matrix of domination, and assemblage theory[8] and combining this with design justice. Feminist technoscience, according to Floegel and Costello, is a "metatheoretical perspective with a rich history, meaning that a singular definition of [it] is difficult to develop" Floegel and Costello (2021, 626). Nonetheless, it is desirable because it can respond to LIS's neoliberal underpinnings, specifically within information practice research. LIS's limitations include multiple non-divisible issues, such as extractive logics, monological individualism, techno-solutionism, and binaries between people and technologies. Floegel and Costello's preoccupation with feminist technoscience, design justice, and Black feminist analyses—including Black and queer speculative futurities—hinges on their desire to shift LIS away from these limitations.

Discussing how design justice and PHCRP can work together to advance equity in public health, Huffstetler et al. (2021) claim that the theoretical framework commonly underpinning the two is Critical Race Theory (CRT). According to Huffstetler et al., CRT "posits that the dominant social, economic, and political structures in contemporary society are shaped by racism" (Huffstetler et al., 2021,

---

[8]"At their most basic (and literal, from the French term 'agencement'), assemblages describe groupings or collections of actors like humans and technologies" (Floegel and Costello, 2021, 627, quoting Nyong'o (2017)). They also describe other objects, velocities, fusions, power dynamics, and imperceptible things. According to Floegel and Costello (2021), assemblages cannot be juxtaposed or deconstructed but they can construct and indicate power.

22). CRT is predominantly a Black feminist theory but is not credited as such in Huffstetler et al.'s work. Rather, they gesture toward intersectionality and the matrix of domination to denote how political structures, such as public health, are shaped by racism. They leave explicit connections between these analyses, CRT, design justice, and PHCRP, to be elaborated. Under the theoretical rubric of CRT, the research framework that best complements PHCRP is design justice. According to Huffstetler et al., the reason these two frameworks work well together is because 1) they have a common theoretical underpinning (i.e.,CRT), and 2) design justice can subvert the "expert" and "non-expert" dichotomy between public health providers and communities, at least in theory.

Similar to how Huffstetler et al. work to combine design justice and PHCRP, Piazzoni et al. endeavour to integrate design justice and Urban Design Justice. That is, although closely allied, Piazzoni et al. (2022) claim that design justice and Urban Design Justice have not directly conversed with one another. Certainly, following Costanza-Chock (2020), Piazzoni et al. (2022) assert that "[w]hile the Design Justice movement has mostly influenced digital media, fashion, and product design, its advocates have also called for giving more attention to spatial inequities" (5). As such, the ideas underpinning Urban Design Justice can inform design justice, and in turn, design justice can forward contributions toward Urban Design Justice. In other words, Piazzoni et al. aim to generate their own theoretical framework—i.e., Urban Design Justice—using design justice instead of drawing from Black feminist theory. They mention intersectionality in passing but not the matrix of domination. Their foremost goal is to surpass previous iterations of

justice-oriented urban design by advancing an Urban Design Justice that moves beyond spatially small and ephemeral interventions using design justice.

Piazzoni et al.'s (2022) focus on theory generation and limit pushing is similar to Das et al.'s project. Specifically, Das et al.'s (2023) research works to move engineering design pedagogy beyond its current limitations through design justice. The theorising in their work claims that "the normative logics underpinning design are rationalized and perpetuated through pedagogy"; and pedagogy, in turn, is influenced by movements for social justice (Das et al., 2023, 1). In this way, according to Das et al. (2023), design justice can influence the pedagogical practices that shape the subsequent generations of designers. That is, design justice can "inform and stimulate the creation of design pedagogy that creates engineers, who through their design practice, aspire to advance equity and justice" (Das et al., 2023, 2). Das et al. (2023) do not use Black feminist theory in their work in any robust manner. Rather, drawing from Costanza-Chock (2020), they mention the matrix of domination and something called "intersectional equity" (Das et al., 2023, 30) as concepts that design justice incorporates into its analysis, but they do not elaborate further.

6.4   Design Justice, Methodologies, & Methods

Structurally speaking, Das et al.'s (2023) use of design justice is relatively integrated. Though they understand design justice as a social movement, they use it as though it were a methodology. But, unlike Floegel and Costello (2021), do not explain it as such. Instead, they say that their "work develops a methodology—

based on the Design Justice framework—for ethics, equity, and justice audits of design pedagogy" (Das et al., 2023, 1). This unnamed methodology is premised on design justice and is used to audit engineering design pedagogy, gauging to what degree it engages with design justice ideas. It comprises a theory of how pedagogies operate relative to social movements and a set of methods also premised on design justice. The methods they use to measure the presence of design justice ideas are Costanza-Chock's seven design justice questions from a 2018 conference proceeding. The questions are as follows:

1. Who gets to do design and whose work is recognized as design (Equity)

2. What users and communities do we design for and with (Beneficiaries)

3. What values are embedded implicitly or explicitly in technological artifacts and systems (Values)

4. How do we scope and frame design problems (Scope)

5. Where is design work done and how does the location of the design work impact which sites are privileged whereas others are marginalized or ignored (Sites)

6. Who received the benefits of design work and how can the work be owned by communities instead of individuals (ownership, Accountability, & Political Economy),

7. How do we rationalize and remember how and why technologies are designed as they are (Discourse & History)[9] (Costanza-Chock, 2018, 6)

---

[9]Note that Das et al. understand question seven as "discourse" and "history" for conducting their analysis of course materials. Whereas, Costanza-Chock conceptualises question seven as "discourse" only.

For Das et al. (2023), cultivating aspiring designers is achieved by advocating for exemplary pedagogical practices and course design using design justice methods. However, their own use of these methods is partial at best. Notably, their auditing practice only includes MIT administrators and professors from whom they seek course syllabi. This level of engagement may align with their definition of design justice as "a framework for analysis and a community of practice" (Das et al., 2023; Costanza-Chock, 2020) given that their auditing process may constitute a "framework for analysis" and their research team may be "a community of practice". Yet, the exclusion of engineering design students, local designers, and diasporic designers is in contention with other aspects of the definition they forward—i.e., "ensuring a more equitable distribution of design's benefits and burdens; meaningful participation in design decisions; and recognition of community-based, Indigenous, and diasporic design traditions, knowledge, and practices" (Das et al., 2023; Costanza-Chock, 2020). Nowhere in their research do they indicate engagement with these values. In other words, though Das et al. endeavour to analyse pedagogy for design justice ideas, their actual implementation of design justice practice is less obvious. This is a problem because they advocate for design justice and specifically equate it with "equity" and "justice".

A less practical application of design justice could stem from its inability to admit its methodological history. Although Costanza-Chock specifically advocates for further elaborating the theoretical connections between various methodologies and design justice (Rose et al., 2023), they also claim this has been done through their 2020 book (Rose et al., 2023). Specifically, they assert that Par-

ticipatory Design, Codesign, and Human Centred Design have historically contributed to design justice (2020). Elsewhere, they attribute design justice to the history of Values in Design (Costanza-Chock, 2018, 11). These historical predecessors can be understood as methodologies. However, Costanza-Chock does not identify them as such, provide definitions of them, or explain their historical or theoretical elements. Rather, they cite them as nominally contributing to design justice, while burying them in vast lists of social justice-oriented entities who apparently contribute to design justice. A further explanation of how these design methodologies inform design justice may be in order, especially since they have their own historical lineages that may be bound-up with ethically murky research practices. Moreover, an explanation may be required to help explain how design justice is differentiated from what Ruha Benjamin calls a "branded methodology" (Benjamin, 2019b, 178).[10]

Regarding design specifically, Benjamin's contention with branded methodologies is that they tend to veer away from robust engagements with justice. In her words, "[i]f design as a branded methodology is elevated, then other forms of generic human activity are diminished" (Benjamin, 2019b, 178). Here, part of the problem is that design methodologies tend to "envelop...ideas and practices that have been around for a while" (Benjamin, 2019b, 177). In this way, design can constitute an all-encompassing or colonising force over "just plain old liberation"

---

[10]A common branded methodology that Benjamin discusses is "design thinking", also often referred to as "design speak". Importantly, design thinking is often regarded as antithetical to design justice. Indeed, in many ways, design justice is a direct response to issues that arose out of design thinking (Jen, 2018; Costanza-Chock, 2020) Nonetheless, it may be the case that, in practice, the two do not operate so differently in the end.

(Benjamin, 2019b, 176–179). Instead, we ought to problematise what we mean by both "design" and "justice" and not confuse the two. According to Benjamin, we can do this by investing in "socially just imaginaries" and focusing our attention on everyday and speculative practices (Benjamin, 2019b, 183).

Floegel and Costello (2021) also want to engage with everyday and speculative practices, specifically through the use of Black and queer futurities. For them, "speculative futurities describe a method wherein people craft fictional works (often, but not always, in response to a prompt) that imagine what the world, or aspects of it, may look like outside of current structural confines" (Floegel and Costello, 2021, 629). They advance futurities to temper a shortcoming they identify in design justice. They call this shortcoming a "logic of improvement". In their words, "[t]he Design Justice Network centres the 'design process,' 'design solutions,' and 'outcomes', all of which suggest building or modifications of some sort" (Floegel and Costello, 2021, 629). As such, design justice, as a methodology, does not address LIS' techno-solutionist limitations because it assumes that betterment is achieved predominantly through building technologies. Speculative futurities, however, imagine technology as a means of effecting structural change, instead of defaulting to construction as an inherent end to liberation—this can include de-constructing or elimination of harmful and oppressive systems (Floegel and Costello, 2021, 630, quoting Benjamin (2019a); Cifor et al. (2019)).

Speculative futurities operate as methods for Floegel and Costello. They are desirable insofar as they counteract the techno-solutionism underpinning design justice and LIS. They also constitute a promising adaptation to a design justice

methodology within a metatheory of feminist technoscience. In other words, as a limited methodology (Floegel and Costello, 2021, 629-631), design justice provides a larger framework for speculative futuritive methods. This is instead of utilising speculative futurities as a framework for design justice. As such, Floegel and Costello effectively engage in an analytical expansion of design justice by advancing speculative futuritive methods. They offer several amendments to design justice, which I have included in the following. Notably, they engage in this proliferation of design justice with speculative methods even though they admit that methods should be determined in collaboration with communities (Floegel and Costello, 2021, 630).

- [d]esign justice encourages collaboration between academics, marginalized communities, activists, and designs—entities who are not traditionally in dialogue with each other.
- Design justice centres emergent design rather than projects that begin with a clear process and end-goal.
- Design justice. . . embraces emergence and flux, two central principles of assemblage theory.
- Nonexploitative solutions are the goal of design justice, responding to the logic of extraction that pervades models and theories of information behavior and practice.
- [h]ighlighting the centrality of collaboration, community, and collectivity. . . [is] a clear departure from. . . monological individualism.
- [p]rinciples resist binary logic by calling attention to the fact that the de-

signer is not an expert, but a facilitator, and that everyone has expertise that comes from lived experience, though the full problem of binarizing "systems" and "users" is not a central feature of the principles (Floegel and Costello, 2021, 629).

Unlike Floegel and Costello (2021), Piazzoni et al. (2022) do not think that design justice has a techno-solutionist shortcoming. Instead, design justice opens up "possibilities" that support the "self-empowerment" of marginalised or disenfranchised groups (Piazzoni et al., 2022, 4). Opening up possibilities is a product of design justice's commitment to facilitation, not expertise, and its drive to build "upon knowledges and practices that already exist within communities" (Piazzoni et al., 2022; Costanza-Chock, 2018, 4). That is, Piazzoni et al.'s (2022) research expresses building on community knowledge and practices. Like Floegel and Costello (2021), they also want to respond to design justice by offering some methods, or "pathways", specifically drawing from communities they once worked with.

Recall that they use design justice to theorise an Urban Design Justice. Through their theorising, they generate methods that can be used for both. Specifically, they advance "comparing in difference" for design justice. According to Piazzoni et al. (2022), comparing in difference highlights marginalised and disenfranchised peoples' spatial responses to counter global oppression. Calling the spatial responses of marginalised and disenfranchised peoples "insurgent designs", Piazzoni et al. (2022) assert that they can operate, not as methods, but as "pathways" for architects and planners. Building on the work of previous urban

design scholars (see Robinson (2014); Goldberg (2009); Hart (2018)), they explain "comparing in difference" as a method which elucidates how "power structures operate through similar logics across radically different geographies" (Piazzoni et al., 2022, 7). The "pathways" that comparing in difference elucidate emulate methods and contribute to the development and expansion of Urban Design Justice and design justice. Through previous work with communities in Baitu, Los Angeles, and Rome, they identify the following three "pathways".

- Situate Possibilities: "[t]his requires not only, as others suggest, to support the advocacies of oppressed people, always prioritizing Indigenous design practices before proposing exogenous ones. But, by making a political use of their privileges and trained skills, designers should also propose spatial possibilities that oppressed groups may have not yet imagined".

- Exclude-to-Include: "[t]his requires unapologetically prioritizing the access and usage of marginalized groups, e.g., by co-designing spaces that honor their belonging, and satisfy the needs of oppressed people at the cost of excluding more privileged city dwellers".

- Reject Aesthetic Canons: "[t]his requires that architects and planners refuse to comply with dominant construction of what—and who—looks 'beautiful' or 'appropriate,' and instead support marginalized groups to be seen, or not to be seen in space" Piazzoni et al. (2022, 18).

Huffstetler et al. (2021) also exhibit tension over matters of empowerment. Again, their definition of design justice is "an approach for empowering com-

munities to lead design and social transformation" (Huffstetler et al., 2021, 22). However, they provide a retroactive example of design justice practice. Specifically, they discuss how design justice, in conjunction with CRT and PHCRP, could have been used for implementing COVID-19 vaccination accessibility. They do not work with communities who still need access to COVID-19 vaccinations or other related necessities. Rather, they theorise how working with communities might have occurred during the initial waves of the COVID-19 pandemic. They conduct this novel exploration by applying the Network's ten design justice principles drawn from Costanza-Chock's 2020 book. As such, for Huffstetler et al. (2021), the design justice principles operate as a series of systematic methods for explaining better public health outcomes. However, these principles are taken as a given and applied to the situation after the fact. This form of application demonstrates confirmation bias since the principles are assumed to be a net "good" and hindsight about COVID-19 vaccination "roll out" is 20/20. Moreover, Huffstetler et al. (2021) do not "empower communities to lead design and social transformation", as their definition of design justice suggests.

The sources discussed in this text treat design justice in different ways. Floegel and Costello are the most forthcoming. They define design justice as a methodology (Floegel and Costello, 2021, 629) for a feminist technoscience metatheory and use it as such. Through their processes, they amend and expand design justice. They define design justice as a methodology "that seeks to reconsider the place of a scholar and their university in research that centres technology and, by extension, design" (Floegel and Costello, 2021, 5, paraphrasing Costanza-Chock

(2020)). And they say that design justice is a "community-led movement" that works with people who are "most impacted by technologies' harms" (Floegel and Costello, 2021, 5).

Das et al. (2023) also conceptualise design justice as a methodology but are less forthright about it. Specifically, their research programme holistically integrates design justice as theory, method, and methodology to influence engineering design pedagogy at MIT. They define design justice as a "framework for analysis" and "a community of practice" that "ensur[es] a more equitable distribution of design's benefits and burdens; meaningful participation in design decisions; and recognition of community-based, Indigenous, and diasporic design traditions, knowledge, and practices" (Costanza-Chock, 2020).

Piazzoni et al. (2022) use design justice to theorise an Urban Design Justice. This theorising results in the development of methods for both "justices". They define design justice as bringing debates together, opening spaces for action, and shedding light on how design reifies oppression through "an intersectional, [I]ndigenous, queer-feminist lens" (4). Such a lens criticises white supremacy, heteropatriarchy, capitalism, and settler colonialism.

Finally, Huffstetler et al. (2021) apply design justice directly. Specifically, they use the ten design justice principles as retroactive methods. Their goal is to advance PHCRP by using design justice methods and CRT. They define design justice as "an approach for empowering communities to lead design and social transformation" Huffstetler et al. (2021, 22).

6.5   Design Justice & Systems Change

Design justice is heavily depicted as some kind of community, or "a community of practice", that does "community things". For instance, the Network itself appears to cultivate such a community through its ten principles, statement, and the "signing-up" of individuals and groups to become paid "DJN members" (Design Justice Network, 2024). The Network web page says that "people and organizations [can] engage with the network—as signatories, members, working group participants, and local nodes" (Design Justice Network, 2024). The Network's statement on design justice also advocates for cultivating "a network" and practising "community-led design" (Design Justice Network, 2024). And, as pointed out by Floegel and Costello, "the word 'community' appears in 5 of 10 [design justice] principles" (Floegel and Costello, 2021, 50). As before, Costanza-Chock, a Network Steering Committee member, also provides this provisional definition of design justice, which clarifies what a "community of practice" does:

> Design justice is a framework for analysis of how design distributes benefits and burdens between various groups of people. Design justice focuses explicitly on the ways that design reproduces and or challenges the matrix of domination (white supremacy, heteropatriarchy, capitalism, ableism, settler colonialism, and other forms of structural inequality). *Design justice is also a growing community of practice that aims to ensure a more equitable distribution of design's benefits and burdens; meaningful participation in design decisions; and*

recognition of community-based, Indigenous, and diasporic design traditions, knowledge, and practices (Costanza-Chock, 2020, 23, emphasis mine).

Despite citing Costanza-Chock's book on design justice, none of the sources I analysed utilise or implement the above definition in its entirety. Instead, these sources gesturally use partials of Costanza-Chock's definition. More frequently, they derive their own definitions through Costanza-Chock's descriptive uses of design justice. However, none of them practises whatever definition they use. Additionally, although nearly all of the sources use the Network's ten design justice principles, none apply the principles literally or engage with any of the communities their research focuses on. Instead, all of the sources seem to expand design justice ideologically through gesturing toward some generalised "community" or "communities". Specifically, these sources imagine what working with some community or communities might look like rather than working with those they refer to.

This use of design justice is perplexing since its values and intent appear relatively explicit. Additionally, as indicated by the Network web page and Costanza-Chock, there are various community-centred design justice projects outside of academic publishing which demonstrate design justice in practice. However, in the context of academic scholarship, the meaning and intent of design justice appears significantly changed. The "community aspect", ubiquitous to design justice is emptied of any meaningful engagement, appearing antithetical to communities as conventionally understood or experienced. Indeed, according to the ethos of

design justice, can we really say that speaking of communities does not include actual communities? Or that "a community of practice" only involves academic designers or researchers—even if those designers and researchers may be from the community or communities of interest? The short answer should be "no".

However, given my positionality as a community member and a student researcher, and that this project is bound up with the structural requirements of the academy, it is worth thinking through these questions. An analysis of academic sources on design justice indicates that "communities" or "a community of practice", translated through the rubric of the university system, amounts to a recentring of scholars, researchers, and designers. I will need to grapple with this recentring through the academy in my own work. However, more broadly, there is a concern that design justice lends itself to something made for academics and designers, not communities. Perhaps this is simply a matter of design justice co-optation by the academy. Yet, I am hesitant to resolve to this conclusion alone.

Recall that design justice itself is partially situated within academic contexts. As such, more than an easy conversation surrounding co-optation will be required. Design justice was conceived within the context of the Allied Media Conference; it has been marketed through the Design Justice Network, resulting in paid membership and the generation of outputs to the benefit of several designers, academics, and researchers; and Steering Committee Member Costanza-Chock's dispersal of design justice ideas are predominantly situated within academic publishing, i.e., a conference proceeding, the journal Critical AI, and an MIT Press

book.[11]

Moreover, resolving that the issue is the academy *simpliciter* misses that influential movements, projects, and thinkers operate in the various registers of academic and community contexts. Yet, these projects do not result in community co-optation or the uniform recentring of academics, researchers, and designers divorced from community. For instance, consider various modes of "scholar-activism" imbricated with communities and the academy (See, e.g., Chinyere-Oparah and Okazawa-Rey, 2009; Pulido, 2008; Gilmore, 2022)

The co-optation of design justice by the academy seems like only part of the answer. Rather, recognising an inability of academic sources on design justice to move away from recentring the "expert" elucidates an issue with systems change generally. Costanza-Chock's discussion of systems change is instructive in this instance. Their book illustrates tensions with effecting systems change primarily through design justice. For instance, as evinced in their book, design justice is generally preoccupied with problematising binaries, such as the "expert" and "non expert" dichotomy. However, much of their discussion on systems change concerns a binary "pragmatic/utopic approach". The "pragmatic/utopic approach" proposes immediate and concrete suggestions with people affected by systemic inequities while also doing the work to challenge those systemic inequities (Costanza-Chock, 2020, 129). These are meaningful aims. However, these phenomena are not segregated. Immediate deliverables and long-haul sys-

---

[11]This MIT Press book is open access. However, whether it is actually accessible or not is unclear.

tems change are neither independent nor discrete but intimately connected to each other and pluralised. A dichotomous understanding of systems change is an issue for design justice, especially since effecting meaningful systems change with communities must be materially grounded in those communities.

Proponents of emergent strategy are clear on this point. For instance, Nick Obolensky (2014, 93), defines emergent strategy as "the way complex systems and patterns arise out of a multiplicity of relatively simple interactions". Following Obolensky (2014), adrienne marie brown (2017), asserts that emergent strategy is a mode of relationship building that practises complexity at the level of bodyminds to effect systems change. In her words, "[e]mergent strategy is fundamentally about how we get in right relationship with change, realigning with an [I]ndigenous worldview that understands the relationality of all things" brown (2017, 12). For brown, somatics grounded in permaculture and biomimicry underpin emergent strategy. As such, taking cues from natural phenomena, emergent strategy's understanding of systems change is not binarised. For example, brown's discussion of emergent strategy focuses on multiple interconnected elements, including the gradient fractal patterns found in flora and fauna. For instance, according to an emergent strategy perspective for systems change, '[e]xistence is fractal—the health of the cell is the health of the species and the planet' (brown, 2017, 13). Here, 'health' may be broadly understood.

Understanding systems change through the lens of emergent strategy, instead of a dichotomous "pragmatic/utopic approach",[12] foregrounds the necessity of

---

[12]It is surprising that Costanza-Chock, and the Network, do not advance emergent strategy for

working with communities.[13] Efforts to cultivate justice-centred systems change should not lose grasp on the tangible effects of organising. Likewise, our work's distributive or pragmatic outcomes must be relevant to how we build long-term social, political, economic, and racial justice. These are bound-up together and should not be understood as divisible components, abstracted away from the materiality of communities. Such pluralised processes are not easily reconcilable in practice and are arguably made more difficult through a binarised approach to systems change. For instance, Costanza-Chock discusses the "pragmatic/utopic approach" through conceptualising procedural and distributive justice, concluding that the tensions between the two are not fully resolvable. In their words,

> [a] design project may be wonderfully inclusive, provide all participants with a sense of ownership, and reward people equitably for their work, but fail to produce a design product that is useful to the community. Alternatively, a process that is not at all inclusive may produce a product that is useful and widely loved. These tensions are not fully resolvable, but they do not invalidate design justice practitioners' attempts to pay attention to both procedural and distributive justice (Costanza-Chock, 2020, 218).

It seems the problem is a matter of theoretical framing: i.e., there is a thing called "procedural justice", and another thing called "distributive justice"; they

---

systems change, especially since the term "emergence" occurs in the design justice principles and Costanza-Chock uses the word in their 2020 book. Moreover, both emergent strategy and design justice draw inspiration from the Allied Media Project Network Principles (brown, 2021; Design Justice Network, 2024; Costanza-Chock, 2018, 2020).

[13]Here, my provocation is to centre communities, not to improve or expand design justice.

are not fully congruent, but designers must focus on both. This is insufficient.[14] How designers do or make things and how those things get meted out is not nearly capacious enough for an integrated and holistic form of systems change. This binarized thinking, foregrounding how some designers conceive of systems change, is why I think design justice falters.[15] Rather, systems change ought to be meaningfully grounded in communities.

Notably, the issue of binarization is not specific to Costanza-Chock's formulation of design justice. The issue is also apparent in the ten design justice principles developed by the Network and the academic sources I analysed. Specific to academic publishing, an unacknowledged binarized theory of systems change appears to recapitulate the centrality of the designer, researcher, or academic—i.e., the "expert". Here, design justice becomes something for designers, researchers, and academics, not something for communities. Indeed, although "communities" are referenced multiple times in these sources, they are not centred. Rather, they appear as an empty category within a binarized view of systems change, falling between the cracks of "procedure" and "distribution". In this way, the "expert" becomes "expert enough" to discuss design justice and community research without working with communities. This is an issue because various extensions of design justice research are propagated without actually being grounded in commu-

---

[14]Benjamin also takes issue with design justice as something that focuses on procedural and distributive justice. However, she is not explicitly troubled by the binarization of systems change. Rather, Benjamin problematises how "justice itself might be altered by its proximity to design as a buzzword and a brand" (Benjamin, 2019b, 175).

[15]Floegel and Costello similarly note that the design justice principles do not problematise the binarising of "systems" and "users" (Floegel and Costello, 2021, 629), but they do not develop this point.

nity justice. In other words, instead of focusing on "justice"—i.e., working with communities to effect systemic change—academic sources focus on criticising "inequities". As such, design justice loses its focus on "just plain old liberation" (Benjamin, 2019b, 176–179).

Reflecting on research within my own communities, I do not think that uncritically following design justice or its principles would have improved this project. My foremost concern is that design justice can end up operating as a default for liberation instead of grounding an analysis of systems change in communities. Following Benjamin's line of thought, if lived/living experience peoples are the "experts" of our own experience, what is the epistemic and ontological utility of following some prepackaged "justice" in research design? My answer is that there is some worth in considering exogenous principles or values strictly as a guide. After all, "[e]mergent strategy is about helping us find our place in this complex existence, perhaps even making it simple to be complex together" (brown, 2017, 10). However, my provocation is to remind community researchers to continue generating their own liberatory values, principles, concepts, theories, and modes of systems change. Indeed, the project discussed in this text is not perfect. Certainly, activist communities need to discuss what "community" even means. Yet, there continue to be meaningful moments and interactions which may not have transpired had I been trying to advocate for design justice in community or follow its principles myself.

In this chapter, I provided a historical overview and analysis of design justice. I discussed how design justice functions in the sources I analysed. I divided my

analysis into a survey of theory, broadly construed, methods and methodologies, and systems change. In the next chapter, I will elaborate on how strategising with activists appears to approximate a form of organising called emergent strategy.

7 Emergent Strategy

In the last chapter, I discussed the concept of design justice. I gave a brief historical overview and analysed how design justice operates in academic contexts. I also discussed how design justice conceptualises community and systems change. In this chapter, I elaborate on how strategising with housing justice and anti-poverty activists appears to approximate a form of organising called emergent strategy. Discussing some of the practicalities of how emergent strategy plays out in organising with X and TCH foregrounds emergent strategy as a viable theoretical perspective and strategising method for project creation. A future CBPR project or projects could reasonably implement emergent strategy as an intentional part of the research process. Indeed, such an approach appears already to be occurring among activists. As such, co-researchers ought to consider whether or not emergent strategy is purposively appropriate for a CBPR project or any other form of collaborative project creation. In the following, I will reiterate this research's origins and subsequent growth, recapitulate a possible technology framework that emerged through interviews, and discuss some preliminary project creations.

This research began with exploring the creation of a live updating shelter bed database through some form of community-based research with Montréal and Toronto-based housing justice and anti-poverty activists. Over the course of the research, CBPR became a viable form of community-based research, and, as such, the project shifted to exploring the creation of a CBPR project based on database and technology creation. Additionally, the way that co-researchers began concep-

tualising the project also shifted. Activists began to increasingly focus on organising in a way that closely approximates emergent strategy.

In line with emergent strategy thinking, co-researchers were cautious about implementing a database, or any technology project, divorced from systemic and structural considerations and from the material realities of peoples and communities with lived/living experience. For instance, activists emphasised ensuring that project creation be led and determined by peoples with lived/living experiences of poverty, homelessness, and street cultures; and that more peoples with lived/living experience ought to be brought into project collaboration. Additionally, this affirmation was bolstered by a strong affirmation that elite researchers, state representatives, and corporations cannot impact meaningful systems change when it comes to homelessness and the Canadian housing market, likely due to an incompatible method of systems change.

When it came to discussing the tangible parameters of database and technology project creation, co-researchers, again, focused on systemic, structural, and material considerations. For instance, two of the five research questions that activists focused on centred on technology barriers and access. These two considerations are certainly grounded in a systemic or structural analysis of the relative availability or unavailability of technology, its cognates, and its material effects on peoples with lived/living experiences. Additionally, co-researchers formulated several project changes that front-loaded systemic and intangible considerations, and activists provided lived/living experience project advice that centred on consideration for others. While explaining the tangible parameters of technology and

database creation, it is also necessary to foreground these intangible aspects of the research, specifically so that project creation does not become abstracted from activist communities. Bearing this in mind, a potential database could be implemented in conjunction with the changes co-researchers emphasised. Such a database could also use a framework centring on *education*, *trustworthiness*, *usability*, and *dependability*. During interviews, co-researchers elaborated several explanations of what makes technology accessible or not, seemingly leading to this possible conceptual framework. Future iterations of this research may consider implementing such a framework, if activists chose to create a database or technology project.

Recall that this research is grounded in the desires of an intimate, lived/living experience street outreach community in Montréal. Activists from this community expressed needing a database that provides live updates on available shelter beds. Such a tool could provide an increased means of finding shelter beds for those who seek them. Co-researchers in Toronto have slightly different desires which take various unique forms, but predominantly centre on community-oriented engagements to counteract the effects of societal austerity. These desires do align with the desires of Montréal activists who did not uniformly focus on database creation but, rather, more properly, collaborative project creation. Additionally, an adapted project on technology or database creation may constitute a community-oriented engagement for both Toronto and Montréal activists.

However, as before, what is similar to all co-researchers is an issue with elite research, state representative, and corporate solutions to the Canadian housing

market and homelessness. For Toronto activists, these entities propagate societal austerity, leading to these phenomena' ongoing material effects. As such, these entities and their solutions are determined to be illegitimate by Toronto co-researchers. Additionally, Montréal activists also do not find elite research, state representative, and corporate solutions adequate. A desire to create a database that can serve one's own community is certainly grounded in counteracting societal austerity. In this way, elite research, state representative, and corporate entities are illegitimate for Montréal activists as well. Housing justice and anti-poverty activists know these entities and their solutions are inadequate. According to these co-researchers, elite research, state representative, and corporate entities cannot meaningfully mitigate the Canadian housing market and homelessness. Certainly, each activist expresses this inadequacy in differing degrees and kinds. However, at the bottom, for these co-researchers, these entities are experientially under qualified and unable to respond in a meaningful manner.

Rather, from an emergent strategy perspective, activists advance desires to get "in right relationship with *change*" (brown, 2021, 12, emphasis mine). Emergent strategy is all about relationships to change, specifically "how we shape and generate complex systems and patterns through our own relatively simple interactions" (brown, 2021, 13). Certainly, co-researchers advocate for a reconceptualisation of change relationships relative to homelessness and the Canadian housing market. This emergent view of systems change advances a speculative and multiform analysis instead of a binarised notion of "top-down" systems change emanating from elite research, state representative, and corporate formations. Activists specifically

advance emergent systems change as a potential force in communities composed of differently situated people. This multiform view of systems change rejects the binarised stratification of change into blunt notions of critical mass or the equitable distribution of products within the logic of racial capitalism alone. It also rejects a dichotomy between "top down" and "bottom up" hierarchies. Notably, however, a necessary component of change-making includes peoples with lived/living experiences, specifically because the form of systems change co-researchers are particularly concerned with pertains to homelessness and the Canadian housing market.

Necessarily, for activists, our relationship to change is grounded in our every day and speculative interactions with our communities. Indeed, several speculative interactions transpired during this research. Specifically, co-researchers advanced various project changes when speaking about technology and database creation. These project ideas include *art, stories, education & skills, political actions, supports, space, programmes, information, general technology*, and *systemic changes & intangibles*. Shortly thereafter, activists began to 'test the waters' with these ideas. For instance, we discussed initiating a podcast, created and operated by peoples with lived/living experiences of homelessness. The idea arose during one of the earliest interviews with an activist in Toronto. Later, in subsequent interviews, I brought up the podcast to gauge thoughts around the idea. Engagement and interest among activists was significantly stratified. Some were highly engaged and welcomed the prospect of a lived/living experience podcast. Others were more reserved as they maintained concern about the needs of other co-researchers.

For example, one activist explained that they had previously worked on a podcast and initiated a conversation concerning time constraints and task management. Another offered several suggestions to streamline overhead and production and raised the issue of encouraging meaningful public engagement. Still, some seemed even more reserved, especially given the technological barriers we discussed during interviews. And some, concerned with attending to activist desire, offered unique ways to pivot the project toward a hybrid, consisting of a podcast, a database, other technologies, and arts-based components. For instance, two co-researchers in Toronto discussed such a hybrid. These activists wanted to include written pieces, zine art, and video content created by peoples with lived/living experiences along with a database and a podcast. Additionally, another co-researcher in Montréal also suggested making zines based on podcast episodes. In this way, a podcast website or database project hosting episodes and zines may be a viable project that a few activists could undertake together. Over time, more elements could be integrated, such as video content, written work, and so forth.

Over the winter, however, I became discouraged when the organisation Voices for Unhoused Liberation created their podcast, "Trial by Shelter". This Toronto-based podcast is made "by folx who are currently, or have past experience of being unhoused alongside artist allies" (Voices for Unhoused Liberation, 2024). As a Voices for Unhoused Liberation supporter, I became concerned with re-making a similar podcast and "stepping on toes". In hindsight, these concerns perhaps could have been mitigated by reaching out to Voices for Unhoused Liberation to gain their perspectives on the initiative and adhering to co-researcher advice on not

"being afraid to recreate the wheel" or "recreate an existing tool". Nonetheless, I was also struggling with the move to Halifax at the same time and experiencing a series of mental health issues as a result. Specifically, I had become relatively isolated in an unfamiliar community hostile toward peer work, and I began to feel alienated from the research. As such, I applied for a research fund through my university and used the money to travel to Montréal for a few days.

During this time, I again reapproached the idea of a podcast and creating a live updating shelter bed database with co-researchers; I spent two nights doing street outreach with X; I reconnected with some familiar faces on the street; had dinner with one of the activists I interviewed; and drinks with another; and arranged a small meet up at a bar on rue Saint Laurent. Additionally, I met with a computer programmer who seemed interested in the project. We met through my partner and spoke about the possibility of a database over dinner one night. This meeting led to drafting a series of "pen-and-paper" database mock-ups, and we discussed making an accessible interface that would be operational across various technology makes and models. The programmer colleague seemed like they could be a good fit for the project since they had expressed experiences of growing up in an under-resourced/low-income immigrant community in Vaughn—a northern borough of the Greater Toronto Area. We remained in contact about the database for a few months following our meeting in Montréal but eventually lost contact when they experienced a family emergency.

Though I am continually open to creating a live updating shelter bed database, I have concerns that the project may not survive the hostility of the shelter sys-

tem. I have worked in both grassroots spaces and the shelter system. I know that shelters often receive funding through unmet "calls for service"—i.e., calls to the shelter for beds or other basic services. When shelters cannot provide such services to callers, they record this data and use it to lobby governments for increased funding. More recently, shelters have been collecting demographic data under the auspices of "service diversion" or "shelter diversion" and using these data to gain state funding. Service diversion occurs when no service is available at a given shelter, requiring a worker to question an inquiring caller about any personal details, including their age, gender, and name. These data are then used to refer a caller to another shelter that "better fits their situation" and may have service available. However, most shelters do not connect callers directly to another shelter. Rather, callers must "dial-around" to various shelters, consistently being turned away for lack of available services. All the while, each "turn away" results in collecting demographic data on a caller to be used for stimulating funding. The reality is that callers are being asked the same questions repeatedly about their identity and situation while receiving no services.

This exploitative and arduous system has made it such that many simply no longer call for service at all. Even so, calls for service are unlikely to decrease any time in the near future. As such, this form of institutional violence, involving funding premised on calls for service, is why a live updating shelter bed database is more than a simple initiative. Shelters would be required to update the database on the availability of shelter beds. Yet, they have little incentive to do so since they depend on calls for service to receive operational funding. As such, a multiform ef-

fort may be required to see this project through. A comprehensive database project may require extensive collaboration from co-researchers, advocacy groups, the shelter system, and possibly government funding bodies. However, given that activists identified a problem with elite research, state representative, and corporate solutions to the Canadian housing market and homelessness, co-researchers must continue advocating for centring our own knowledge and analyses during any such possible collaborations. Alternatively, a further direction for this research could be politically agitating and organising around the shelter funding issue or selecting shelters with alternative funding structures willing to contribute to a live updating shelter bed database.

These two technology project examples (the podcast and the database) are part of various ongoing creations with Montréal and Toronto activists. They also indicate how emergent strategy plays out among co-researchers in these activist communities. Co-researchers are often at the ready to collaborate and are receptive to the needs of other activists. And, indeed, the ways that co-researchers discuss collaboration and project creation in interviews also closely approximates this kind of organising. These similarities also make sense since many of the activists have often engaged in project creation with each other and our interviews were treated as conversations. Nonetheless, future collaborative iterations of this project may find that this form of organising, emulating emergent strategy, is a frequent occurrence. As such, co-researchers involved in further collaboration relating to this project may consider emergent strategy as apt theoretical and practical organising tool.

At the time of writing, I am preparing to visit Montréal again and spend a few days connecting with co-researchers from X. I am also planning to relocate back to Toronto. I have been reoffered another student space in York Housing, now as an incoming PhD student, and will move in four weeks. When I arrive, TCH expects me to reconnect on a peer support basis, and I will continue to work on various initiatives with them there. Specifically, one TCH activist has reached out to discuss creating a street outreach project. In the past, this co-researcher expressed a particular interest in X's grassroots structure and ethos. As such, we are now in the planning stages of initiating a street outreach project in the immediate area surrounding TCH. Additionally, another activist recently shared that they are writing stories about their experiences inside shelter hotels and they want to speak about this on Voices for Unhoused Liberation's podcast; activists from "X" are becoming increasingly more organised with their values and purpose; their administrative functioning, group training, and organising funding sources; another co-researcher is doing more public speaking around lived/living experience advocacy; one activist is getting more involved in zine making; and another co-researcher started a brown bag lunch programme. This is all to say that while I cannot close this text with a tidily packaged research narrative, I can say that this research has spurred several ongoing initiatives. As such, perhaps, a next step for this research may involve organising a series of workshops to discuss current and future iterations of research. Otherwise, elsewhere, ideas shared during interviews have grown beyond this project as activists take up and implement their initiatives in various other community contexts. As a co-researcher in this project,

I am pleased with this outcome and look forward to where these initiatives will go next.

In this chapter, I provided an overview of this research's origins and development over time. I also provided a preliminary description of a possible technology framework to be used in future iterations of this research. Additionally, I discussed some ongoing project creations and some limitations to creating a live updating shelter bed database. I conclude this chapter by forwarding emergent strategy as a possible organising method for future research-creation. In the next chapter, I will conclude this text by providing a summary of the overall research project.

8 Conclusion

In this text, I began by giving an introduction and overview of the research undertaken with Toronto and Montréal-based activist communities; as well as providing a roadmap of the text itself. In the subsequent Context chapter, I provided an overview of Canadian state privatisation in order to situate the current research. In the Methodology chapter, I gave an explanation of how CBPR could be conceptualised and operationalised for both the present and future research. I also gave an overview of the terminology used in this text. In the Methods chapter, I provided a description of the differentiations between methods and methodologies; and I discussed the activist co-determined methods used and adapted for this research. Next, in the Findings chapter, I discussed the collaborative interview questions implemented in this research and troubled community research processed through institutional REBs. I also proffered a possible technology framework for a subsequent community-based research project. In the Design Justice chapter, I provided an in-depth analysis of design justice and generated some reflections on systems change. Next, in the Emergent Strategy chapter, I offered insight into how emergent strategy appears to operate in activist communities, discussed some ongoing project creations, and explained some limitations to database creation. In this Conclusion chapter, I will give a broad summary of the research discussed in this text and provide an "Accessible Summary".

This research explores generating a community-based project on technology and database creation with housing justice and anti-poverty activist communities

in Toronto and Montréal. The project is partly grounded in a lived/living experience street outreach community in Montréal. Co-researchers from this community express a need for a live updating shelter bed database to counteract the effects of homelessness arising from the Canadian housing market. Additionally, the project is also anchored in a lived/living experience community that operates a drop-in space in Toronto. Activists from this community are also interested in database and technology creation. However, their main concern centres on community-oriented engagements to counteract societal austerity in the face of homelessness and the Canadian housing market. A community project on database or technology creation may address some of the effects of these phenomena.

Drawing from interviews conducted during this research, a possible methodology that could inform such a project is CBPR. Notably, however, this research does not hold that CBPR is the only methodology that can be used for project creation nor does it assert that project creation must centre on a database or technology more generally. Nonetheless, in this iteration of the research, I have employed CBPR as a methodology with database and technology creation in mind. Specifically, I used a CBPR perspective instead of a conventional CBPR methodology. The purpose of utilising a CBPR perspective is to gauge whether this methodology is appropriate for a future project or projects with activists in Toronto and Montréal.

A survey of the literature foregrounds three common components of a CBPR methodology. These three components are 1) a community-identified *problem* or issue, 2) a community's orientation toward mitigating the issue through some form

of *change*, and 3) a *collaborative* effort to achieve this change. This research primarily achieves components one and two—i.e., a community-identified problem and an effort to enact change.

Using stratified purposive sampling, I interviewed 12 co-researchers, including seven in Toronto and five in Montréal. All 12 activists are people I organise with on an ongoing basis. My rationale for choosing these co-researchers—i.e., our familiarity—is typical of a purposive sampling method. According to Adler and Clark (2003, 130), purposive sampling involves choosing people to interview based on who will facilitate an investigation. Purposive sampling is a broad method hosting several sub-methods, including stratified purposive sampling. This method involves "sampling from subgroups to facilitate comparisons between or among them" (Adler and Clark, 2003, 130). I use stratified purposive sampling in this research. Subgroups, according to this method, include housing justice and anti-poverty activists in Montréal and Toronto. Initially, I did not intend to use stratified purposive sampling in this research. Rather, this method became appropriate when co-researchers showed an interest in comparing Montréal and Toronto contexts.

Interviews were conducted using a semi-structured, open-ended interviewing method. I chose this interviewing method because it is conversational in style. Instead of a fixed or rigid structure, this form of interviewing uses context-dependent questions loosely based on a specified topic. Because this kind of interviewing encourages interview collaboration (Bogdan and Biklen, 1998; Esterberg, 2002; Hesse-Biber and Leavy, 2011), activists often sought information about the dif-

fering contexts in Montréal and Toronto. This form of interviewing led to several interconnected findings, including a distinctive and common problem identified in both activist communities—the first component of a CBPR methodology. Namely, both communities determined that elite research, state representative, and corporate solutions to homelessness and the Canadian housing market are illegitimate. They charge that these entities are under-qualified and unable to respond to these phenomena primarily because they employ binarised "top-down" problem-solving. Instead, co-researchers assert that what is needed is "non-binarised" systemic and structural change achieved within communities—the second component of a CBPR methodology.

Specifically, activists recommend multiform project creation as a possible avenue for mitigating aspects of homelessness and the Canadian housing market. This form of project creation closely resembles a form of organising called emergent strategy. According to brown (2017, 13), "[e]mergent strategy is [specifically] about how we shape and generate complex systems and patterns through our own relatively simple interactions"; this, of course, can include project creation (brown, 2017). As such, future iterations of this research ought to consider implementing emergent strategy as an intentional organising method for grounding systemic and structural change.

During this research, co-researchers also forwarded a possible technology framework for a collaborative project on database creation. Through co-researcher determined questions, four central themes appeared common to activists during interviews. These four themes are *education*, *trustworthiness*, *usability*, and *de-*

pendability. A framework that incorporates these themes could inform a CBPR project on database creation. An emergent strategy method that focuses on intimate and multiform project creation and systems change could be integrated into such a framework. Indeed, co-researchers forwarded many speculative community projects changes that could inform holistic database creation, or that could constitute several distinct projects in their own right. These project ideas often involved *art*, *stories*, *education*, *skills*, *political actions*, *supports*, *space*, *programmes*, *information*, *general technology*, and *systemic changes* & *intangibles*. These findings, advanced by activists, provide appropriate foundations for either a holistic CBPR project or many additional community-oriented projects. Moving forward, I hope that co-researchers implement the third component of CBPR—i.e., collaboration—and use their ideas to engage in change.

8.1 Accessible Summary

8.1.1 Where This Research Came From

This research project is inspired by an idea that my street outreach group "X" had in Montréal. The idea was to create a live updating database that shows available shelter beds.

This research is also inspired by the lived experience-led kitchen and drop-in centre I worked with in Toronto called "TCH". Specifically, the research is inspired by TCH's focus on lived experience community building and their workshops.

8.1.2 How This Research Was Conducted

For this research, I interviewed 12 lived experience activists in Toronto and Montréal and asked them if technology is helpful. I also asked activists if a database is a good idea or if they need technology for other things. I know all the activists, but I keep their organisations and identities anonymous.

I used *stratified purposive sampling* and *semi-structured open-ended interviewing* in this research.

8.1.3 What This Research Found

- Some activists said a database is a good idea, and some said it is not.
- Some activists said technology is helpful, and some said it is not.
- Activists identified several barriers to technology, including a lack of technology *education*, concerns about *trustworthiness*, issues with *usability*, and a need for greater *dependability*.
- Activists identified many ways to make technology accessible, including enhancing technology *education*, *trustworthiness*, *usability*, and *dependability*.
- All activists told me that *activists are different and have different needs*.
- Activists also said that *all activists need to be able to access things themselves*.
- Activists also said they need *systemic and structural change*. They told me that *elite academic researchers, people who represent the state, and corpo-*

rations cannot solve homelessness or the Canadian housing market.

- Activists said systemic and structural change can happen through *building community between people with various lived experiences.* Some activists said this could be done through a technology project and some said it can be done in other ways.

- Some other ways include making *art*, sharing *stories*, gaining *education & skills*, taking *political action*, accessing *support*, accessing *space*, making *programmes*, and accessing *information*.

8.1.4   What This Research Can Do

I hope activists use their ideas for change. Activists could also lead a Community-Based Participatory Research (CBPR) project. These components are central to CBPR:

1. a community-identified *problem* or issue;
2. a community's choice to do something about the problem through some *change*;
3. *collaboration* to achieve the change.

In a CBPR project, different individuals can come together as co-researchers. These individuals are not just participants, but active contributors to the research process. Whether the project is about technology or any other topic, the goal of CBPR is to foster community and drive systemic and structural change.

* Co-researchers could create a live updating shelter bed database as a CBPR

project. Still, they will need to convince shelters to use the database. Shelters may not want to use a database because when they receive phone calls for beds, they count them and then ask governments for money.

8.1.5   What Perspective This Research Can Take

Activists should decide what values, principles, and frameworks are important to their projects. These can guide the overall structure of any project. One perspective I can suggest is *emergent strategy*. This perspective seems similar to what activists told me during interviews.

Here is an emergent strategy definition that Nick Obolensky (2014, 93) gives: "[e]mergence is the way complex systems and patterns arise out of a multiplicity of relatively simple interactions".

Emergent strategy is not just a perspective, it is also a practice. For example, adrienne marie brown uses emergent strategy for group facilitation and mediation. For brown, emergent strategy is about "getting in right relationship with change" (brown, 2021, 12).

brown (2017, 2021) also says we can imagine how emergent strategy works when considering nature. For example, think of a fern. Fern leaves are fractal patterns that contribute to the plant's life. Many ferns make up part of a forest. Forests produce oxygen for breathing and contribute to the flourishing of the planet

Here are some emergent strategy values or principles:

- Small is good, small is all.
- Change is constant.

- There is always enough time for the right work.

- There is a conversation in the room that only these people at this moment can have. Find it

- Never failure, always a lesson.

- Trust the People. (If you trust the people, they become trustworthy, and/or the necessary boundaries become clear.)

- Move at the speed of trust. Focus critical connection more than critical mass, build resilience by building relationships.

- Less prep, more presence.

- What you pay attention to grows.

References

Adler, Emily Stier and Roger Clark (2003). *How It's Done: An Invitation to Social Research*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth. 37, 38, 111

Armaline, William T. (2005). 'kids need structure': Negotiating rules, power, and social control in an emergency youth shelter. *American Behavioral Scientist 48*, 1124–1148. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764204274196. 18

Atalay, Sonya (2012). *Community-Based Archaeology: Research With, By, and for Indigenous and Local Communities*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. 24, 30, 31

Bakker, Isabella and Katherine Scott (1996). From the postwar to the postliberal keynesian welfare state. In Wallace Clement (Ed.), *Understanding Canada: Building on the New Canadian Political Economy*, pp. 286–310. Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press. 11

Banet-Weiser, Sarah (2018). *Empowered : Popular Feminism and Popular Misogyny*. Durham: Duke University Press. 73

Benjamin, Ruha (2019a). *Captivating Technology: Race, Carceral Technoscience, and Liberatory Imagination in Everyday Life*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. 83

Benjamin, Ruha (2019b). *Race After Technology: Abolitionist Tools for the New Jim Code*. Cambridge: Polity Press. 82, 83, 95, 96

Bennett, Jane (2010). *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things*. Durham: Duke University Press. 74

Bogard, Cynthia J. (1998). The rhetoric of domination and its strategic use by homeless mothers. *Sociological Spectrum 18*(3), 229–262. https://doi.org/10.1080/02732173.1998.9982197. 18

Bogdan, R. C. and S. K. Biklen (1998). *Qualitative research in education: An introduction to theory and methods*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon. 40, 111

Brodie, Janine (1996). Restructuring and the new citizenship. In Isabella Bakker (Ed.), *Rethinking Restructuring: Gender and Change in Canada*, pp. 126–140. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 16

brown, adrienne marie (2017). *Emergent Strategy: Shaping Change, Changing Worlds*. Chico, CA: Ak Press. 4, 93, 96, 112, 116

brown, adrienne marie (2021). *Holding Change: The Way of Emergent Strategy Facilitation and Mediation*. Chico, CA: Ak Press. 94, 101, 116

Brown, Wendy (1993). Wounded attachments. *Political Theory 21*(3). 27

Browne, Kath and Cathrine Nash (2016). Queer methods and methodologies: an introduction. In Kath Browne and Cathrine Nash (Eds.), *In Queer Methods and Methodologies: intersecting Queer theories and social science research*, pp. 1–23. New York: Taylor and Francis. 34

Canadian Lived Experience Leadership Network (CLELN) (2023). Virtual Discussion Panel, March. 26

Chinyere-Oparah, Julia and Margo Okazawa-Rey (2009). *Activist Scholarship: Antiracism, Feminism, and Social Change*. London: Routledge. 92

Cifor, M., P. Garcia, T. L. Cowan, J. Rault, T. Sutherland, A. Chan, J. Rode, A. L. Hoffmann, N. Salehi, and L. Nakamura (2019). Feminist data manifest-no. *Feminist Data Manifest-No*. https://www.manifestno.com. 83

Clark, John (2024). How our struggles are contained by those in power. *Canadian Dimension*. https://canadiandimension.com/articles/view/how-our-struggles-are-contained-by-those-in-power. 2

Collins, Patricia Hill (1990). *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. Boston: Unwin Hyman. 76

Collins, Patricia Hill and Sirma Bilge (2016). *Intersectionality*. Cambridge: Polity. 76

Cossman, Brenda and Judy Fudge (Eds.) (2002). *Privatization, Law, and the Challenge to Feminism*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 11, 13, 15, 16, 17

Costanza-Chock, Sasha (2018, June). Design justice: Towards an intersectional feminist framework for design theory and practice. In *Proceedings of the Design Research Society*, pp. 1–14. 68, 75, 80, 82, 85, 94

Costanza-Chock, Sasha (2020). *Design Justice: Community-Led Practices to Build the Worlds We Need*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press. 68, 71, 73, 75, 78, 79, 81, 82, 87, 88, 90, 92, 94

Coughlin, Steven, Selina Smith, and Maria Fernandez (2017). *Handbook of Community-Based Participatory Research*. New York: Oxford University Press. 23, 24, 25, 34

Crenshaw, Kimberlé (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A black feminist critique of antidiscrimination doctrine, feminist theory and antiracist politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum 1989*(1), 139–167. 76

Crenshaw, Kimberlé (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review 43*(6), 1241–1299. 76

da Silveira Gorman, Rachel (2024). Personal correspondence. 2

Das, Madhurima, Anastasia K. Ostrowski, Shelly Ben-David, Gillian J. Roeder, Kimberley Kimura, Catherine D'Ignazio, Cynthia Breazeal, and Aditi Verma (2023). Auditing design justice: The impact of social movements on design pedagogy at a technology institution. *Design Studies 86*(C), 101183. 72, 79, 80, 81, 88

Dauvergne, Peter and Genevieve LeBaron (2014). *Protest Inc. The Corporatization of Activism*. Cambridge: Polity Press. 18

Design Justice Network (2024). Design justice network. https://designjustice.org. 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 89, 94

Desmond, Cole (2024, January). #policingisharm press conference today to send a message ahead of toronto city budget decisions. we need money for services not harm! Instagram video, January 22, 2024. https://www.instagram.com/p/C2Z_fRZgQhg/. 2

Escobar, Arturo (2017). *Designs for the Pluriverse: Radical Interdependence, Autonomy, and the Making of Worlds*. Durham: Duke University Press. 74

Esterberg, Kristin G. (2002). *Qualitative Methods in Social Research*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill. 40, 111

Feathers of Hope Inc. (2024). Feathers of hope. https://www.facebook.com/fohtbay/. 68

Floegel, Diana and Kaitlin L. Costello (2021). Methods for a feminist technoscience of information practice: Design justice and speculative futurities. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology 73*(4), 24597. 72, 73, 77, 79, 83, 84, 85, 87, 88, 89, 95

Fraser, Nancy (1997). *Justice Interruptus: Critical Reflections on the 'Postsocialist' Condition*. New York: Routledge. 8

Gill, Stephen and David Law (1988). *The Global Political Economy: Perspectives, Problems, and Policies*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press. 13

Gilmore, Ruth Wilson (2022). *Abolition Geography: Essays Toward Liberation*. London: Verso. 92

Goh, Kian, Anastasia Loukaitou-Sideris, and Vinit Mukhija (2022). *Just Urban Design: The Struggle for a Public City*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 75

Goldberg, David Theo (2009). Racial comparisons, relational racisms: Some thoughts on method. *Ethnic and Racial Studies 32*(7), 1271–1282. 86

GoPaul, Butterfly (2023). Whose camp(us)? reimaginging community safety together. In *Panel discussion presented at York University by the York Federation of Students, York University Graduate Student Association, Ontario Public Interest Research Group York, Reimagining Community Safety Action Group*. 2

Hacker, Karen (2017). *Community-Based Participatory Research*. London: Sage Publications Inc. 24

Hart, Gillian (2018). Relational comparison revisited: Marxist postcolonial geographies in practice. *Progress in Human Geography 42*(3), 371–394. 86

Harvey, David (1989). *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Oxford: Blackwell Press. 11, 13

Hesse-Biber, S. and P. Nagy Leavy (2011). *The Practice of Qualitative Research*. New York: Sage. 40, 111

Huffstetler, Hanna E., Sarah E. Boland, Caitlin R. Williams, Dana K. Rice, and Rohit Ramaswamy (2021). Beyond virtue-signaling: Advancing equity through design justice and public health critical race praxis. *Health Equity 6*(1), 0075. 73, 74, 77, 86, 87, 88

Hulchanski, J. David (2009). Homelessness in canada: Past, present, future. Conference keynote address, Calgary, AB. 9, 10, 12

Hulchanski, J. David, Philippa Campsie, Shirley B. Y. Chau, Steven W. Hwang, and Emily Paradis (2009). Homelessness: What's in a word? In David J. Hulchanski, Philippa Campsie, Shirley B. Y. Chau, Steven W. Hwang, and Emily Paradis (Eds.), *Finding Home Policy Options for Addressing Homelessness in Canada*, pp. 1–16. Toronto: Cities Centre, University of Toronto. https://www.homelesshub.ca/sites/default/files/attachments/ FindingHome_Full.pdf. 9, 10, 14

Hunt, Trevor Purvis Alan (1999). Identity versus citizenship: Transformation in the discourses and practices of citizenship. *Social and Legal Studies 8*(4), 457–482. 15, 16

Jackson, Sid (2023). On the marginalization of poor peoples' politics. *Carceral Continuum.* https://www.carceralcontinuum.ca/blog-1/on-the- marginalization-of-poor-peoples-politics. 2

Jackson, T., G. Conchelos, and A. Vigoda (1980). The dynamics of participation in participatory research. In F. Dubell, T. Erasmie, and J. de Vries (Eds.),

Research for the People—Research by the People. Selected Papers from the International Forum on Participatory Research in Ljubljana, Yugoslavia, pp. 41–60. Linkoping, Sweden and Amersfoort, Netherlands: Linkoping University and S. V. E. The Netherlands Study and Development Center for Adult Education. 24

Jen, Natasha (2018). Why design thinking is bullshit. https://www.itsnicethat.com/articles/natasha-jen-pentagram-graphicdesign-230218. 82

Jenson, Jane (1989). 'different' but not 'exceptional': Permeable fordism in canada. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology 26*(1), 69–94. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-618X.1989.tb00413.x. 13

Jenson, Jane (1997). Fated to live in interesting times: Canada's changing citizenship regimes. *Canadian Journal of Political Science 30*(4), 627–644. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0008423900016450. 16

Jessop, Bob (1993). Towards a schumpeterian workfare state? preliminary remarks on post-fordist political economy. *Studies in Political Economy 40*(1), 7–39. https://doi.org/10.1080/19187033.1993.11675409. 14

Korpi, Walter (1998). The iceberg of power below the surface: A preface to power resources theory. In Julia S. O'Connor and Gregg M. Olsen (Eds.), *Power Resource Theory and the Welfare State: A Critical Approach*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 8

Leavy, Patricia (2017). *Research Design: Quantitative, Qualitative, Mixed Methods, Arts-Based, and Community-Based Participatory Research Methods*. New York: The Guilford Press. 24, 25, 26, 30, 31

Lewis, Jane (1998). Gender and the development of welfare regimes. In Julia S. O'Connor and Gregg M. Olsen (Eds.), *Power Resource Theory and the Welfare State: A Critical Approach*, pp. 229–249. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 8

LiveEx (2023). Virtual Discussion Panel, March. 26

MacKinnon, Shauna (2018). *Practising Community-Based Participatory Research: Stories of Engagement, Empowerment, and Mobilization*. Vancouver: UBC Press. 24

Maynard, Robyn (2017). *Policing Black Lives: State Violence in Canada from Slavery to the Present*. Halifax, NS: Fernwood Press. 9, 18

McIntyre, A. (2008). *Participatory Action Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE. 29

McWade, Bridgit (2020). Was it autoethnography? the classificatory, confessional and mad politics of lived experience in sociological research. *Social Theory & Health 18*, 123–137. 26

Mertens, Donna M. (2005). *Research and valuation in Education and Psychology: Integrating Diversity with Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE. 31

Mertens, Donna M. (2007). Transformative paradigm: Mixed methods and social justice. *Journal of mixed methods research 1*(3). 32

Mertens, Donna M. (2009). *Transformative Research and Evaluation.* New York and London: The Guilford Press. 31

Mooers, Colin (1998). And we still resist? globalization, citizenship and class formation. *Social Studies Bulletin 53*, 194–211. 16

Murphree, Marshall (2008). Foreword. In Louise Fortmann (Ed.), *In Participatory Research in Conservation and Rural Livelihoods*, pp. xv–xxii. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. 31

Muszynski, Alicia (1996). *Cheap Wage Labour:Race and Gender in the Fisheries of British Columbia.* Montréal: McGill-Queen's Press. 8

Nyong'o, Tavia (2017). Foreword to 2017 edition. In *Jasbir K. Puar. Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism is Queer Times (Tenth Anniversay Expanded Edition)*, pp. xi–xvi. Durham, NC: Duke University Press. 77

Obolensky, Nick (2014). *Complex Adaptive Leadership: Embracing Paradox and Uncertainty.* Burlington, VT: Gower. 93, 116

Peck, Jamie (1996). *Workplace: The Social Regulation of Labor Markets.* New York: Guilford Press. 14

Piazzoni, Francesca, Jocelyn Poe, and Ettore Santi (2022). What design for ur-

ban design justice? *Journal of Urbanism: International Research on Place-making and Urban Sustainability*, 1–22. 74, 75, 78, 79, 85, 86, 88

Pulido, Laura (2008). Faqs: Frequently (un)asked questions about being a scholar activist. In *Engaging contraditions: Theory, politics, and methods of activist scholarship (Edited by Charles R. Hale)*, pp. 341–365. Berkeley: University of California Press. 92

Robinson, Jennifer (2014). New geographies of theorizing the urban: Putting comparison to work for global urban studies. In *The Routledge Handbook on Cities of the Global South*, pp. 6. London: Routledge. 86

Rose, Kristin, Kate Henne, Sabelo Mhlambi, Anand Sarwate, and Sasha Costanza-Chock (2023). Critical ai and design justice: An interview with sasha costanza-chock. *Critical AI 1*(1–2). 68, 72, 81

Satzewich, Vic (1991). *Racism and the Incorporation of Foreign Labour: Farm Labour Migration to Canada since 1945*. London: Routledge. 8

Sears, Alan (1999). The lean state and capitalist restructuring: Towards a theoretical account. *Studies in Political Economy 59*(1), 91–114. https://doi.org/10.1080/19187033.1999.11675268. 17

Sharma, Nandita (2000). Race, class, gender and the making of difference: The social organization of 'migrant workers' in canada. *Atlantis 24*(2), 5–15. 8

Smith, Cassie Lynn (2022). Establishing long-term relationships for collaborative ethnographic research. In Sonya Atalay and Alexandra McCleary

(Eds.), *The Community-Based PhD: Complexities and Triumphs of Conducting CBPR*, pp. 161–177. Tucson: Univeristy of Arizona Press. 34

Smith, Selina Ann, Mary Smith Whitehead, Joyce Sheats, Jeff Mastromonico, Wonsuk Yoo, and Steven Scott Coughlin (2016). A community-engaged approach for developing a mobile cancer prevention app: The mcpa study protocol. *JMIR Research Protocols 5*(1). 25

Snow, David A. and Leon Anderson (1993). *Down on Their Luck: A Study of Homeless Street People*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press. 18

Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto (1960). Report on homeless and transient men. Technical report, Social Planning Council of Metropolitan Toronto. 10

Stark, Louisa R. (1994). The shelter as "total institution. *American Behavioral Scientist 37*(4), 553–562. 18

Strand, Kerry, Sam Marullo, Nicholas Cutforth, Rrandy Stoecker, and Patrick. Donohue (2003). *Community-Based Research and Higher Education: Principles and Practices*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 30

Thistle, Jesse A. (2017). *Indigenous Definition of Homelessness in Canada*. Toronto: Canadian Observatory on Homelessness Press. 9, 26

Tranjan, Ricardo (2023). *The Tenant Class*. Toronto: Between the Lines. 1

Tshuma, Lawrence (2000). Hierarchies and government versus networks and government: Competing regulatory paradigms in global economics regulation. *Social and Legal Studies 9*(1), 115–142. https://doi.org/10.1177/096466390000900106. 13

Tuck, Eve (2009). Suspending damage: A letter to communities. *Harvard Educational Review 79*(3), 409–427. 49

Tyler, Imogen (2015). Classificatory struggles: Class, culture and inequality in neoliberal times. *The Sociological Review 63*(2). 27

Vasudevan, Raksha and Magdalena Novoa (2021). Pluriversal planning scholarship: Embracing multiplicity and situated knowledges in community-based approaches. *Planning Theory 1*(24). 75

Voices for Unhoused Liberation (2023). It's egregious, it's appalling, it's abysmal. *Trial by Shelter*. Podcast, December 2023, 43 Min. https://www.unhousedliberation.ca/trial-by-shelter. 18

Voices for Unhoused Liberation (2024). Voices for unhoused liberation. https://www.unhousedliberation.ca/trial-by-shelter. 103

Voronka, Jijian (2016). The politics of 'people with lived experience' experiential authority and the risks of strategic essentialism. *Philosophy, Psychiatry, & Psychology 23*(3). 26, 27

Vosko, Leah Faith (2000). *Temporary Work: The Gendered Rise of a Precarious Employment Relationship*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 13, 14

Weeks, Jeffrey (1981). *Sex, Politics and Society*. London: Longman. 17

Wilmsen, Carl (2008). Negotiating community, participation, knowledge and power in participatory research. In C. Wilmsen, W. Elmendorf, L. Fisher, J. Ross, B. Sarathy, and G. Wells (Eds.), *Partnerships for Empowerment: Participatory Research for Community-Based Natural Resource Management*, pp. 1–22. London: Earthscan. 24, 31

Withers, A. J. (2021). *Fight to Win: Inside Poor Peoples' Organizing*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing. 2

Workman, Thorn (1999). Hegemonic modulation and the discourse of fiscal crisis. *Studies in Political Economy 59*(1), 61–90. https://doi.org/10.1080/19187033.1999.11675267. 13

Yaneva, Albena (2022). *Latour for Architects*. London: Routledge. 74

Appendices

A   Technology Barriers

A.1   Education

- Everyone at a Different Place in Life
- Focusing on Immediate Needs
- General Digital Literacy
- Technology Not Giving Feedback (i.e., No Learning Occurring)

A.2   Trust

- Not on People's Terms
- Lived Experience People Not Consulted
- Lack of Trust (e.g. Conspiracies)
- Programmers Biassed
- Fear of Surveillance from "Big Tech"
- Biassed Toward Programmers & Service Providers
- Fear of Data Mining
- Rarely "By & For"
- Information Not in People's Hands
- People are Private
- Non-Democratic
- Fear of Surveillance From the City
- Not Peer Reviewed

A.3   Usability

- Technology Overwhelming (e.g. 211)
- Can't Transfer Technology Between Devices
- Websites Hard to Understand
- People in Crisis Mode
- Overcomplicated
- Basic Information is Poor Quality
- People are Burnt Out
- Not User Friendly
- Hard to Coordinate Resource

- Updates
- Over Designed
- Not Localised
- Not Nuanced
- Too Much Data
- Bad Data Framing & Interpretation
- Not Based on the People Who Know the Needs
- Not for Building Community
- Resource Lists Unusable

A.4 Dependability

- Internet Availability Lack of Available Data
- General Lack of Devices
- Devices are Expensive
- Data Not Convincing

- Lack of Secondary Technology (e.g. Printers)
- Theft of Devices on the Street
- Outdated Devices
- Loss of Devices on the Street

B Technology Access

B.1 Education

- Teaching People How to do Things
- Interpersonal Components
- Education a Human Right
- Spaces for Interacting With Technology
- Putting Tools Into Someone's Hands
- Spaces for Connecting People With Technology

B.2 Trust

- Made by Us
- Give Autonomy
- Spending Time With People
- Physical Space
- Give People Control
- Less Time Jumping Through Hoops
- Collaborate on People's Terms
- Safe Space to Access Technology
- nology
- Removing Restrictions
- Representation
- Non-Commercialised Third Spaces
- Relatable
- Ethical Considerations
- Knowledge of Who is in Control

B.3 Usability

- Exchanging Knowledge
- User Friendly For Low Tech Skills
- Consulting People
- Lived Experience-Oriented
- Consulting People
- For Connecting
- Understandable Information
- Quality Information
- Keeping Things Simple
- Focusing on Immediate Needs

- Practical
- Providing Information in Different Languages
- Helping People Feel Human
- Localised Within the Non-Local
- Practical
- Very Clear
- Basic Stuff
- Nuanced
- Non-Generalised Solutions

B.4 Dependability

- Not an App
- Stable
- Non-Digital Components
- Physical Components
- Non-Time Consuming
- Different Methods of Communications
- Transferable to Other Devices

- Consistent
- Self Sufficient
- Interpersonal Components
- Sharing Technology
- Giving People Equipment
- "By & For" With External Support

C Changes

C.1 Systemic Change & Intangibles

- Healing
- Humanising
- Collective
- Community-Based
- Ending Austerity
- Giving a Shit
- Enduring
- Accountability to Power
- Caring
- Caring Politicians
- Ending Politicians
- Ending Corrupt Government, Private Sector, Non-Profits
- Ending Status Quo

- Politically Investing in Young People
- Ending Middle-Class Home owner Ideology
- Addressing Middle-Class Fears
- Starting Over
- A Revolution
- Realistic Support
- Movement Building
- Grassroots
- Mutual Support
- Building Relationships
- Learning to Live Together

C.2 Art

- Zines
- Art Programmes

- Non-Arts Based
- Video, Art, & Writing

C.3 Stories

- Stories in General
- Real Stories
- Stories About How Homeless-

  ness Can Happen to Anyone
- Stories About People's Interests

C.4 Education & Skills

- Job Retention Support
- Resume Support
- Digital Literacy
- Proper Interpretation of Statistics
- Books
- Changing Perceptions of Who is

  Homeless
- Recreation Skills
- Employment Skills

C.5 Political Actions

- Fighting Non-Profit Statistical

  Goals
- Web Actions
- Campaigning
- Political Actions
- Protests & Marches
- Protesting
- Ending Institutional Referrals
- Lived Experience Informed Pol-

  icy
- Pressure Elected Officials
- Fighting Non-Profit Statistical

  Goals

C.6 Supports

- People Seeing My Perspective
- Spending Time With People

- Connections Forged Between Shelters
- More Livable Construction Jobs
- Organisational Networking
- Renter & Houseless Solidarity
- People Believing Me

C.7 Space

- Address Climate Change (Floods & Fires)
- A Welcoming Space
- Ending Social Capital-Based Housing
- Low-Barrier Housing
- Investing in Home Building
- Short Term Rentals
- Drop-In Centres
- A Phone Charging Space
- Bus With Computers Inside
- Free Transportation
- Available Transportation
- Outdoor Events
- Indoor Events
- Land Activities
- LANDBACK

C.8 Programmes

- Support Hotline
- Not a Support Hotline
- Reference Letter Programme
- Unhoused Rental Find Group
- Giving Refurbished Phones
- Safe Supply
- Focus on Immediate Needs
- Basic Services Van

C.9 Information

- Central Shelter Intake
- An Argument for Affordable Housing
- Centralised Services
- Something People Can Populate Themselves

- Affordable Place List
- Bad Landlord List
- Organisation Budgets
- City Budgets
- Police Budgets

C.10   General Technology

- Media-Based
- Website
- Centralised Website
- Digital Service
- Uploading Police Footage
- TikTok

- YouTube
- Documentary
- Podcast
- Radio Station
- Non-Video

D   Advice

- Consider Non-Hierarchical

- Consider Non-Colonial

- Titles and Ranks Make People Uncomfortable

- Tell People What You're Going to Do With the Information

- Be Patient

- Don't Scrutinise or Judge

- Something Collective

- Make Connections

- Create a Network

- Bring More People in

- Bring More People From the Outside in

- Get People to Start Talking to Each Other

- Talk to More People

- Find a Programmer

- Make Connections With a Programmer

- You Don't Need Money

- Don't be Afraid to Create an Existing Tool

- Don't be Afraid to Recreate the Wheel (People Have Different Perspectives)

- Different Models for Different Areas

- Professionalism at the Policy Level

- Build Something People Actually Need

- Listen to People

- Consider Lived Experience

- Talk to Lived Experience People

- Talk to More People With Lived Experience

- Keep Considering Lived Experience People

- Another List of Resources Not Helpful

- Lists Make People Feel Better

But Are Not Accessible

- Technology Can't Save Us
- Something Localised
- Share Technology Around for Innovation
- Keep Things Simple
- Team-Up With Organisations
- Have a Theme
- Have a Structure
- Start Small
- Keep it Open
- Some People May Not Want to Share Their Story
- Help People Feel Included
- Manage Expectations Around it Being Co-Opted
- Don't Put People on a Pedestal as Knowledge Holders
- People Deserve to Get Paid, but There are People Out There Who Want to Contribute to Community and Volunteer
- Keep Things Grounded in the

People it's for

- Give People the Respect and Dignity They Deserve to Have Their Own Supports
- Technology Often Goes Wrong, Unless it's for Building Community
- Don't Make Technology the Thing; Make it the Thing That Supports the Human Thing
- Do We Just Go Along with Technology? Or do We Actually Think About How Can We Use This for Good?
- Technology is an Enabler for Bringing More People in
- There is an Agreement About the Problem but a Disagreement About What Would be Helpful
- Lots of People Want to Participate but They Can't Necessarily Take Things on Themselves
- People Are Burnt Out

- Consider That People Are Tired

- You Don't Need a Lot of People for a Project

- Find the Lightest Possible Form of Production

- Consider the Most Do-able Licensing

- Audio is Smaller File Sizes

- Video Files are a Nightmare

- Radio Requires a lot of Airtime

- Websites are Versatile

- If You Can't Help Homeless People, You Aren't Getting Anywhere in Life

- Keep Caring About People

- You Must Have the Supplies and Willingness to do it

- Duration is Important for Impact

- Stay Focused, Don't Get Distracted

- Check Your Biases

- Surround Yourself With People Who Point Out When You are Doing Something Incorrect

- Being Aware of Differences

- Different Things Work for Different People

- Good to Stay in Conversation with People

- Keep a Clear Idea Once you Have Set on it

- Don't Get Distracted and Pulled in Different Directions

- If You Create Something too Broad, it Won't be Useful

- If You Try to Meet all of the Needs, it Won't be Effective

- It's helpful to Have One Thing Consistently

- People Need to be Motivated in Help Others, Rather Than Desiring to Look or Behave in a Certain Way

- Stay With a Smaller Group You Trust

- Don't Get Bogged Down

- People Make Mistakes
- It's Hard to Start Things Without Financial Capital but Technology is Inexpensive
- Talk to People and Find Out What Works for Them
- Only Helping a Few People is OK
- Just do it
- Have a More Measured Idea When Working With Folks
- Focus on Improving Quality of Life, Ensuring as Much Safety as Possible
- Never Stop Thinking About Moving Into Cycles of Healing
- Be Pragmatic About Outcomes and Seeing Where to go from There
- Things Won't Change Today but There are Steps we Can Take

- Today
- There are Ways to Make Non-Harmful Technology
- We May not Have Everything we Want but How do we Get Closer to What we Want
- Communities are Resilient
- Absolute Pessimism is not Where Change Happens
- Recognise Our Privilege
- Understanding Privilege at Different Rates to Build Interdependence
- We are not all in This Together
- Need to do Some of the Hard Work
- Consult Indigenous People
- Ask People Who Have Been Around
- Be Honest