Mental health service user territories: Enacting 'safe spaces' in the community

Abstract

This article develops a conceptualisation of 'space' that enables in-depth analysis of mental health service user 'territories'. Driven by the aim to understand how spaces within the framework of 'community care' are produced, an approach that draws upon Deleuze and Guattari's notion of 'territoriality' is developed. Through this we see how important it can be for service users to produce 'safe spaces' that enable forms of 'normalised' activities to be produced, but, crucially, in settings that exist outside completely mainstream settings. Analysing drop-in day centres and home environments (two key sites in community care), the paper demonstrates the value of a micro analysis of the production of space to understanding some of the ways service user experience operates in a spatially distributed sense. This helps to illuminate the impact on identity of existing within 'community care'.

Keywords
Community care, territoriality, Deleuze and Guattari

Introduction
The move to 'community care' for people with mental health difficulties accessing psychiatric services (hereafter referred to as service users) led to a wave of interest in geographies of mental health (Wolch & Philo, 2000). The change in scale of space, from the closed and cramped wards of institutional care to the expansive landscapes of community settings invigorated this concern as to the spatial distribution of mental health. In this paper a particular conception of the production of space is developed through the work of Deleuze and Guattari, in relation to two key sites for service users; drop-in day centres and home environments. The utility and impact on service users' lives of the constituent parts that make up 'community care' are currently the subject of some debate (Vernon & Qureshi, 2000). Alongside this is a drive within the social sciences to engage with the work of Deleuze (and Guattari) as a means of unpicking some of the complexity of the spatially distributed materiality of everyday life (Brown, 2007).

Community Care
The move from institutional to community care in mental health has been well documented (Bennett, 1991; Coppock & Hopton, 2000; Ekeland & Bergem, 2006; Pinfold, 2000; Rossler, 1992; Scull, 1977). Although the politics behind the move have been hotly contested (Laurance, 2003), the move was driven, at least in part, by a desire to be more inclusive, to encourage a re-integration of people with mental health difficulties into mainstream society (Coppock & Hopton, 2000). However, it

has been widely reported that community care has not proved to be a panacea of social integration and inclusion (Rogers & Pilgrim, 2005). Service users are often still reported to face challenges in terms of social inclusion (Sayce, 2003). Debates are still prevalent regarding the operation of community care, and whether aspects of it (e.g. the use of day centres) actually work as exclusionary spaces as they locate service users in spaces removed from mainstream settings (Mental Health and Social Exclusion Report, 2004).

Research focusing on the operation of community care has been diverse, including investigating demographic patterns amongst service users (e.g. people of lower socio-economic status tend to be diagnosed more commonly than those of higher socio-economic status) (Bayne Smith, 1996; Loring & Powell, 1988; Williams, 1999); prevalence of abuse (Janssen et al., 2004; Read, 1997); conceptualising overall theoretical frameworks relating to service users' ability to 'cope' with community care (Mechanic, 2001); and efficacy of treatments (an der Heiden, 2001; Tyrer, 2001). What all these approaches share is a focus on the individual, e.g. investigating personal coping strategies or the effect of treatments on service users. Analysis of mental health in terms of the space/s of service use has offered a valuable alternative perspective on service use, through focusing on the organisation of spaces at a level of inter-relations between people and their environments, rather than the impact of practices upon individuals. Spatial analysis has consequently sought to illuminate the practices that exist through the spatial distribution of mental health service use. For instance, how service users' experiences are not entirely reducible to individual factors (e.g. coping strategies) but are produced in contexts that are spatially existent (e.g. how the places people spend their time are produced through and effect day-to-day living).

To date geographies of mental health have focused on the inclusion of accounts of service users and the 'service user movement' in illuminating geographies of difference in relation to mental health (Parr, 1997); how space is produced through service user action to attempt to resist medical identities (Parr, 1997); and exploring how the experience of particular forms of mental distress (e.g. delusions) are driven into material embodied spaces (Parr, 1999). A central tenet of these approaches has been to focus on relations between individuals and space, in such a way that frames space as a pre-existing entity that can afford, and subsequently be interacted with, through individual action. Medical geography more broadly has sought to analyse the macro level organisation of landscapes, e.g. Gesler's (1992; 2003) 'therapeutic landscapes' in which certain spaces/places are framed as having a therapeutic/healing function. Here integration between therapeutic and spatial practices is illuminated, with particular reference to general health. Baer and Gesler (2004) suggest the priorities of therapeutic landscape literature as it moves forward are to focus on negative as well as positive factors; to ground analyses in people's everyday life experiences; and that variability will exist in relationships between space and individual whereby a particular space may be therapeutic for one person but non-therapeutic for another. These concerns are mirrored and recognised in analysis developed in this paper.

The concept of 'community care' has been explored through systematic analysis of a range of different factors in care, both formal and informal, with specific focus on analysing how caring operates as a fragmentary entity built of a number of forms

(Parr & Philo, 2003). Focus has predominantly been upon the role and efficiency, constituting factors, and service users views of, care. Literature specifically addressing voluntary sector day centres has analysed spatialised forms of subjectivity, within a humanistic psychological framework (Conradson, 2003). In regard to home environments analysis has been limited, although interesting work has been produced around domestic spaces of care in health more generally (e.g. Milligan, 2000). Twigg (2000) has also produced some interesting work around practices of bathing and the body, again in relation to more general health care.

In this paper attention is paid to service user action in relation to how activity impacts upon production of particular spaces. It is not so much a concern with how spaces of care operate for service users, but a concern to explore the multi- relational production of material spaces through both service user and care practices. This will aid articulation of the production of spatialised experience of service use that examines both day centre and home environments, and utilises Deleuzian (and Guattarian) theory as a means to unfold some of the complexity that exists in relations between humans, objects and space in the production of service user 'territories'. It is not 'care' as an object itself of interest, but a drive to unfold service user territories understood as a product of relations that involve human and non-human factors (e.g. objects). Approaches to date have not fully explored the 'action potential' ever present in the relation between bodies and space, and have taken these as ontologically distinct entities. Following Grosz (2004), the body (and its relation to space) is understood "not as an organism itself, but as a system, or a series of open-ended systems" (p.3), meaning that spaces and bodies should not been seen as distinct entities, but rather as produced through systems of relation (Tucker, 2006).

Turning to Deleuze and Guattari
There has been a growing interest in the utility of the work of Deleuze and Guattari in social theory in recent times (e.g. Bogard, 2000; Braidotti, 2003; Brown & Lunt, 2002; Colebrook, 2002; Fox, 2002). In this paper it is specifically the notion of territory that will be taken from the Deleuze-Guattarian lexicon. Territory is not used in a traditional sense to refer to the laying out of boundaried space in any straightforward manner (e.g. how walls of a house provide a boundary to home), but attempts to develop and engage with a more honed down micro analysis of the multiple factors at work in a constantly fluid sense of space. So that territory is taken as the means of thinking how space is constantly made and remade (or 'becomes') through multiple systems of relation between human and non-human phenomena. Deleuze and Guattari turn not just to the physical make up of our environments, such as buildings, but also to the transformation of spaces into territories through the use of auditory and visual markers. For them it is the oft-subtle and fragile ways that territories are mobilised and face ever-present challenges to their space/s that is of focus. Following MacGregor Wise (2000) territories are considered not as a place as such, but as an act. To explore territories of service use requires a microanalysis of the multiple relations (between humans, objects and space) through which they are enacted.

Territoriality
MacGregor Wise (2000) offers an interesting account of territorial acts, events and happenings. He uses the example of the home, which he claims is not to be understood entirely in terms of understanding the role of the home (house) according

to cultural stereotypes, but rather in terms of the practices, objects, spatialised events through which the home setting is constantly re-worked. They are of course influenced by cultural expectations and common modes of practice (such as being gendered spaces (Massey, 1994)), but they are not entirely reducible and determined by such norms, having instead an existence that is continually reworked, and thus potentialised, as different. Home spaces *become* rather than *are.* These acts connect with objects that *mark* territory. In developing this idea, MacGregor Wise (2000) gives the examples of marking out and laying claim to space, such as placing one's coat to save a seat, or placing one's belongings on the adjacent seat on a bus to stop anyone else from sitting there.

Deleuze and Guattari do not argue that space is pre-existing and that we operate 'within' space, but rather that activity is constantly being (re)produced (or (re)enacted) in spatially distributed ways. Clearly definable boundaries are not felt, for instance between bodies and space, as if they exist as different entities. They exist as part of systems (or flows) of relation that work through material forces that encompass bodies as well as non-human factors. Focus is on the ways that everyday life is organised in a non-reductionist manner that is dynamically ever primed for change. Emphasis is on becoming, not being. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) state:

> 'What defines the territory is the emergence of matters of expression (qualities). Take the example of colours in birds or fish: colour is a membrane state associated with interior hormonal states, but it remains functional and transitory as long as it is tied to a type of action (sexuality, aggressiveness, flight). It becomes expressive, on the other hand, when it acquires a temporal constancy and a spatial range that make it a territorial, or rather territorializing, mark: a signature.' (1987: 346).

Territories are marked out by the expressive acts through which they are produced. In the above example we see that territories are produced through the expression of colours forming acts of aggression (or sexuality).

All these activities act as milieus (chunks of space-time), all coded by the periodic repetition of their activity. Some occur in different patterns of repetition, but all are coded. Coding though is not a static happening, forever set in one pattern of function. Rather, it is in a constant state of re-coding (transcoding). Deleuze and Guattari use the example of a fearful child sitting in the dark singing to himself under his breath (1987: 343). The repetition of the song acts to code that space. Milieus interact, mesh, interweave and spin off in new directions: "the notion of the milieu is not unitary: not only does the living thing pass into one another; they are essentially communicating" (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987: 345); "milieu effects are always the result of connections to elsewhere" (MacGregor Wise, 2000: 301). Territories are 'built' from parts of the milieus that operate in centres, they are produced through an accretion of milieu acts. It is not simply the additional consequence of the production of each milieu, but rather an autonomy, that only *becomes* in an action, an action built on parts of milieus. So, the operation of settings (e.g. train platforms) is created through the connections of multiple chunks of coded space-time (e.g. the conductor's whistle).

As previously touched upon, a central tenet of territoriality with regard to space is the notion of expressivity. Deleuze and Guattari claim that territories only enter a state of

becoming through the transition from functionality to expressivity. Take the colours of a bird; which are at once physiological effects relating to internal hormonal states; functional effects in terms of relating to factors such as aggression or sexuality; but also *expressive,* in terms of becoming markers of a territory. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) draw on the example of zebra finches (which have both coloured and all white members), in which the coloured members maintain a certain distance from each other (the colour marking the territory), whereas the all-white members exist in much closer proximity to each other. Here we see that the territory at once becomes and is produced *through* the acts that define it (with zebra finches, the colour).

It is a theoretically informed empirical analysis of the production of service user territories developed in this paper. The utilisation of Deleuze-Guattarian concepts aid formation of an approach to the theorisation of space, which then frames the upcoming analysis. As such, a conceptual approach is developed that contributes an understanding of space as fluid and malleable, which would not necessarily be attainable if alternative approaches were undertaken. For instance, a traditional ethnographic approach without the Deleuze-Guattarian framework. Or, a more straightforward qualitative methodological approach looking for discursive or semiotic patterns in participant transcripts. The theoretical-empirical lens developed will be used to analyse day centre spaces, and explore the lesser-researched home spaces of service users. This involves incorporating the role of both human (i.e. bodies) and non-human factors (i.e. objects), along with taking a micro-analytic approach to how different forces inter-relate in the production of space. In doing this I am framing space not as an ever-present stable entity that awaits interpretation, but as constantly being remade through the various and multiple sets of relations that emerge from a continuous flow of experience. The Deleuze-Guattarian influence is greatest in its emphasis on becoming rather than being. This means that the analysis is formed through engaging with service user spaces in terms of what they become and are produced in a dynamic process of constant potential for change, rather than what they are per se. The aim is not to explore how service users are served by the spaces they inhabit, but to unfold some of the complex relations through which spaces of service use are produced.

Method
The centres visited as part of this study were a variety of social service run and volunteer run locations (all located in the Midlands in the UK). They shared a focus on providing a safe space in which service users could engage (or not) with a number of activities, such as more formal courses (e.g. computer, woodwork, cooking), along with less formal activities (e.g. days out, bingo, playing pool). Additionally, there was not a focus on drawing in medical model thought, in terms or dealing with people according to diagnosis, treatment schedule etc, but rather in inviting people to enter a location in which very little talk of formal diagnoses, treatments etc. would take place. The general aim is to provide a more user-centred approach in terms of attending to everyday needs of living in community settings. The service users interviewed were aged between eighteen and fifty, with roughly equal numbers of male and females. All participants provided written consent, and pseudonyms have been used to ensure anonymity.

Analysis

Day Centre Milieus

The day centres under focus have different modes of function in terms of their general aims for the space they provide for users. For example, one centre had its onus on providing an essential safe space in which users can have a hot meal, interact with other members and staff, along with receiving some alternative treatments (e.g. holistic massage). These are general 'day' activities, with evenings often taken up with more specifically focused activities, such as groups for those with alcohol problems. Users are free to interact as much as they like, or to just attend passively and not interact at all. It is very much designed to be a multi-functional space. Another centre has a range of activities including computer skills, cookery, woodwork, gardening, and textiles. These are all designed to be flexible, so users can work at their own pace, with 'in-house' and more formal qualifications and certificates to be worked towards if users desire. Thus, there are different modes of action between different sites. The aim here is to highlight some of the forms of spatialised experience produced in centres, as examples of the kinds of places available to users to spend their time. One example of activity can be seen in the following extract:

> **Phil**: I get involved here in (.) the games and that [I: mm] (.) pool [I: mm] snooker and e:r (1) having a chat and a cup of tea (.) with my <u>mates</u> in the Smoke Room [I: mm] (1) playing music (1) which I like to do (.) <u>Six</u>ties stuff [I: mm] e:r (2) that's about it really [I: mm] (1) i..i..it's (.) <u>so</u> nice coming here [I: mm] (.) you know [I: mm] (2) I have made a lot of friends here and all that [I: mm] and have a good laugh and everything…..(lines 77–82)

Here Phil describes the activities he undertakes, which are formed through relations between different bodies (referring to both human and non-human factors) impacting upon each other in a variety of ways. Phil talks about listening to music, having a chat and a cup of tea, having a good laugh. These activities are functional, but also in a Deleuze-Guattarian sense *expressive* of a space that is not entirely pathological. Drinking tea with friends, listening to music, are 'normal' things to do. Through such activities the day centre territory becomes visible according to non-pathological practices, which can be an important task given the position often experience by service users as 'abnormalised' in some way, due to the multiple forms of discrimination that they can face (Sayce, 2003).

The activities of the day centres allow for connections to be made to other bodies, e.g. other service users attending the centre, which facilitate managing and producing a space in which users are more satisfied. They experiment with a variety of activities, e.g. drinking tea, listening to music, playing games, which facilitate new more productive (and mainstream) connections to be made. Activities listed allow for a sense of a whole range of mainstream actions to be apprehended, a sense that can only occur through the *doing*. Phil's expressed happiness about his time in the day centre demonstrates how the space opens up new connections that are, in a sense, productive and therapeutic. For instance, playing a game acts as a means of gaining a sense of different connections that can be formed through such an activity. Playing a game can be a family event, part of a traditional family setting, or one between friends. A common leisure activity for many people, but for service users, these activities are ways of experimenting with forming new 'mainstream' connections.

As Patton points out, drawing on Spinoza, bodies may seek to increase their power by entering into relations with other bodies that "serve to reinforce or enhance their own powers" (2000: 79). This is what is happening in the day centre. Service users are engaging in activities that serve to increase their own powers of normalisation, which as we saw, may allow them to enter into a greater number of socially integrative activities.

Other territorializing events are inflecting the day centre space, playing pool, having a cup of tea, and listening to music. Each are milieus, blocks of space-time. These flow as the space is constantly subject to dynamic inflections. Drinking a cup of tea will flow into listening to music. Playing pool may flow into 'having a laugh' with other users. The space of the day centre is constantly bent, shaped and re-shaped through the flow of these territorializing events. Users gain a sense of identity through *seeing* themselves expressed as part of these activities, which in turn are *expressive* of service use in this day centre. A constant feedback process is produced through creating the day centre space in a particular way and then observing one's participation in it. The latter operating as a force for reassurance that the space is not wholly pathological. Another example can be seen here:

> **Ian**: Yeah and do you find it helpful?
> **Peter**: Oh yeah very helpful, yeah.
> **Ian**: What sort of things do you – in what ways do you find it helpful?
> **Peter**: I do art here on a Wednesday afternoon with the art teacher, I meet people, I play games, listen to music, debate current affairs like you know……(lines 19-24)

Peter's time at the day centre is made up of taking part in art sessions, along with playing games and listening to music. His interaction with other members is specified in terms of debating current affairs, which demonstrates how each event, in this case, user interaction, operates in different ways in different milieus. Peter produces a chunk of interaction based on debating current affairs, whilst other users may be more focused on producing spaces of humour-based interaction, such as Phil 'having a laugh'.

These events becomes *expressive,* in terms of producing a *marker,* a *signature* laying out this space of service use. A conversation, sharing of experience, passing of the time of day; all milieus marking out this space as a safe space. These operate as territorializing events, marking out the location as a part of service use. Interacting, forging alliances with other users, is produced as a central part of community service use. Day centres become territorialized spaces through the organisation of multiple systems of relation that come to be in the *doing,* rather than in any pre-defined manner. So, we can see how these activities operate as milieus, through periodic repetition in the space-time block of day centre activity. Service users repeatedly inhabit the space-time that is the day centre, and in their time there, they constantly (re)produce the space through milieu effects: interaction; playing pool; drinking tea; shared production of 'safe space'.

Home Territories

One location in which service users can spend a large part of their time is their home environment (Granerud and Severinsson, 2003). These can involve a number of set-ups, including living in the family home; living in a self-maintained home; living in a service provision run centre; or local housing association run accommodation. A key territorializing factor in service use is the home space itself, in which large amounts of time can be spent due to status as a service user, which often means not being employed. Of keen interest is how the space of home functions and operates. The territorializing activities of users relate and connect to sets of events and productions. In the example of Chris, the territorializing of his flat was made possible by his ability to gather and store the required levels of sustaining objects to fill his flat. Consider the following extract:

> **Chris**: and I do bulks and bulks of shopping, I get bulks and bulks of food and drinks in my flat (.) cos at the moment I spend my money on videos, cds, food (.) drinks (.) hot and cold drinks (.) clothes (.) and (.) cigarettes (.) and paying my bills (I: mm) and because I'm on special (.) <u>benefits</u> cos of my illness I can afford to buy things (I: mm) I never run out of cigarettes cos I always have a supply but I've had to change my brand again because I (.) had problems getting the other ones so (.) three days of the week I'm usually out doing things (I: mm) (.) and the other four days I'm in the house (.) relaxing…..(lines 114-121)

Chris has spent his time accumulating a large amount of food and drink in his flat. He uses the word "bulk", intimating the direct relationship between the space of the flat and the objects of food and drink. To bulk something is to fill it, and this highlights how important the accumulation of grocery supplies is in terms of the space of the flat. The food and drink acting to mark the flat out as a personal space for Chris. A space primed for self-sufficiency if needed; food and drink acting as signifiers of the sustainable nature of this space. Here Chris can exist with minimal outside contact if necessary. Bulking his flat to bursting could be seen as creating a space that is difficult for others to enter. Both in terms of the sheer amount of space taken up by storing grocery supplies, and also (as we will see in upcoming data) the activities Chris engages in at home (e.g. adult television channels). Chris's space is thus *his* space.

Bulking his space and filling it with a host of entertainment technologies becomes a barricading practice, defending against the stressors that can exist in mainstream settings. This is like a hibernating practice. Chris, at any time, can lock himself away in a place that cannot be breached by others. It is so full that there is physically no space for others. This defensive strategy becomes a visible expression of Chris's autonomy, ability and facility to exist in solitude. Given his position as a service user who has spent a great deal of time in mental hospital wards - experiences he views as negative - it is of critical importance that he is able to produce and express his everyday living as within his control. Through these practices he can position and express himself as a service user, but one who is in control of his own daily existence, which serves to demonstrate progression from the time when he was a service user whose time and space was controlled by others. The items bulking up his flat serve as the visible face of this autonomy:

> **Ian**: what music do you like?
> **Chris**: I like <u>Michael</u> Jackson, Pet Shop Boys and Madonna, I got all the tapes (I: mm) I've got <u>all</u> the facilities (.) I've got stack system, I got bulks of videos, I got satellite (.) I've got all the fantasy channel stations what can (.) offend some people, adult stations (.) but the majority of time when I'm in my flat or on my own I just spend lot of time listening to my Walkman cd (I: mm) cos the most important thing to me believe it or not is actually my Walkman (I: mm) (.) the amount of time I spend listening to Walkman cd music…..(lines 447-454)

In becoming a highly personalised (territorialized) space, it is not just food and drink that serve as expressive qualities of home territories. Chris states he also has a variety of electronic goods and associated services, allowing him to create a functional, amenable and pleasurable personal space. He has a television, VCR, stereo equipment, along with services such as satellite television channels and audio tapes to play on his stereo equipment. These produce a home space in which Chris is happy to spend a large part of his time. They provide a range of entertainment activities for Chris to fill his time. Whilst the food and drink operate and express the marking out of Chris's space through their physical presence, the entertainment equipment also provides sonorous events, acting as territorializing space through sound. Similarly to Deleuze and Guattari's (1987) original notion of birds marking territory through bird song, these facilities work to produce sonorous markers. The music, television, and the fact that he has adult channels that can offend some people, mark this territory as his. In the same way that adult magazines mark out top shelves at newsagents, and peep shows and adult focused shows mark out parts of city centres, Chris's adult channels act as visual expressions of his space. The way that Chris territorializes his space bears close similarities to the following quote from Deleuze and Guattari in relation to one's own territory:

> 'The territory is first of all the critical distance between two beings of the same species: Mark your distance. What is mine is first of all my distance; I possess only distances. Don't touch me, I growl if anyone enters my territory, I put up placards' (1987: 352)

Chris is marking distance through the bulking of his flat. He is putting up placards through the sonorous markers of music and the visual markers of adult channels. His sense of personalised space, and consequently distance from others, is central to his everyday living. It is a three pronged territorialization producing Chris's space, with the physical presence of a large amount of food and drink; the sonorous production of music; and the visual expression of adult material marking out the setting. Chris listening to his walkman is additionally interesting as it potentially acts to create a 'space within a space' for him. He can fold even further into his home retreat by providing an additional layer between himself and the outside world through the use of a walkman that provides a sonorous boundary around his head. This safe, self-sufficient home space appears to help Chris ease into entering more mainstream spaces. His going out works in relation to the knowledge and practice of having a protective home space. It is as if the knowledge that at any time he has enough groceries and entertainment for an extended time at home helps him to enter more mainstream settings on the days he does go out. Given the variety in the nature of

home environments there is a diverse range of territorializing strategies employed by users. Consider the following example with Roy:

> **Ian**: mm (1) how do you like to (.) set out the space then (.) have you done particular things, brought particular things in and?
> (3)
> **Roy**: well there's (.) some things I've kept there (1) but only things that are absolutely necessary [I: mm] (.) and if there's any little bits of (rubber) I've got a little shoe box, I don't know if you know what (Argos) shoe boxes are like (.) si.. (.) six tiers or something [I: yeah] and anything that I need to sort out I put in the drawers [I: mm] (.) you know I've got lots of drawers and they're all orderly (.) I think since my mum died I've been (.) completely orderly
> **Ian**: are you quite an organised person are you?
> **Roy**: yeah I am now (1) anyway eventually I know that (.) while I sort everything out (.) all the stuff is starting to disappear now all that was (.) cluttering [I: mm] (.) I mean (let's say you've got) a table like this [I: mm] (.) I don't like papers all over the tables [I: yeah yeah] (.) so I keep it clear [I: mm] (1) (only) thing I got for my birthday I got a chess set [I: mm] I put it on the Welsh dresser I got [I: mm] (.) and e::r (.) you know I have sort of strategically put things out just how I want them [I: mm mm] (inaudible) become (.) orderly in that way (.) sort of helped me become orderly in other ways…..(lines 367-385)

In this extract Roy details his home environment, in which he lives alone having taken on the tenancy of the house after his mother recently passed away. Roy's narrative of organising (or making) the home space demonstrates the process of territorializing taking place, now that he has sole control. Firstly Roy's cleared the space, only keeping things that are "absolutely necessary", with remaining objects subject to a rigorous ordering. Small items are put away in drawers, of which Roy has a great deal. He has sorted the "clutter" through a "strategic" process of laying out his home space exactly as he desires. This ordering has been a key process of territorialisation, which in turn, has become an active therapeutic process. It does not appear solely as a functional process of organising one's home, but works as an expression of a therapeutic process. Roy becomes visible as a service user whose life is improving and working towards a better position through the therapeutic ordering and territorialization of his home. The use of the chess set a key exemplifier of what Deleuze and Guattari call a *reorganisation of function*, through which its function as a strategic game between two people is reorganised into an expressive role in which it forms a part of the organising process of Roy arranging his space:

> **Roy**: but I do I feel as though I am becoming more stable and the (.) place is becoming more stable [I: mm] (3) and now I've got all the space I need (.) I can sort of look in other places for other things now…..(lines 394-396)

The creation of organised space is seen here as important for Roy. The strategic ordering has produced a stability that has flowed into other parts of his life. Stability acting as a foundation upon which Roy can build and look for "other things now". This suggests what Roy feels able to do is indelibly linked to the operation of his personal space, and with this ordered, he can consider other parts of his life that he would like to improve. Thus, the territorialization is expressive of Roy producing

himself as a service user whose life is improving. Territorialisation being not just functional in terms of easing his daily living activity, but also aesthetic, in terms of visually producing a stable being.

The possibilities created by these territorializing actions and events can be important in terms of setting up personal space over which service users have a significant level of control. For people who may well have spent considerable time in the control of others (e.g. in-patient care), these practices are central in constructing a sense of identity, an identity in control of personal space. Additionally, Roy's extract demonstrates that practices that may in the first instance seem not to promote social inclusion, such as spending a large amount of time at home alone, can in fact contribute to feelings of social normality in terms of being able to organise and manage one's home environment (something most people take for granted).

Mainstream Space Anxieties
When thinking about the functions of the territorializing activities seen in this paper, it is important to consider how service users can feel about particular settings, and how important it can be to connect with particular spaces, and not others. Territorializing home environments and day centres can guard against engaging with more mainstream spaces, which can be anxiety-provoking. An example of this can be found in the following extract:

> **Ian**: oh they bring (.) oh ok (2) how (.) how did you come to (.) be (.) coming along to this place?
> **Ben**: er my CPN (1) er (.) sort of sorted it out (I: mm) cos I tried to go to college (I: uh mm) (.) but the big crowds and stuff, I was getting paranoid and (I: mm) (1) i..i..it didn't (.) it didn't (.) gel well with me so (I: mm) she mentioned this place…..(lines 49-54)

In this extract Ben communicates anxiety about connecting with certain mainstream spaces, in this case a local college. He describes his experiences of enrolling on a course at the local college, a common thing for someone of Ben's age to do (he was 19 at time of interview). This mainstream space though proved to be too pressured for Ben, with the sheer amount of people located at college an obstacle to inclusion and attendance. Subsequently his Community Psychiatric Nurse suggested the day centre as a space he may feel more comfortable in. Ben demonstrates that service users can be fearful and anxious about connecting with mainstream space, an anxiety borne from past negative experiences.

Space has been clearly marked out as a contributor to ongoing mental well being of Ben. Certain specific spaces with personal history and meaning (e.g. the college for Ben) can act as anxiety provoking and prove difficult for service users to engage with. Rather, it is the safe space expressed through the events that produce day centre activity that Ben feels more comfortable with. He states later that:

> **Ben**: um (2) except coming to this place I just sort of (2) I get up (2) e::r (.) I usually get up about (.) eleven twelve (I: uh mm) (2) and I just generally, I don't like going out much (I: mm) (1) but I will do if if it's necessary (I: mm)…(lines 65-68)

Only going out when necessary demonstrates the anxiety Ben feels regarding connecting with mainstream space. Whereas day centres can produce spaces that aid confidence in everyday life (e.g. through formation of predictable and comfortable activities), mainstream spaces can be pregnant with a mass of possible unpredictable experiences and connections, a reality that can produce anxiety in users. Thus, space can be a factor whether in relation to specific meaning-imbued places or just space as *not* home or day centre space (i.e. places that can be more difficult to construct feelings of control within).

Connecting Safe Spaces
This paper has demonstrated intricate practices of territorialization that mark out the spaces where service users can spend a lot of time, namely home and day centre environments. Crucially, these expressive practices and strategies of territorialization serve to mark out personal space, along with constructing and expressing boundaries against more mainstream spaces. Connecting with mainstream – non-user focused - space can be a major anxiety for community service users, and producing visible safe non-mainstream space is vitally important. Thus, the territorializing events seen in this paper become expressive and productive of safe spaces. Home environment and day centres are visible as safe spaces through the connecting of the particular practices productive of that space, be it bulks of food, drink and entertainment facilities with Chris, or the interactionary activities expressed in day centres. Through the provision of safe spaces for interaction, day centres can allow users to engage and connect with other people in a comfortable non-mainstream space. Interaction, users sitting talking and having meals, playing pool, bingo, and the range of other interactionary activities that take place act as *expressions* of this space as safe. They become visual markers, territorializing this space, marking it out as a user-centred space, and one boundaried off from mainstream space. These are the visible expression of service use. Users come to recognise themselves as those who exist in safe spaces through being able to *see* territorializing expressions. Their sense of identity is constructed through these sets of connecting events and actions.

This is not to suggest that all day centres and home spaces are 'positively' territorialized. Experiences of day centres for service users can be expected to be incredibly variable. What is a safe comfortable space for one can be an unproductive frustrating space for another. Additionally home spaces can be isolating places serving to bring to bear feelings of solitude and associated anxiety. It would be disingenuous to homogenise service users, day centres, and home spaces in a unidimensional manner (as Baer and Gesler (2004) point out in relation to the notion of 'therapeutic landscapes'). Indeed, this would be anti-thetical to the Deleuze-Guattarian informed theoretical framework put forward, which places complexity and difference above stability and generalisation. The aim of this paper has been to point to those practices and places where spaces are produced in ways that seem to work for the service users involved. And to offer such analysis as part of a wider body of knowledge surrounding place, identity and mental health that would be broader and more diverse.

Deleuze and Guattari's notion of territoriality provides a useful micro analytic conceptual framework to analyse the everyday practices of service user territories. It can be a delicate balance between engaging in practices that enhance a sense of 'normality', and doing so in such a way that still protects from a fully-fledged

engagement in mainstream spaces. This demonstrates that 'safe' spaces such as day centres can serve a critical role of laying out a space in which service users can interact that is in the community, but also boundaried from more mainstream spaces. Coupled with personal home environments, they provide a connecting safe space that is key for service users to exist in an environment in which they can practice 'normalised' activities, which are important for a sense of social inclusion.

Current social service policies are directed towards reducing the number of day centres available for service users to attend. The National Social Exclusion Programme is now in its fifth year, with significant effort expended in relation to evaluating current day centre provision for those using community mental health services. Key to this is the idea that day centres can increase isolation and consequently lessen opportunities for social integration (Mental Health and Social Exclusion Report, 2004). Whilst it is contested as to the precise reasons and motivation behind such an ideology of care, an understanding of space as crucial to ongoing well being is an important consideration. The analysis in this paper suggests that for some service users the space of day centres is critically important one in terms of promoting inclusive practices (e.g. meeting and making friends, gaining work skills). A crucial point here seems to be that users enjoy taking part in 'mainstream activities' (e.g. having tea with friends, listening to music), but that these occur in non-mainstream settings. In this sense it could be argued day centres provide a 'stepping stone' towards the mainstream. Additionally we have seen that other practices that may initially be seen as exclusionary (e.g. spending large amounts of time at home) can actually garner a sense of inclusion through developing skills of organising and running a home (e.g. Roy), whilst for some (e.g. Chris) home environments provide a bolt hole space, helping to ease engagement in mainstream community spaces.

References:

an der Heiden, W. (2001) Methods for evaluating community mental health services. In G. Thornicroft & G. Szmukler (Eds.) *Textbook of community psychiatry.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp 73-83

Baer, L. D., & Gesler, W. M. (2004). Reconsidering the concept of therapeutic landscapes in J D Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye*. Area, 36 (4), 404-413

Bayne Smith, M. E. (1996). Race, gender, and health. London: Sage.

Bennett, D. (1991). The drive towards the community. In G. E. Berrios & H. Freeman (Eds.), 150 years of British psychiatry, 1841-1991. London: Gaskell, 321-332

Bogard, W. (2000). Smoothing machines and the constitution of society. Cultural Studies, 14(2), 269-294.

Braidotti, R. (2003). Becoming woman: or sexual difference revisited. Theory Culture & Society, 20(3), 43-62.

Brown, S. D. (2009). Between the planes: Deleuze and social science. In C. B. Jensen & K. Rodje (Eds.), Deleuzian intersections in science, technology and anthropology. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Brown, S. D., & Lunt, P. (2002). A genealogy of the social identity tradition: Deleuze and Guattari and social psychology. British Journal of Social Psychology, 41(1), 1-23.

Colebrook, C. (2002). Gilles Deleuze. London: Routledge.

Conradson, D. (2003). Spaces of care in the city: the place of a community drop-in centre. Social & Cultural Geography, 4(4), 507-525.

Coppock, V., & Hopton, J. (2000). Critical perspectives on mental health. London; New York: Routledge.

Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1987). A thousand plateaus: capitalism and schizophrenia. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Ekeland, T. J., & Bergem, R. (2006). The negotiation of identity among people with mental illness in rural communities. Community Mental Health Journal, 42(3), 225-232.

Fox, N. J. (2002). Refracting 'health': Deleuze, Guattari and body-self. Health, 6(3), 347-363.

Gesler, W. M. (1992). Therapeutic landscapes: medical issues in light of the new cultural geography. Social Science and Medicine, 34, 735-746

Gesler, W. M. (2003). Healing Places. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield

Granerud, A., & Severinsson, E. (2003). Preserving integrity: experiences of people with mental health problems living in their own home in a new neighbourhood. Nursing Ethics, 2003 (10), 602-613

Grosz, E. A. (2004). The nick of time: politics, evolution, and the untimely. Durham: Duke University Press.

Janssen, I., Krabbendam, L., Bak, M., Hanssen, M., Vollebergh, W., de Graaf, R., et al. (2004). Childhood abuse as a risk factor for psychotic experiences. Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica, 109(1), 38-45.

Laurance, J. (2003). Pure madness: how fear drives the mental health system. Abingdon: Routledge.

Loring, M., & Powell, B. (1988). Gender, race, and DSM-III: a study of objectivity of psychiatric diagnostic behaviour. Journal of Health and Social Behaviour, 29(1), 1-22.

MacGregor Wise, J. (2000). Home: territory and identity. Cultural Studies, 14(2), 295-310.

Massey, D. (1994). Space, place, and gender. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press

Mechanic, D. (2001). The scientific foundations of community psychiatry. In G. Thornicroft & G. Szmukler (Eds.), Textbook of community psychiatry. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 41-53.

Milligan, C. (2000). 'Bearing the burden': Towards a restructured geography of caring. Area, 32, 1, 49-59.

Parr, H. (1997). Mental health, public space, and the city: questions of individual and collective access. Environment and Planning D: Society & Space, 15(4), 435-454.

Parr, H. (1999). Delusional geographies: the experiential worlds of people during madness/illness. Environment and Planning D: Society and Space, 17(6), 673-690.

Parr, H., & Philo, C. (2003). Rural mental health and social geographies of caring. Social & Cultural Geography, 4(4), 471-488.

Patton, P. (2000). Deleuze and the political. London: Routledge.

Pinfold, V. (2000). 'Building up safe havens ... all around the world': users' experiences of living in the community with mental health problems. Health & Place, 6(3), 201-212.

Read, J. (1997). Child abuse and psychosis: A literature review and implications for professional practice. Professional Psychology-Research and Practice, 28(5), 448-456.

Rogers, A., & Pilgrim, D. (2005). A sociology of mental health and illness: 3rd edition. Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Rossler, W. (1992). Wilhelm Griesinger and the Concept of Community-Based Care. Nervenarzt, 63(5), 257-261.

Sayce, L. (2003). From psychiatric patient to citizen: Overcoming discrimination and social exclusion. New York: Palgrave.

Scull, A. T. (1977). Museums of madness: the social organization of insanity in 19th century England. London: Penguin Books.

Social Exclusion Unit (2004). Mental Health and Social Exclusion. Office of the Deputy Prime Minister

Tucker, I. (2006). Towards the multiple body. Theory & Psychology, 16(3), 433-440.

Twigg, J. (2000). Bathing: the body and community care. London: Routledge.

Tyrer, P. (2001) Methods for evaluating community treatments. In G. Thornicroft & G. Szmukler (Eds.) *Textbook of community psychiatry.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp 63-73

Vernon, A., & Qureshi, H. (2000). Community care and independence: self-sufficiency or empowerment? Critical Social Policy, 20(2), 255-276.

Williams, J. (1999). Social inequalities and mental health. In C. Newnes, G. Holmes & C. Dunn (Eds.), This is Madness. Ross-on-Wye: PCCS Books, 29-51.

Wolch, J., & Philo, C. (2000). From distributions of deviance to definitions of difference: past and future mental health geographies. Health & Place, 6(3), 137-157.