

---

# Governing Through Definitions and Numbers: Analysis of the Nordic Homeless Registrations as Instruments of Governing Homelessness

---

Evelyn Dyb, Lars Benjaminsen, Marcus Knutagård,  
and Jarmo Lindén

Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research NIBR, Oslo Metropolitan  
University, Norway

The Danish Center for Social Science Research (VIVE), Denmark

School of Social Work, Lund University, Sweden

The Housing Finance and Development Centre of Finland (ARA), Finland

## Introduction

---

The four Nordic countries, Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden, have for many years carried out periodic national surveys of homelessness. These surveys constitute time series, which make it possible to follow the development of the number of persons and the profile of those experiencing homelessness. The starting point of the time series differs between the countries. Finland's surveys date back to 1987, while Denmark, which has the shortest series, conducted the first survey in 2007. The studies in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden are widely similar with regard to the definition of homelessness and the method for carrying out the surveys, while Finland has a somewhat different approach. The surveys in the four countries are closely linked to governing homelessness, though in different ways. In some cases they are used partly as direct instruments of governance in monitoring the developments, but also provide a response to whether political initiatives to prevent and counteract homelessness are effective or not. The collection of the data, even if they are included in the comparable time series, adapt to some extent the questions that the authorities want to know something about. This is also a way in which the mappings are included in the management of the area. Finally, the very definitions of homelessness, who is included and excluded, is a form of management of the field.

Dividing and categorising social conditions, and indeed the population itself, is inherent in governing modern democracies. Principally, there are no phenomenon, conditions, or populations not subjected to division and categorisation into standardised facts. The modern state collects statistics about conditions such as the crime rate, rate of unemployment, poverty rate, level of trust, cross-national happiness, health condition, and wellbeing etc. (Shore and Wright, 2015; Scott, 1998). According to Rose (1991), the relationship between enumeration and politics is reciprocal and mutually constitutive: Politics is involved in both what and how to measure.

Relatively few countries have comprehensive data on their homeless population. The Nordic countries, Denmark, Finland, Norway, and Sweden, all collect statistics on homelessness and are among the exception of countries able to present reliable statistics over a long time span. The definitions of homelessness, although with some differences between the four countries, are characterised as wide and generous; capturing many individuals who are considered 'hidden homeless', described as such because they are hard to find and include in the statistics. After a brief presentation of the 'Nordic method' of data collection on homelessness, the article continues with a discussion of how these data are connected to the governance of the homeless policy. Table 1 includes an overview of timelines of homeless surveys and national governing structure of the homelessness field.

## **The 'Nordic Method' – A Summary**

---

The surveys of people experiencing homelessness in the four Nordic countries in question are comprehensively outlined by Benjaminsen et al. (2020). They emphasise the similarities and differences, including minor nuances, between definitions of people experiencing homelessness and the methods of implementation of the mappings. The characteristics of the mappings – how they are carried out and who is included in the definition – have a major impact on how the results can be used as steering tools. This section therefore provides a brief review of definitions and methodology.

The so-called 'Nordic method' refers primarily to homeless registrations used in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. These countries are therefore discussed collectively and with an emphasis on the similarities between the three countries. The very first survey of people experiencing homelessness according to this method was carried out in Sweden in 1993. In 1996, a similar survey was carried out in Norway, where the same definition and methodology were used. Denmark conducted its first survey according to this definition and methodology in 2007.

The conceptual definition, which also applies to Finland, is based on positions in or outside the housing market. The common core states that people experiencing homelessness are people who lack their own dwelling (rented or owned) and who are referred for temporary accommodation; stay in institutions including prison; live temporarily and without a contract with relatives, friends, or acquaintances; and those who do not have an alternative place of residence. Homelessness related to the institutional sphere and imprisonment is limited to people who do not have their own dwelling and who are to be discharged or released within a certain time.

Finland, which has a different definition than the other three countries, makes a distinction between single people experiencing homelessness and families experiencing homelessness as primary categories in the Finnish enumeration. The definition of a single person experiencing homelessness, largely follows the positions on the housing market, which also define homelessness in the other Nordic countries. Families experiencing homelessness are families and couples, who live in temporary housing or live separately due to lack of their own dwelling. Finland's method does not provide a dataset of people experiencing homelessness as entities, and the information collected is limited.

The mappings are cross-sectional studies, which means that they give a picture of the situation in a specific time window. Denmark, Norway, and Sweden conduct the surveys within a week, while Finland registers everyone who is homeless during a particular day. The actual registration is carried out by services who are in contact with or know of people experiencing homelessness. A short questionnaire is completed for each person experiencing homelessness, and provides data on an individual level. A strength of the Nordic surveys is that the respondent group includes a wide range of health and welfare services in addition to the homeless service sector. This method captures people who do not use hostels and services for people experiencing homelessness and achieves to include the so-called hidden homeless, and in particular 'sofa surfers' who stay temporarily with relatives or friends.

## **Formal Government Lines**

---

The definition of homelessness is based on positions in and outside of the housing market. The field itself – political and administrative governance at the national level – is anchored in different sectors in the four countries (Table 1, row 5-6). In Finland and Norway, the area is governed by the housing sector. In Denmark and Sweden, homelessness policy is rooted in the social sector. However, there is also another difference with regard to who conducts the surveys. In Finland and Sweden, the surveys are carried out by state agencies – the Housing Finance and Development Center (ARA), and the National Board of Health and Welfare (NBHW/Socialstyrelsen)

respectively. ARA is responsible for implementing housing policy in Finland and operates under the Ministry of Environment. NBHW is a government agency under the Ministry of Health and Social Affairs, with responsibilities within the fields of social services, health, and medical services.

**Table 1. Timelines of homeless surveys, formal governance of the homelessness field and homeless programs/policy initiatives in four Nordic countries.**

Characteristics	Denmark	Finland	Norway	Sweden
First and last homeless survey	2007 2019	1987 2021	1996 2020	1993 2017
Intervals between surveys	2 years	1 year	4 years	6 years
Conducting the survey	The Danish Center for Social Science Research/VIVE	Housing Finance Development Center/ARA	Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research/NIBR	The National Board of Health and Welfare/NBHW
Anchoring in national policy field	Social policy	Housing policy	Housing policy	Social policy
Initiating and/or commissioning the survey	Ministry of Social Affairs and the Elderly	Ministry of Environment	Ministry of Local Government and Modernisation/ The Housing Bank	Ministry of Health and Social Affairs
First distinct homelessness program/policy	National Homeless Strategy, start year 2008	Setting up Y Foundation: 1985	National initiated city program, start year 2001	First national strategy, start year 2007
Prevailing strategy/ program/policy	The Homelessness Strategy, the implementing and anchoring phase	The Government Co-operation programme to halve homelessness 2020–2022	Included in National Strategy for Social Housing Policy (2021-2024)	Prevent and Counteract Homelessness: Supporting the local social services (2021- )

In the other two countries, the mapping of homelessness is carried out by research institutes – the Danish Center for Social Science Research (VIVE) and the Norwegian Institute for Urban and Regional Research (NIBR). The surveys in both countries are dependent on public funding, and they are carried out on behalf of government agencies. In Denmark, VIVE conducts the surveys in collaboration with the Ministry of Social Affairs and Senior Citizens. In Norway, the surveys were carried out on behalf of the Norwegian State Housing Bank (Husbanken), formerly a state bank that is now a directorate under the Ministry of Local Government and Modernisation.

Despite the fact that the four surveys are relatively similar, they were initiated in different ways. With the exception of Norway, the initiative for the first surveys of homeless people was taken by the governments of the respective countries. In Norway, the first survey was conducted by researchers, who in the mid-1990s wanted to copy the mapping in Sweden from 1993. The researchers succeeded in

obtaining funding, i.e., capturing the interest of the authorities, and the first survey was carried out in 1996 (Ulfrstad, 1997), and Denmark followed with their first survey in 2007 (Benjaminsen and Christensen, 2007).

In summary, the collection of statistics in the four Nordic countries has been carried out both by State authorities (Finland and Sweden) and by research institutes on behalf of State authorities (Denmark and Norway). The national authorities in each country decide that the mappings shall be carried out and when they will be carried out. The four countries carry out the survey at different intervals: Finland has annual censuses, Denmark with two years apart, Norway with four years between, and Sweden counting every six years. Although three of the four countries have decades of comparable data, and even Denmark with the shortest time series has data over a period of 14 years, whether the counts will be repeated is generally dependent on the alternating governments prioritising homelessness as a political field. In addition, the Government decides on the definition of people experiencing homelessness and the method of mapping as appropriate and desirable against political objectives.

## **A Distinct Governance Field Emerges**

---

There may be several reasons why the Nordic states from the late 1980s and early 1990s defined homelessness as a political area. The starting point appears to be quite different in the four countries. Finland experienced a large increase in unemployment and homelessness among young people in the mid-eighties, which far outpaced the other Nordic countries, even though these were also marked by economic recession. In Finland, an important actor to reduce homelessness – the Y Foundation – was established in 1985 based on co-operation between major cities, construction trade unions, construction employer organisations, NGO's, and strongly supported by the State. The Y Foundation, which owns 18 000 social housing dwellings, is active and plays a central role in responding to homelessness today. Also, the UN International Year of Shelter for the Homeless (IYSH) in 1987 was an important booster for government actions, and the eradication of homelessness was, for the first time taken into a government programme in 1987. In Finland, a housing subsidy system has been focused on construction, renovation, and acquisition of social housing since the 1990s, while other parts of rental housing has been liberalised. Subsidy system for social housing operated by The Housing Finance and Development Centre (ARA) has been an important part of coordinated homelessness policies.

In Norway and Sweden, the housing sector was liberalised. Political management and regulation of residential construction weakened and the market gained greater dominance. In Norway, the Housing Bank has been transformed from a state bank,

which has previously both implemented and had a major influence on housing policy, into a welfare directorate with a growing focus on vulnerable groups in the housing market. The transformation of the Housing Bank is not necessarily an explanation for why the authorities paid increased attention to homelessness, but it may explain why the homelessness policy was entrenched in the Housing Bank and the housing sector. In parallel with the fact that general housing policy is increasingly left to the market, homelessness, to varying degrees in the four countries, has become a distinct political field.

In Denmark, the public housing sector did not undergo the liberalisation seen in Norway and Sweden and the focus on homelessness seems rather to have grown out of a general concern with marginalised groups with complex needs falling through the social safety net. However, other developments in the welfare system in Denmark may have played a role, such as welfare benefit reforms, where in particular lower benefits for young benefit receivers may have fuelled the rise in youth homelessness that has been in the centre of the public debate on homelessness in Denmark. In addition, general complexities in the welfare systems – operating in silos making it difficult to meet the complexity of needs amongst many people experiencing homelessness – has been at the centre of attention in framing the focus on homelessness in Denmark, and in Norway as well.

## **Homeless Strategies and Governance**

---

The data collected in the surveys are used directly to monitor the development of the homeless policy area. The use of the homeless counts as a monitoring tool is the main justification for maintaining the definition of people experiencing homelessness and securing series of comparable numbers. Sweden, which has made significant changes to the definition (see Benjaminsen et al., 2020), has also secured the opportunity to compile time series, illustrating developments over a long period of time. The central authorities, who decide that the surveys should be carried out, use the data as one, and perhaps the most important, measure of whether national policy produces results. In the Nordic countries, the municipalities play a very important role in implementing national policy. The municipalities also have, to varying degrees in the four countries, autonomy in how they will adapt and implement national policies locally. Finally, it must be pointed out that some policy areas, including social housing policy, are to a lesser extent mandatory compared to, for example, certain health services, social assistance, and basic education.

In relation to the municipalities, the collection and use of the statistics has at least two different functions. The figures are primarily collected through the municipalities (supplemented by state and private actors in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden).

Municipal bodies, together with various accommodation services (e.g. homeless shelters), are the most important respondents in the survey. It is crucial for the quality of the statistics that these respondents participate. It is therefore essential that the municipalities believe that they need and benefit from the statistics in local homelessness work and policy. The homeless surveys are also monitoring how municipalities implement the policy and the extent to which municipalities do a 'good job', usually in terms of reducing the homeless numbers.

The surveys are closely related to programmes, strategies, and efforts to counteract and reduce homelessness. This is particularly prominent in Denmark, Finland, and Norway. Table 1 shows the first (row 7) and the prevailing (row 8) national homeless programme or initiative. The Danish Government initiated the first survey in 2007, at the same time as it was drawing up a national strategy to address homelessness. The first national strategy was implemented from 2008. Previously, homelessness was addressed in other programmes, specifically in *The City Programme* (Storbypuljen 2003–2005), but the national strategy was the first to specifically target homelessness and set objectives for achievements. Denmark was the first country in Europe to build a national strategy explicitly on the concept of Housing First, inspired by the original New York model of Housing First. Subsequent surveys of people experiencing homelessness showed that the overall objectives of the strategy were not achieved. Together with separate evaluations of the strategy, the results of the surveys had an impact on the alignment of the next programmes, *The Implementation Programme*, carried out in the period 2014 – 2016 and the programme *Extending Housing First* from 2016 to 2019.

Finland launched its national strategy *Paavo I* (2008–2011) at the same time as the Danish strategy. However, the theme was not new. The Y-Foundation, which plays a central role in implementing homeless policies in Finland, was founded in 1985. As mentioned above, the national surveys of homeless people go back almost as far. But while the measures for the first decade, such as the establishment of the Y-Foundation, were aimed at a larger group, the primary target group in *Paavo I* was people experiencing long-term homelessness, who for many years had stayed in hostels for the homeless, and people at high risk of ending up in homelessness. *Paavo I* was followed by *Paavo II* (until 2015). *Paavo* programmes were followed by the action programme for preventing homelessness (AUNE 2016–2019). At the moment, Finland has a nationally designed 'Housing First' policy based on a government programme in 2019. In order to halve homelessness by 2023, the Ministry of the Environment has launched a three-year cooperation programme with the largest urban regions, service providers, and organisations, including e.g. ARA.

The first programme to counteract homelessness in Norway, *Project Homeless* (2001–2004), was a direct result of the first survey in 1996 and a follow-up study, which showed that the services to this group was very poor (Ulfrstad, 1999). Project Homeless was followed by the national strategy *The Pathway to a Permanent Home* (2005–2007). *The Pathway to a Permanent Home* introduced a housing-led homelessness policy, which has some commonalities with the Finnish variant of Housing First, on a broad basis nationally and in the municipalities. However, the surveys showed that the number of people experiencing homelessness rose during this period and continued to rise during the first period of the subsequent *Housing Social Development Programme* led by the Housing Bank (second phase: The Housing Bank's Municipal programme). Under the national strategy *Housing for Welfare* (2014–2020), which also includes the second phase of the *Municipal Programme*, the number of people experiencing homelessness decreased.

In Sweden, developments have followed a different path. Sweden initiated and designed the definition of people experiencing homelessness and the methodology used in Denmark and Norway to map the homeless population. Sweden has both the largest scope of research and forms the research front in the Nordic region in the field. Sweden is the only Nordic country to have appointed a public committee to investigate homelessness (SOU 2001: 95a). The report was submitted with an extensive research paper (SOU 2001: 95b). Nevertheless, Sweden has had a weaker political interest nationally in this area than the other three countries. The first and only comprehensive national strategy, *Homelessness – many faces, the responsibility of many* (2007–2009), had much in common with the other Nordic strategies. It argues for Housing First models as one of several solutions, but variants of Housing First or housing-led policies have not had the same impact here as in the other three countries. The long intervals between the surveys of homeless people and significant changes in the definition also indicate that these surveys have less significance as a measure of the effects and the policy design.

## **Steering Logics and Knowledge Production**

---

Homelessness policy finds itself between two types of governance logics. One is governing by setting performance targets that can be measured and monitored through enumeration, and in particular, the homeless surveys. Beside the prime objective of reducing homelessness, many of the strategies discussed above have applied secondary performance targets, like achieving reduction of the number of evictions with 30% (Norway). The municipalities that are responsible for implementing the strategies held a high degree of autonomy. National authorities have limited authority to impose on the local authorities on how to implement the strategy and must lean on other mechanisms and logics to achieve the national set targets.

As phrased in the Swedish strategy, homelessness is the responsibility of many. Large parts of the homeless population in the Nordic countries need services from several service areas, such as housing, social services, and/or health services, and many are in contact with the control apparatus in meetings with the police, the judiciary, and the correctional services. However, the right to housing and assistance in obtaining a dwelling is weakly founded in the legislation. It also means that the State cannot impose on the municipalities to provide housing for people experiencing homelessness. None of the Nordic countries have legislated an individual right to housing. The weak legal framework concerning housing and local autonomy means that the State's steering tools are limited.

The national authorities may choose a governance logic based on knowledge production. An essential element of such a management logic is the launch of programmes and strategies (Rose, 1999; Dyb, 2020) and definitions of target groups for the programmes. The strategies for preventing and reducing homelessness are just one of many government programmes in a number of areas that municipalities are expected to implement. The strategies may be followed by government funds made available to the municipalities to support the objectives of the strategy. In Norway, state earmarked funds were allocated for housing social work, in particular initiatives addressing homelessness, in the municipalities. At its peak (2012 and 2013), the total pot amounted to €8m per year. The premise for access to the funds was that they went to local innovative projects and that the projects were aimed at target groups for the current strategy. In Denmark, a relatively large pool of funding (approx. €65m was provided from the Central Government for the homelessness strategy from 2009–2013), whereas substantially less funding was provided from the Central Government for subsequent programmes.

In Finland, the Government has provided €10m in extra financing to strengthen the homelessness work of local authorities through the use and development of social services in 2020–2022. The reduction of homelessness has also been taken into account in the new MAL agreement, Maankäyttö (Land Use), Asuminen (Housing) ja Liikenne (and Transport), between the municipalities of the seven biggest regions and the State (2020–2031). One aim is to halve homelessness by 2023. Starting in 2022, there will be extra funding (€3m) for developing and enlarging housing counselling services in municipalities.

The Swedish Government decided on state funding (€2.5m annually, 2018–2021) for developing homelessness services. The funding is earmarked towards the 10 municipalities with the highest number of people experiencing homelessness based on the National survey conducted in 2017. The municipalities report to the National Board of Health and Welfare. There is, however, limited demand for funding to develop the services and test out new methods.

The regular surveys of people experiencing homelessness form a key part of the knowledge production within homelessness policy. The definition of homelessness through the operationalisation of positions in the housing market specifies which groups should be included in the population of people experiencing homelessness. In Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, the surveys are more than pure counts of the number of people experiencing homelessness. The scope of the questionnaire filled in for each homeless individual is limited compared to a regular survey, but it nevertheless records a number of characteristics of the individuals. The data from the surveys are used, among other things, to identify specific groups, which are either identified as target groups within the homeless strategies or for other reasons that are considered important to monitor. This applies, for example, to young people experiencing homelessness. The group is established by using the variable year of birth as a basis. Other variables are used to describe and profile the identified sub-group of young people experiencing homelessness. Other groups may be long-term people experiencing homelessness, families with children, or individuals with specific personal challenges. Finland does this the other way around. Specific target groups are identified and entered as a predefined category in the surveys. The Finnish survey is used to monitor the increase or decrease in the number of individuals in the group and whether the goal of reducing the number of people in a specific category is achieved.

## **Definitions as Exclusion Mechanisms**

---

Statistical categories are expected to be clearly operationalised, leaving as little room for grey zones as possible. Operationalisation shall reduce doubts as much as possible about who is included and who is excluded from data collection. However, there may be other, both intended and unintended elements, which affect the accuracy of data collection. One element mentioned above is that the Nordic registrations are carried out by the services and will thus not capture homeless persons who are unknown to the services. There are other more subtle mechanisms for excluding and including groups across the official definition of homelessness. Here we discuss two different mechanisms with examples from Norway, Denmark and Sweden.

In Norway, as in many other countries, the right to services is related to citizenship. Here, however, there are grey areas. EU/EEA nationals have the right to stay in another country within the area, but the length of stay and rights to social security, healthcare, and help with housing problems are linked to the person's employment status. However, there are migrant groups that cannot find work, and some work in the grey market without a contract, and thus have minimal rights regarding welfare services and other benefits. Despite the fact that they actually live outside

or only have access to night shelters without a place to stay during the day, they are not included in the statistics on homelessness. They are recorded in the censuses as far as possible, but since they have little or no contact with mainstream services, they are, to a limited extent, included in the ordinary censuses. However, it is also a political decision, which is not formulated in any document, but is in reality a requirement, that this group should not be included in the official homeless statistics. One argument is that the inclusion of a new group will distort the time series and the basis for comparing and monitoring those experiencing homelessness. Another argument concerns the legitimacy of the mappings and figures. The municipalities, who are the most important contributors in the collection of the statistics, expect an overview of their own residents experiencing homelessness, including how many and which groups the municipalities' obligations are to. Thus, a tacit criterion arises that excludes a group, who actually experience homelessness in the country. Since the survey in 2012, people experiencing homelessness with temporary residence are to some extent counted by introducing a question about whether the person stays temporary in the country, but the group is treated separately in the presentation and analysis of the homeless survey (Dyb and Lid, 2017). The latest survey was conducted in 2020. Due to closed borders and travel restrictions under the Covid-19 pandemic only a few individuals in this group were counted, and they were included in the population (Dyb and Zeiner 2021).

In Denmark, the issue of homelessness amongst temporary migrants without a permanent stay was not addressed in the first two counts in 2007 and 2009. However, with the onset of the homelessness strategy from 2009, and the increased role of the homelessness count as a key monitoring tool, there was a growing need to address this issue in the counts. In particular, as there was an experience of an increased influx of temporary migrants and a growing sense of a homelessness problem attached to this migration, there was a need to be able to distinguish between people experiencing homelessness with a permanent stay in Denmark (Danes and immigrants with a regular stay) and homelessness amongst migrants without a permanent stay. Otherwise, the ability of the counts to serve as a monitoring tool for the homelessness strategy could be blurred, if the numbers experiencing homelessness were conflated by the influx of new groups of temporary migrants ending up in a homeless situation. In the counts from 2011 and onwards, a new question was introduced in the questionnaire asking whether the person had a permanent/fixed stay in Denmark. Over the coming years, it turned out, that a substantial number of temporary migrants were also counted in the national homelessness count, thus helping to make this group visible in the statistics. Yet, for monitoring purposes, separate homelessness figures were given for people with a permanent residence in the country (Danes and immigrants with a permanent stay) and temporary migrants without a permanent/fixed stay in the country, respec-

tively. Yet, as the access to services is generally more limited and restricted in the latter groups, the overall homelessness figures for this group is generally more insecure than for the former group (Benjaminsen, 2019).

Sahlin (2020) discusses how categories and the use of them, influenced by the political discourse, may change when travelling from one policy area and level to another. As mentioned above, Sweden has at present no comprehensive national strategy addressing homelessness. The legal framework obliges the municipalities to assist with housing problems and not actually to provide housing. Combined with strong local autonomy on how to serve the citizens and a weak legal framework on the right to housing, the municipal authorities held a wide span to define and re-define sub-groups, and thus shift the focus and definition of which sub-groups are most in need of housing assistance. Some Swedish municipalities have transferred, through municipal guidelines, a division between structural and social homelessness, the former reflecting homelessness caused by societal structures like unemployment, poverty, etc. and the latter by individual problems like addiction and mental illness. As Sahlin (2020) pinpoints, strangely enough and contrary to the historical views on who is 'deserving' and who is 'undeserving', the socially homeless with special problems are defined as those most in need. Thus, the prioritised group entitled to assistance with housing is narrowed down close to the image of the traditional 'vagrant' or 'rough sleeper'. The so-called structural homeless, the majority being families with children, are judged as able to solve their housing problems themselves, which in fact means that children's needs are set aside on the advantage of (mainly) white males with addiction problems. The majority of the homeless families are headed by single women, and they are born abroad (Samzelius, 2020). Sahlin (2020) discusses the rather odd re-definition of homeless categories on the background of the discourse on immigration and xenophobia led by a strong extreme right wing party in Sweden.

## Conclusion

---

The article has shed light on how surveys of homeless people are not just a count of heads and registration of a set of characteristics of the homeless population in four Nordic countries. The mapping of homelessness, including the definitions and operationalisation of categories of homeless people, is part of a wider system of how this field is governed. The homeless surveys are actually at the core of the steering mechanism of the homeless politics. The definitions used in the national surveys are incorporated as the official definition of homelessness in the respective countries. The persons registered in the censuses are the official number of people experiencing homelessness in the country. This is one form of governing through categorisation and enumeration. The figures govern priorities in the field, for

example whether homelessness should be prioritised as a political issue, which sub-groups should be prioritised, and which measures are adequate to implement. In turn, the figures are used to monitor developments and are used as one of, but perhaps the most important measure of how successful the policy measures and efforts are. However, the examples in the last part of the article illustrate that the 'official' definition can be circumvented and exclude groups that formally meet the criteria (Norway), or the categories are redefined in the journey from state to local level, so that certain groups, which would normally be of highest priority, are prioritised down (Sweden). It should be emphasised that enumeration of a population is a way of recognition. Rejecting enumeration, including conceptualising, operationalising, and counting, may be considered what Marquardt (2016) characterises as governing by neglect, not recognising legitimate needs and claims of the group.

## ► References

- Benjaminsen, L. (2019) *Hjemløshed i Danmark 2019: National kortlægning* [Homelessness in Denmark 2019. National mapping] (København: VIVE).
- Benjaminsen, L. and Christensen, I. (2007) *Hjemløshed i Danmark 2007: National kortlægning* [Homelessness in Denmark 2007. National mapping] (København: SFI).
- Benjaminsen, L., Dhalmann, H., Dyb, E., Knutagård, M., and Lindén, J. (2020) Measurement of Homelessness in the Nordic Countries, *European Journal of Homelessness* 14(3) pp.159–180.
- Dyb, E. and Zeiner, H. (2021) *Bostedsløse i Norge 2020 – en Kartlegging*. [Homeless in Norway 2020 – a survey]. NIBR Report 2021: 10 (Oslo: NIBR)
- Dyb, E. (2020) Reinventing Homelessness through Enumeration in Norwegian Housing Policy: A Case Study of Governmentality, *Housing, Theory and Society* 38(5) pp.56–579.
- Dyb, E. and Lid, S. (2017) *Bostedsløse i Norge 2016 – en Kartlegging* [Homelessness in Norway 2016 – a survey]. NIBR-report 2017: 13. (Oslo: NIBR).
- Marquardt, N. (2016) Counting the Homeless: Statistics on Homelessness and the Spatial Ontology of Political Numbers, *Society and Space* 34(3) pp.301–318.
- Norwegian Ministries (ND) *Housing for Welfare. National Strategy for Housing and Support Services (2014–2020)* (Norwegian Ministry of Local Government and Modernisation). Available at: [https://www.regjeringen.no/globalassets/upload/kmd/boby/housing\\_for\\_welfare\\_national\\_strategy\\_for\\_housing\\_and\\_support\\_services\\_2014\\_2020.pdf](https://www.regjeringen.no/globalassets/upload/kmd/boby/housing_for_welfare_national_strategy_for_housing_and_support_services_2014_2020.pdf)
- Rose, N. (1991) Governing by Numbers: Figuring out Democracy, *Accounting, Organizations and Society* 16(7) pp.673–692.
- Rose, N. (1999) *Governing the Soul: The Shaping of the Private Self* (London: Free Association Books).
- Sahlin, I. (2020) Moving Targets: On Reducing Public Responsibilities through Re-Categorising Homeless People and Refugees, *European Journal of Homelessness* 14(1) pp.27–54.
- Samzelius, T. (2020) *A Vicious Circle of Silent Exclusion. Family Homelessness and Poverty in Sweden from a Single Mother Perspective* [Doctoral dissertation]. (Malmö University, faculty of Health and Society).
- Scott, J.C. (1998) *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press).

Shore, C. and S. Wright (2015) Governing by Numbers: Audit Culture, Ranking and the New World Order, *Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale* 23(1) pp.22–28.

SOU 2001: 95a (Green Paper 2001: 95) *Att motverka hemlöshet. En Sammanhållen Strategi för Samhället. Slutbetänkande av Kommittén för hemlösa* [Counteracting Homelessness. A Comprehensive Strategy for Society. Final report by the Homelessness Inquiry] (Stockholm: The Swedish Government).

SOU 2001: 95b (Green Paper 2001: 95) *Att Motverka Hemlöshet. En sammanhållen strategi för samhället. Expert- och forskningsrapporter. Bilagedel.* [Counteracting Homelessness. A Comprehensive Strategy for Society. Expert and research reports. Appendix. Final report by the Homelessness Inquiry] Slutbetänkande av Kommittén för hemlösa. (Stockholm: The Swedish Government).

Swedish National Board of Health and Welfare (2017) *Hemlöshet 2017 – Omfattning och Karaktär* [Homelessness 2017 – Extent and Character] (Stockholm: National Board of Health and Welfare ).

Ulfrstad, L-M. (1997) *Bostedsløse i Norge. Kartlegging av bostedsløse i kontakt med hjelpeapparatet* [Homeless in Norway. Survey of homeless in contact with the services]. (Oslo: Byggforsk).

Ulfrstad, L-M. (1999) *Hjelpeapparatet for Bostedsløse. Om hjelpeapparatet i Oslo, Bergen, Trondheim og Stavanger* [The services for homeless. About the services in Oslo, Bergen, Trondheim and Stavanger]. (Oslo: Byggforsk).

