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ABSTRACT

Faith based organisations (FBOs) have made long-standing contributions to services for homeless people. This research sought to understand how FBOs working within the Scottish homelessness sector operationalised their faith and explore whether that had an impact on the relationships they formed with other agencies and ways in which users experienced services.

Three main qualitative methods were used. Firstly, literature reviews were conducted to create a robust theoretical framework. Secondly, organisational profiles were created by extrapolating data from ‘grey literature’ to identify how organisations operationalised faith (or not). Thirdly, the main empirical research was conducted through key informant interviews and detailed qualitative case studies of three organisations, of which one was overtly faith-based, one had previously strong, but now less obvious, connections to faith, and one was not faith-based.

The concept of ‘faithness’ was introduced and used as the main analytical lens to investigate how faith was operationalised (if at all) in organisational characteristics. An assessment of organisational ‘faithness’ revealed the full extent to which faith (and secular) influences were present in individual organisations (faith and non-faith based) as well as allowing comparisons between them. By identifying the presence (and absence) of faith in organisational characteristics, the study eliminated the need to reinvent a complex organisational typology found within other research on this subject.

In a more general sense, the study found that stakeholders were unconcerned about the presence of FBOs in the sector where those organisations did not emphasise their faith or place religious conditions on service users, but were cautious about those perceived as evangelistic. Service users understood that religious beliefs underpinned the values of some organisations and staff and were accepting of (voluntary) religious observances where these were present, but organisational faith affiliation did not make a difference to their experiences (even where staff hoped it might).
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PART 1: IDENTIFYING THE RESEARCH CONTEXT
Chapter one: Introduction

1.1 Homelessness systems and faith based organisations

Throughout the UK, homeless people have a series of rights enshrined in legislation. The legislative framework determines what rights they have and places duties on local authorities to ensure these are met. This system is relatively modern though, with the passing of the first bespoke piece of homelessness legislation in 1977. Before that, support for people in need was managed and delivered by the State and Church together through the ‘Poor Laws’. From the early twentieth century onwards, the State began to take control of this form of support and, with the passing of the ‘National Assistance Act 1948’ created an early duty for local authorities to provide temporary accommodation for people in urgent need. State developments continued with the creation of the Welfare State ending the formal influence of the Church in this form of social care.

The presence of religious organisations continued during this period though, when, along with secular organisations, their philanthropic and charitable actions formed the basis for the current voluntary sector (Kendall and Knapp, 1993) which continue to support vulnerable people today (Bowpitt, 1998; Crane and Warnes, 2000). The current voluntary sector therefore includes faith-based organisations (FBOs) as well as secular agencies (mirroring the early influences of Church and State) and has continued to make substantial contributions to homelessness services since the 1970s (Foord et al, 1998). In particular, voluntary sector organisations provided services for homeless people who were not supported through the statutory duties (Anderson, 1993; Warnes et al, 2003; Pawson and Davidson, 2007; Fitzpatrick et al, 2012). This included delivering state-funded services as part of national programmes set up by specific funding streams such as the Rough Sleepers Initiative and Supporting People (Anderson, 1993, 2007; SWSI, 2001; Laird et al, 2003; Fitzpatrick et al, 2005). Many voluntary sector organisations are currently commissioned by local authorities (and to a lesser degree, health boards) to work with them to deliver services to homeless and vulnerable people (Fyfe and Milligan, 2003; Trudeau, 2008) and, in some instances, support the achievement of statutory duties.

Where homelessness services are delivered by FBOs, whether state funded or not, a number of questions are raised about whether faith influences their operations and whether that could impact on the service user’s experience? There may be visible signs of faith in spaces which service users access and use (Johnsen et al 2005; Sager and Stephens, 2005;
Bowpitt et al., 2013). An FBO’s ethos may motivate them to provide services based on
notions of hospitality and/or unconditional acceptance of service users with no requirement
on them to change (Lane and Power, 2009; Johnsen, 2014). Or, on the other hand, FBOs
could place conditions on service users because of their faith. This may include the service
user’s participation in mandatory religious observances such as prayers and bible readings
before they can access the service (and throughout the use of the service), or an
understanding that the support they receive in making lifestyle changes includes working
towards a religious conversion to faith (Sager and Stephens, 2005).

In a system which seeks to address homelessness through statutory duties, the types of high
volume, low support services that FBOs offer (day-centres, food distribution, soup runs,
seasonal night shelters) may be argued to inadvertently sustain homelessness experiences
(Warnes et al., 2003, Jones and Pleace, 2005; Johnsen with Fitzpatrick, 2009). This
scenario may also result when FBOs, influenced by faith, choose to operate independently
of public sector agencies (Randall and Brown, 2006; Cloke et al., 2007). FBOs though,
may ‘professionalise’ their approaches because, like other voluntary sector organisations,
they are commissioned by local authority agencies to deliver services to homeless people
(May et al., 2003), including single homeless households where there is no duty on the
council to provide services. This may lead to concerns about ‘mission drift’ (Birdwell,
2013; Johnsen, 2014).

There are added difficulties in answering questions about what role FBOs have in
homelessness services because is not always clear what constitutes an FBO. Definitional
issues which are ‘contentious and problematic’ (Beaumont 2008, p 2020) emerge as
Johnsen (2014) notes ‘in the absence of any agreed definition as to what an FBO actually
is or does’ (2014, p3). Some FBOs were set up specifically to provide services for
homeless people and did this from a perspective of faith. Other organisations, engaged in
wider religious activities, provide services for homeless and vulnerable people using their
own spaces in which to deliver these services (church halls, decommissioned buildings).
These types of services may also draw on members of congregations and other adherents
who are motivated by their faith to be involved in social action/care (Sager and Stephens,
2005, Leavey et al., 2007, Beaumont 2008b, Gravell, 2013). There are also charitable
organisations which are secular in intent, but retain remnants of previous faith affiliations.
This often means that FBOs are heterogeneous in nature (Jeavons, 1997 and 2004; Sider
and Unruh, 2004; FACIT, 2009; Johnsen, 2014).
The concept of ‘faithness’ proposed in this thesis acknowledges that the faith component of organisations is often not a simple binary issue of its being present (as in FBOs) or absent (as in secular organisations), but is rather very often a fluid, multi-faceted and nuanced matter of degree. In developing the concept of ‘faithness’, the ‘exploratory proposal’ of T. H. Jeavons (1997) was of particular interest because of its understanding of organisational religiosity (the level of faith in organisational structures and activities) as a non-binary and fluid spectrum. The concept of ‘faithness’ can be used to capture the degree of religiosity across a wide range of the characteristics and operations of relevant organisations, including how it impacts (if at all) on their organisational policies, income generation, who they work with, the services they deliver and the people they support. Elaborating on the concept of ‘faithness’ is key to this research because it seeks to explain how (if at all) organisations are influenced by faith, whether faith-based and non-faith based organisations share similarities or, where there are differences, is that due to ‘faithness’?

1.2 Research objective and questions

The overarching objective of this research is to ascertain the relevance, impact and implications of the continuing role of FBOs in the delivery of homelessness services in Scotland. The following research questions are pursued in this thesis in order to meet this objective:

1. What are faith based organisations?
2. What current role do FBOs play in the delivery of homelessness and allied services in Scotland?
3. What difference does 'faithness' make on:
   a) What services they deliver and how they deliver them?
   b) Their relationships with statutory agencies and other voluntary sector organisations and how other providers perceive these?
   c) How they are perceived and experienced by service users?

1.3 The thesis structure

The thesis has been divided into four parts. In Part 1, this introductory chapter and the next set out what the research is about and how it was conducted. Chapter two sets out the methodological approaches used in the doctoral research, detailing the rationale behind the research design, before describing each of the research stages, from literature review to the
empirical activities of organisational profiling and qualitative data collection, to data analysis and write up. It also evaluates the effectiveness of the selected methods, discusses the challenges encountered as the research progressed, and the ethical considerations that had to be taken into account in studying these potentially sensitive subjects (faith and homelessness).

Part 2 of the thesis, containing chapters three to six, presents the substantive background for the main research questions. Chapter three sets out the key timeline for the development of the Scottish homelessness system starting with the Poor Laws, through to the early decades of rights-based approaches in the UK. It then provides an overview of policy development post-devolution in the late 1990s. It considers the role of legislation, governance, national and local policy initiatives in creating and underpinning developments in all of these periods, as well as considering how levels of need have changed over the whole period.

Chapter four provides a historical overview of the contributions made by faith organisations to provision for people in need. It examines how FBOs have evolved from Church involvement in early welfare provisions to become professionalised homelessness service providers. It also considers the types of services FBOs typically provide in the homelessness field, for example, day centres, drop in, food distribution and emergency accommodation.

Chapter five introduces key theological concepts, focusing mainly on the structures and tenets of the major 'Abrahamic' religions of Christianity, Islam and Judaism, including how these religions instruct their adherents about doctrines of faith such as salvation. The last theme covered in this chapter is the place of ‘Practical Theology’, in introducing religious principles into public (and non-faith based) settings.

Chapter six reviews the debates concerning the definition of an FBO and their relevance to this research. It then sets out the concept of ‘faithness’, the analytical lens proposed in this research to examine the place (if any) of faith in organisations. The chapter also explores key theological concepts - such as love, hospitality, sanctuary and how FBOs might operationalise these through their values and services.

Part 3 of the thesis contains the empirical research findings. Chapter seven presents the broad findings from a national-level 'service profiling' exercise. It begins by providing an outline of the organisations identified through the course of the analysis. It then uses the concept of ‘faithness’ to examine the degrees to which faith is present in those
organisations and expand on the definition of what constitutes an FBO. Following that, the substantial part of this chapter focuses on describing the current contribution that FBOs make to the homelessness system in Scotland.

Chapter eight introduces and describes the three case study organisations that participated in the in-depth qualitative part of the research. Each organisation is detailed in turn, outlining the services they deliver, their operational structures (staff and management, client group and referrals) and whether there are visible conditions placed on service users. The chapter also sets out how faith is present or absent in organisational characteristics.

The following three chapters - nine to eleven - consider the question 'what difference faith makes' to, in turn, organisational identities, structures and ethos; relationships with other voluntary sector organisations and statutory agencies; and service users’ perceptions and experiences.

Part 4 contains one chapter, Chapter twelve, which draws together the key findings of the study, provides answers to all of the research questions identified above, and also reflects on the limitations of the study and identifies potential avenues for further research.
Chapter two: Research design and methods

2.1 Introduction

This research explores how faith influences the delivery of services to homeless people in Scotland. The purpose of this chapter is to set out the methodological approach used. The chapter describes: the rationale behind the qualitative research design, the arguments for and against the use of qualitative methods, the development and accomplishment of the various research stages, and the ethical considerations involved in studying subjects (faith and homelessness) which can be both subjective and sensitive to participants. It also provides an account of the effectiveness of the chosen methods along with challenges encountered as the research progressed.

Section 2.2 introduces the research design and overall methodological approach. Section 2.3 describes how the literature reviews were conducted and the emerging themes used to formulate the research questions. The processes for identifying and characterising FBOs through service profiling is detailed in section 2.4. Section 2.5 describes the fieldwork component of the research including how the case study approach was utilised. The methods for analysing the data are detailed in section 2.6. In section 2.7, consideration is given to the ethical principles applied in the research. Section 2.8 concludes the chapter by reflecting on the strengths and limitations of the methods used and notes the main challenges faced.

2.2 Research design

A qualitative design was adopted because the study sought to understand in depth how ‘faithfulness’ impacts in operational contexts. The research was carried out by using the qualitative methods of literature reviews, service profiling, key informant interviews and case studies of three organisations including interviews with staff, volunteers and service users. Denscombe indicates a strength of the qualitative approach is that the researcher’s investigations include ‘a variety of sources, a variety of types of data and a variety of research methods.’ (2003, p37). Rich narratives generated by qualitative methods are also an appropriate foundation to reflect back to the theoretical concepts identified in the thesis. Denzin and Lincoln (2007) note that a researcher undertaking qualitative work will ‘deploy a wide range of interconnected interpretive practices, hoping always to get a better understanding of the subject matter at hand.’ (2007 p4). An interpretivist approach
was adopted because the subjects of faith and homelessness have elements of human interest and it was anticipated that, at many junctures, an exploration of positions of ‘faith’ would be, by its very nature, subjective. This resonates with Bryman’s (2013) notion of interpretivism where the researcher attempts to ‘grasp the subjective meaning of social action.’ (2013, p712).

An examination of faith positions is also based on identifying how people interpret their faith and then apply it in action, factors that are heavily nuanced, potentially intangible on the surface and therefore require careful analysis. In writing about interpretivism, Denscombe (2007) states that it is about ‘looking for the meaning that the data hold, possibly probing beyond their superficial meaning.’ (2007, p 102).

2.3 Literature review

An extensive literature review provided the conceptual basis from which my research questions were drawn and the parameters of my inquiry set. Bryman (2013) indicates that a literature review will support the researcher to ‘locate your own research within a tradition of research in an area.’ (2013, p99). The literature review is also important because it supports the development of analytical and writing skills at an early stage of the research. This includes using critical judgement of the material and the way in which arguments are formed and countered.

Three techniques were used to identify reading materials for the literature reviews. Stake (1995) highlighted the structured nature of literature reviews where ‘Gathering data by studying documents follows the same line as observing or interviewing’ (1995, p68). First, my supervisors provided me with key texts, articles and books which gave me bibliographies/reference lists for snowballing reading materials. Second, I searched on the internet with ‘Google Scholar’. Third, I examined individual websites, for example the Scottish Government, Shelter and Homeless Link to access national guidance, strategic documents and service directories/databases.

The literature reviewed included journal articles, research reports, books, national and local government policy documents. An iterative approach was adopted for conducting the literature reviews, that is, I read materials, made notes and marked up themes emerging from the literature, discussed these with my supervisors, then went back to the literature and refined the themes until I had three main themes on which I focused, as listed in Table 2.1 below. The output of each of these themes is presented in Part 2 of the thesis, in Chapters three to six.
Table 2.1: themes identified in the literature reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness systems</td>
<td>• To learn about the context of homelessness systems in Europe and the UK including: how homelessness was defined and measured; the development of different approaches (rights based or other); the impact of devolution on UK based policies; the composition of the homeless sector and the relationships between different models of welfare state and homelessness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theological foundations</td>
<td>• To study the basic contexts of different faiths (Judaism, Christianity and Islam) including: how they were formed historically, their philosophical principles and responses to secularisation; the ways in which religious meaning was constructed and conveyed to people of faith and how that might motivate adherents to social action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith Based Organisations</td>
<td>• To increase my knowledge about the characteristics of FBOs; how they had evolved; their operational models; the types of services they delivered and their responses to external policy drivers and the potential impacts of secularisation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Service profiling

The term ‘service profiling’ is used to describe a systematic approach for conducting a desk top review of a variety of sources of information, with the purpose of creating a single data set identifying organisations (faith and non-faith based) delivering homelessness and allied services in Scotland. In this data set, organisational characteristics were examined in detail to ascertain whether organisations were influenced at all by faith.

The service profiling was designed to provide an initial response to research questions about identifying FBOs operating in Scotland and establishing what difference (if any) ‘faithness’ might make to organisations and to inform case study selection (see further below). As such, both faith and non-faith based organisations were profiled, but the focus was largely on identifying and distinguishing the former.

The profiling was mainly conducted after the initial literature reviews, in parallel with the key informant interviews (and responding to intelligence gleaned from interviewees) and preparations for the case studies. During the time of writing up the thesis, further analysis focused on examining whether organisations had changed during the course of the study. The findings from the service profiling are contained in chapter seven. Here, the phases of
*Phase 1: identifying organisations*

The first task of the profiling was to find sources of information detailing voluntary sector homelessness organisations operating in Scotland, from which I could identify FBOs providing homelessness services.

Firstly, I examined the studies of Johnsen et al (2002 a, b and c) because they investigated voluntary/charitable organisations that were delivering homelessness/allied services (accommodation, day-centres/drop-ins and food) across the UK and the research reports indicated they had considered faith bases. They identified 16 FBOs and 22 non-faith based organisations delivering relevant services in Scotland. The majority of FBOs were noted as delivering more than one service each.

Secondly, the Scottish Government’s ‘HouseKey’, a national service directory detailing Supporting People housing support services, was examined. This included organisational details of providers of homelessness services. Eight organisations with a faith base were identified, with three of them also having been identified in Johnsen et al (2002, a, b and c).

The third main source of information examined was the study of Scottish food distribution services in Sosenko et al (2013). This was chosen for examination because FBOs traditionally had contributed to food distribution services. Twenty-two relevant organisations were identified from this source, with seven of these also identified in the other earlier two sources. The methods applied to identify organisations from the three most substantial repositories (Johnsen et al, 2002, ‘HouseKey’, Sosenko et al, 2013) are shown in in table 2.2 below.

**Table 2.2: the main data sources for identifying organisations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Number of entries searched</th>
<th>Method to identify organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johnsen et al (2002 a, b and c)</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>Filters were applied to identify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scottish based services (location)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voluntary organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Service type (accommodation, day-centres, drop-ins and food/soup)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Client group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HouseKey</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>Filters were applied to identify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Support services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Client group (single and family homeless)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Service type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sosenko et al (2013)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Filters were applied to identify:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Service type (soup kitchens, food distribution)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finally, I examined local service directories, web based repositories and local housing strategies, because these were known to me (because of my previous employment in housing and homelessness organisations) as containing information about organisations delivering homeless services. I also examined four national web based service directories ‘the Pavement’ and Homeless Link (both UK wide), the Scottish Council for Voluntary Organisations’ (SCVO) volunteering information directory ‘Get Involved’ and ALISS (A Local Information System for Scotland), identified in previous searches and therefore known to detail organisations delivering homelessness services, alongside those covering health and wellbeing.

Seventy-six organisations, identified through the profiling, were considered as being of interest to the study. That is, they were Scottish (or delivering services in Scotland), they provided homelessness/allied services and there was some degree of ‘faithness’ exhibited in the details that I had reviewed on them. Between them, they delivered 87 services. Although the main method for identifying the organisations is stated above, some key informants mentioned starter packs, foodbanks and street ministries, which were also included in the profiling exercise. Their profiling showed evidence of collaborations between faith and non-faith based organisations (from planning to delivery) and therefore offered insights into changing development trajectories.

**Phase 2: creating organisational profiles**

The next phase focused on creating individual profiles to examine organisations, identified as delivering homelessness and allied services, in more detail. I searched the Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator’s (OSCR) database because I knew it to be the most comprehensive single source of information about Scottish charities. Five of the headings featured in OSCR were chosen to construct the profiles because they covered organisational identity (‘name’, ‘history’), ethos (‘objective’), ‘constitutional form’ and ‘income/expenditure’. Using the OSCR database also provided consistency in the way that data was generated. Further, these characteristics had been examined in other pieces of research (Jeavons 1997; Sider and Unruh, 2004).

**Phase 3: using the profiles to identify ‘faithness’**

The first two phases of the profiling resulted in generating data on 76 organisations (stored in an Excel Workbook). Organisational profiles were then individually examined to identify levels of ‘faithness’ present in the five characteristics using the ‘guide’ in the
second column in table 2.3 below. These indicators of ‘faithness’ were identified via the earlier literature on FBOs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational characteristic</th>
<th>Indicators of ‘Faithness’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Biblical reference, named after religious person/group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Set up by individual/group of people holding faith affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives</td>
<td>Use of religious language, with explicit linkages between faith and ethos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constitutional form</td>
<td>‘Unincorporated Association’ or ‘Trust’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income source</td>
<td>Donations, legacies gifts in kind, trading activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.5 Fieldwork methods

The fieldwork comprised of two stages: firstly, key informant interviews, and secondly, organisational case studies, as identified in table 2.4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Service users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National homelessness organisations/projects</td>
<td>Chief Executive (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government body</td>
<td>Deputy Director (1) through written submission</td>
<td>Service coordinators (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National voluntary sector body</td>
<td>Policy manager (1) through written submission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional homelessness organisation</td>
<td>Policy manager (1) through written submission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National faith based organisations</td>
<td>Chief Executive (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional faith-based organisations</td>
<td>Chief Executive (1) through written submission</td>
<td>Service Manager (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 Key informant interviews (n = 11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A at this stage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service users</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A at this stage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.4: summary of fieldwork participants (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Service users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Trinity 3’</td>
<td>Manager (1)</td>
<td>Female residents (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(resettlement)</td>
<td>Deputy managers (2)</td>
<td>Male residents (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 14)</td>
<td>Project worker (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteers (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Executive (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Team Leader (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project worker (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteers (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Joseph’s Place’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(day-centre)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Kana’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Homeless and prevention services including recovery drop-in)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chief Executive (1)</td>
<td>Service users 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service managers (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Service coordinator (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project worker (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These approaches were used because they were considered as most appropriate for generating relevant data for achieving saturation (the ability to make firm conclusions from the data, Bryman, 2013). During the case studies, I also made informal observations and read organisational literature to support a process of data triangulation (Ritchie and Lewis, 2003, Denscombe, 2007).

The approach taken to conducting the fieldwork will now be explained in more detail, taking the key informant interviews first before moving onto the case studies.

Key informant interviews

Key informant interviews were conducted with prominent players, at national or regional level, from faith and non-faith based organisations. The purpose of conducting key informant interviews was to generate data around different elements of the Scottish homelessness system, for example to develop a comprehensive understanding of different policy agendas and the role and operations of organisations (faith and non-faith based) in the homelessness sector. The interviews were conducted after the main literature reviews and at the same time as the early stages of the service profiling. Staging the methods in this order allowed for the triangulation of data generated from interview responses, literature reviews and service profiling.
First of all, my supervisors and I discussed the purpose of conducting these interviews and the selection of key informants who Denscombe (2007) considers as having ‘some special contribution to make, because they have some unique insight or because of the position they hold.’ (2007, p198). I then drafted a single topic guide (Appendix 1) for key informants with questions covering what their organisation did, their roles in the homelessness sector, their values and their links to other organisations. Key informants were also asked whether they perceived any differences in the operations of faith and non-faith based organisations. The questions in the topic guide were open-ended so that interviews would as Yin (2014) notes ‘resemble a guided conversation rather than structured queries.’ (2014, p110). Using a topic guide allows the exploration of common subjects and issues. Each question also included a range of probes as well as those pertinent to an interviewee’s particular experiences and expertise. Legard et al (2003) indicate that probes help the researcher:

reveal a whole mine of information around the particular point that would otherwise remain unexplored, and probing needs to continue until the researcher feels they have reached saturation, a full understanding of the participant’s perspective. (2003, p152)

The next stage of discussions with my supervisors was focused on which organisations to involve. A list of potential interviewees was drawn up of those that were known to us, firstly because of my supervisors’ research interests in homelessness and secondly through my own work experience in the field of homelessness. The first list included fourteen organisations (six faith-based and eight non-faith based), all operating at national or regional level. I invited people to take part through emails to senior personnel in each organisation. I also attached an information sheet (Appendix 2) and made the point that more information could be provided if required. In the covering email, I explained that I wanted to carry out semi-structured interviews and provided an estimate of the time required of around forty-five minutes to an hour.

Although I followed up on communications, I did not hear back from two of the FBOs and one non-faith organisation. That left a cohort of eleven key informants, six of whom worked for umbrella organisations (faith and non-faith based) with national and regional coverage. In addition to the four informants from FBOs, all the informants drawn from the non-faith based organisations had working experience of FBOs. Some participants had
worked on local and national strategic groups tasked with formulating policies, whilst others had experience in implementing policies in practice.

I introduced the study and explained the informed consent, confidentiality and anonymity protocols that I would adhere to, along with the structure of the interview and my request to record them. Once I informed the interviewees about the purpose and structure of the interviews and was clear that they understood the information, I asked for and gained their consent to proceed and to record the interviews. This consent was given in all cases.

Three interviewees, who were unable to commit to face-to-face interviews because of their scheduling commitments, completed a written survey produced from the topic guide (Appendix 3). These were analysed at the same time as the other key informant interviews and provided limited data for inclusion in the thesis.

**Case studies**

The case study approach is a structured way of collecting and marshalling data for detailed analysis of a small subject group or theme. There are various types of case studies that the researcher can adopt (Stake, 1994, 1995, Blatter and Haveland 2012, Yin, 2014). The requirement to gather data robust enough for analysis is best served using various means. Denzin and Lincoln (1994) note ‘*the case study strategy relies on interviewing, observing, and document analysis.*’ (1994, p34). The researcher therefore needs to apply rigour in designing the case study to bring all these aspects together effectively, or as Yin (2014) suggests ‘*The more a case study contains specific questions and propositions, the more it will stay within feasible limits.*’ (2014, p 31).

The case study organisations were selected through purposive sampling, a form of non-probability sampling. Bryman (2013) notes that by using this method ‘*the researcher aims to sample cases/participants in a strategic way.*’ (2013, p 418). Johnsen (2014) highlighted how she utilised this method to achieve ‘*adequate representation of a wide range of service types.*’ (2014, p6). In the context of this study, purposive sampling was used to choose three organisations whose characteristics ranged across the 'faithfulness' spectrum to capture a relevant range of experiences (Jeavons 1997, Goggin and Orth, 2002, Monsma and Mounts, 2002, Sider and Unruh, 2004).
**Setting out sampling criteria for choosing the case studies**

My supervisors and I agreed the initial rationale for the choice of case study organisations. There were common criteria across all case study organisations, to heighten the visibility of any potential differences attributable to faith influences. First, they would be drawn from the voluntary sector; second, they were providing homelessness services (such as day centres/drop-ins, food distribution, and accommodation); and third, their services were Scotland-based. The organisations also had to be of a suitable size to enable robust data collection for answering the research questions. A sub criterion was that organisations would be in receipt of government funding (to ascertain how ‘faithness’ might be accommodated in these arrangements).

The choice of case studies also had to ensure that the spectrum of ‘faithness’ was covered, from organisations with an overt faith base to organisations with no apparent ‘faithness’. I therefore sought to select and recruit one case study from each of three categories. First, one with overt faith influences such as references to faith in their name, objectives and purpose, public image and organisational affiliations (‘overtly faith-based’). Second, one where faith influences were muted or had undergone identifiable changes for example, in their objectives, public image, organisational affiliations (‘secularised’). Third, one in which there were no current faith influences apparent (non-faith-based). This purposive selection across the ‘faithness’ spectrum was to enable exploration of the central research questions about how (if at all) ‘faithness’ impacted on how Scottish homelessness organisations operated.

**Recruiting organisations to participate in the case studies**

In consultation with my supervisors, I prepared an information sheet (found in Appendix 4) detailing what the study was about, the expected time requirements for participating organisations and ethical considerations. I sent this to the directors of the three prospective organisations that fitted the criteria outlined above and whom we had reason to think may be amenable to participating in the research, also introducing myself and my background in the covering email. After further communications, and meetings with both director and staff in some cases, two out of these initial three agreed to participate (the ‘secularised’ and ‘non-faith based’ services). One declined (the ‘overt faith base’) and I approached an alternative organisation that fitted the same criteria and they accepted.

This meant I had the three case studies that I required to proceed. All three fulfilled the necessary common criteria outlined above (i.e. they were from the voluntary sector,
provided homelessness services in Scotland, and were of a required size with at least some government funding) and one had an overt faith-base, one had become secularised, and one was a non-faith based organisation. These are referred to by the pseudonyms ‘Trinity 3’ (overt faith-based), ‘Joseph’s Place’ (secularised) and ‘Kana’ (non-faith based) henceforth.

Descriptive detail regarding each of the case study organisations is provided in chapter eight.

**Conducting the case studies**

A number of methods were employed in the case studies, including interviews, a focus group, brief observations and document analysis. The way in which each of these methods was used is detailed below, starting with the development of the topic guides that I deployed in the interviews and the single focus group conducted.

**Topic guides for case studies**

I drafted four bespoke topic guides in consultation with my supervisors, including one each for managers, front-line workers, volunteers and service users. The themes, common to all, covered the types of services delivered and organisational faith. There were further commonalities in the topic guides for the managers (Appendix, 5) and front-line workers (appendix, 6) where they were asked about personal roles, client groups, organisational ethos, service conditions, organisational faith and the homelessness sector. In addition, the manager’s topic guide included the themes of organisational history and operational context. The volunteers’ topic guide (Appendix, 7) covered the same themes but in less detail, for example, the question about service conditions focused on whether services users were expected to adhere to any rules during their use of the service. The service users’ topic guide (Appendix, 8) was shorter than the others and focused on their experiences of services (and faith), including the use of other services as well as those of the case study organisations.

Denscombe (2003) notes the purpose of topic guides is to provide the interviewer with ‘*a clear list of issues to be addressed and questions to be answered*.’ (2003, p176). As such, the topic guides were instrumental in setting out the structure for answering all the research questions and in particular whether ‘faithness’ made a difference to the ways in which the organisations operated.

**Interviews and focus groups**

My supervisors and I agreed that semi-structured face-to - face interviews and focus groups would be the main method to generate data from the case studies.
Interviews

I started the process of setting up interview by holding discussions with the lead contact from the organisation prior to commencing the fieldwork, including the best ways to recruit participants from staff, volunteers and service users and the number of interviews I hoped to conduct.

Semi-structured interviews are interactions between the researcher and interviewer (Legard et al, 2003), in which the topic guide acts as the structure to generate data reflecting on the research questions, with flexibility around the order in which to ask the questions (Denscombe, 2007) to allow the interviewee the opportunity to reflect on what they feel about a topic. As Bryman (2013) states the interviewer ‘usually has some latitude to ask further questions in response to what are seen as significant replies’ (2013, p716).

Focus groups are a useful technique to use when interviewing service users because it is less formal than a semi-structured interview and themes are discussed without putting the spotlight on one person. The focus group dynamic is generated by the interactions between individual participants and the group and facilitator (Finch and Lewis, 2003). Focus groups therefore generate a different type of data to that of individual interviews, because the narratives form collective meaning (Bryman, 2013).

In the event, I spoke with 32 people in total, 26 of them through individual interviews. Two volunteers in Joseph’s Place preferred a joint interview and I facilitated one focus group with four service users in Joseph’s Place.

As table 2.4 above shows, the number and profile of staff and volunteers interviewed in the three services varied greatly. In Trinity 3 (overt faith-base) and Joseph’s Place (secularised), the focus was on a single service element, an accommodation unit in the former and day-centre project team in the second. In each of these cases, the number and range of interviewees was representative of the service, that is from senior management to volunteers and service users. Although four of the five staff available in Kana (non-faith based) were management level, they worked across different services. This meant that the data gathered from Kana was more fragmented and was therefore harder to interpret. However, I felt that I managed to achieve saturation in all cases, at least with regard to service provider perspectives.
In Trinity 3 (overt-faith based), I interviewed all managers, along with the project workers and volunteers attached to one team. In Joseph's Place (secularised), I interviewed the organisation’s director and the staff from the team which ran the core service within the day centre. This included the team leader and all the project workers. In Kana (non-faith based organisation), I managed to cover all of the relevant staff groups, that is the chief executive, service managers and a project worker. However as noted above, unlike the two other organisations, I was unfortunately unable to recruit service users. This was despite several attempts being made through contacts with the project worker and visits to the drop-in premises. During these visits, the project worker did ask two or three people who declined to take part. As I was trying to conclude the fieldwork, I asked the project worker to try to get peoples’ views using a short single sided form based on the topic guide. When I contacted the project worker a few days later, there had been no responses forthcoming. I left it at that stage as I felt I could not press further.

On average, interviews with staff lasted fifty-five minutes and volunteers, forty-five minutes. As expected, the average duration of thirty minutes for the individual interviews with service users was shorter than other interviewees because the topic guide focused on specific questions relating to their experience of services and the homelessness system and faith influences. The themes and issues pertinent to the research questions were fully covered in these timescales which also allowed participants the opportunities to expand on points.

**Focus group**

I facilitated one focus group consisting of four service users which lasted thirty minutes in total in the 'secularised' service. While I had expected to do focus groups with service users in all three services, the eight service users from Trinity 3 participated in individual interviews. This followed discussion with the service manager who had asked the residents what they would prefer. It turned out to be more convenient for the service users if I interviewed them individually, and as noted above, I was unsuccessful in gaining access to service users in the non-faith based service.

The focus group in the secularised service required flexibility on my part, because the space in which it was convened was busy and one participant was impatient to get away. The topic guide questions were therefore used as prompts to start up conversations. In the last few minutes of the interview, the participant who had been restless got up and left but the remaining three continued. The members of the focus group all had long standing
connections to homeless services, including experiences of faith-based organisations, and therefore provided an adequate amount of data for responding to the research question about service user experiences.

**Observations**

The interview and focus group data was complemented by a small amount of observation, conducted during my visits to the participating services. There are formal observation techniques (participant and non-participant) that the researcher can utilise during their fieldwork providing oversights of the study environment (Denscombe, 2007). As I was conscious of my proximity to service users, I wanted to be as unobtrusive as possible to maintain their privacy, and therefore did not utilise formal observation techniques.

Importantly, I consciously observed whether there were any religious artefacts or imagery present in service settings. Where this was the case, I asked interviewees about whether they thought they were obvious and how service users responded to these as well asking service users how they felt about them.

In addition, staff in each organisation briefly showed me how practical procedures were implemented (residents’ key handling in case one and a log book in cases two and three). A small amount of data was generated from these interactions and recorded on the documents themselves or cross-checked against service user perspectives about access to services.

**Documentary analysis**

During the case study visits, I was provided with organisational documents which I had not already had access to and analysed during the literature reviews, service profiling and in preparation for the case studies. The manager of Trinity 3 provided me with the staff training presentation, staff handbook and occupancy agreement. The first two documents both set out the organisation’s ethos, aims and objectives and expectations on staff. The occupancy agreement set out the service standards, expectations on staff and residents, the latter through house rules. In Joseph’s Place, I was given an organisational flow chart which was also explained to me by the team leader. I was also given two pieces of external research which highlighted aspects of the work they had done as part of the local homelessness system and their collaborations with other organisations. Kana’s chief executive gave me the annual impact report and the values and mission statements and staff from the recovery service provided me with staff and service user handbooks and a
book about twelve step recovery programmes and signposted me to national handbooks
detailing the Scottish agenda around recovery.

The documents did generate small amounts of data, and by revisiting them after interviews,
I could identify any areas of congruence or dissonance between what the documents
indicated and interviewees’ experiences.

2.6 Data analysis

As substantial amounts of data were generated throughout the research, the data had to be
managed carefully in order to answer the research questions. The data was analysed using
hard copies of documents and computer-aided methods because, as Bryman (2013) notes
in relation to the latter, ‘among qualitative data analysis its [computer aided programmes]
use is by no means universally embraced’. (2013, p592).

The recordings from all the individual interviews with key informants and case study staff
and volunteers were fully transcribed. I typed up notes and quotes from the eight
interviews with Trinity 3 residents, the service user focus group from Joseph’s Place and
the joint interview with the volunteers from Joseph’s Place. I produced full transcripts for
the key informant interviews and four of the staff interviews from Joseph’s Place. As I
wanted to maximise the time for analysing the data and I was slow at transcribing, I got
the remaining eight interviews transcribed by a professional company.

All transcriptions were then anonymised with the prefixes ‘KII’ for key informants, ‘FB’
for Trinity 3, ‘CFB’ for participants from Joseph’s Place and ‘NFB’ for Kana, followed by
numbers in the order they were interviewed before analysis.

Coding hard copies of transcripts

I collated all the full transcripts into a single Word document for each interview cohort,
that is the key informants, Trinity 3, Joseph’s Place and Kana. I also produced Word
documents for topic guide themes, by cutting and pasting sections of the transcripts
relating to the research questions contained within the themes. This was to ensure that all
relevant data was being extracted for each research question.

I read, re-read and marked up these hard-copy documents. Annotations were also made
where points reflected particular insights into a subject, not necessarily identified at the
outset, for example, faith-based recovery programmes.
I repeatedly listened to the recordings of the interviews from which I had prepared notes and quotes, to augment these and check points for accuracy. Interview recordings and the full transcripts were constantly revisited to safeguard against the original context being lost through the selection process identified above, keeping in mind following Bryman’s (2013) thoughts about data retrieval, ‘it is always important to make sure you have ways of identifying the origins of the chunks of text.’ (2013, p577).

**Computer assisted analysis programmes**

Yin (2014) urges researchers to think about why they are using software packages for data analysis, ‘The software will not do the finished analysis on its own but it may serve as an able assistant and reliable tool.’ (2014, p134). Finding a practical way to identify what could or could not be achieved through software was assisted by Saldana (2009) who suggests ‘Using a smaller portion of your data first, such as a day’s field notes or a single interview transcript, before importing the data corpus into the program.’ (2009, p23).

The functions of two computer software packages, NVivo and ATLAS were tested in this way with the former appearing more straightforward. Another method of analysis called ‘Framework’ (Ritchie and Spencer, 1980) was considered because it linked themes and cases in ways that maintained the contextual integrity of the data. NVivo had incorporated the ‘framework’ method (through spreadsheets), which confirmed my preference for using this package.

The interview transcripts were uploaded onto NVivo. As some coding and analysis had been carried out in Word, NVivo was used in specific ways. Two of its query functions, ‘text search’ and ‘word frequency’ were used on the following terms ‘God’, ‘Church’, ‘Religion’, ‘Bible’, ‘Verse’, ‘Christ’, ‘Christianity’, ‘Faith’ and ‘Jesus’. The results of these searches were exported for examination. First, into Excel which provides a summary of the number of times the word was said and by whom and second, into Word which records the respondent and fragment of narrative in which the reference was made. This short analysis of how words with religious connotations were used by people from across organisations (whether faith or non-faith based) seemed to reflect the spectrum for which the concept of ‘faithness’ was developed.

The main reason for using NVivo was because of its ‘Node’ functions for the case study data. Nodes are used to gather pieces of common data into one place (flat scheme) or two/several places (hierarchical scheme). A loose hierarchical structure was created using ‘parent’ and ‘child’ nodes where the former focused on the main research themes and the
latter, each case. An example of this structure can be found in Appendix 10 below. Collecting the data in this way, partially replicated the framework approach, but in a manageable way because the aggregated data was about one theme across all cases (rather than all themes across all cases). As with the manual coding processes, aggregated data from the node sets was exported into individual Word documents for further analysis.

The final stage of the data analysis was completed when chapters were drafted and consisted of going through the Word documents which contained data to identify suitable quotes to provide evidence that were illustrative of the research theories.

2.7 Ethical considerations

Ethical considerations underpin the course of research from its design, to generating data, to communicating findings in the final thesis. Various research bodies provide practical guidance on the ethical standards expected from students who are conducting social research (British Sociological Association, 2002; Social Research Association, 2003; European Social Research Council, 2015; Heriot Watt University, 2015). The theoretical principles of research ethics are set out in many pieces of literature (see for example Lewis, 2003; Hammersley, 2007; Denzin and Lincoln, 2007).

This section focuses on the notions of inclusiveness, informed consent, respect for participants and confidentiality because I felt that, in the case of the service users particularly, they could create study conditions that counteracted those in which homeless people might generally find themselves.

Inclusiveness

The first ethical principle on which to reflect is being inclusive. The Social Research Association (2003) notes ‘no group should be disadvantaged by routinely being excluded from consideration.’ (2003, p14). Lewis (2003) recognises that attempts to mitigate the potential for excluding participants should be made from the design stage onwards:

*Making studies accessible to the groups involved requires consideration of the appropriate language to use in approaching them, anticipation of the possible barriers to participation, and provision to help to overcome them.*

(2003, p63)
The current research can demonstrate adherence to principles of inclusion. There were several deliberations about the range of participants (organisations and individuals) that were important to this study. Although this research concerned FBOs, a choice was made to involve organisations spanning the spectrum of ‘faithness’, that is, organisations with overt faith-bases, those that had secularised and non-faith based. It was anticipated that this would then open up the study to individuals with different philosophical positions. Further, it was a conscious choice to gain service user perspectives of services (including those delivered by FBOs). The researcher can also create an inclusive research environment by increasing the confidence of participants to get involved. To do this, the researcher needs to demonstrate that they are serious about their subject and engagement with participants. This includes showing they are prepared, that they understand their topic and the contexts in which people are situated. Using topic guides to frame fieldwork interviews is one way to evidence such an approach to participants.

The planning and design of the topic guides for this research included discussions with my supervisors in the drafting stages about the length, content (themes) and structure (order in which themes were laid out) and how questions would be presented (language, phrasing and tone). The decision was made to have four different topic guides with common themes with a series of open questions and probes suitable for facilitating semi-structured interviews. This structure was considered appropriate for engaging participants (front-line staff, volunteers, homeless people) who might not be used to giving their views to a researcher, or be reticent to discuss the subjects of homelessness and faith.

The next few paragraphs focus on the ethical approaches adopted in the fieldwork with particular reference to understanding the research relationship between researcher and participant (both at organisational and individual level).

**Informed consent**

Informed consent is the act of informing people about what the research is about before asking them for their consent to proceed. Each of the participating organisations was sent information sheets (Appendix 4) detailing the purpose of the study and how the interviews would be conducted. I met with a member of staff from each organisation to introduce myself and go through the aims and scope of the study in more detail, to ensure that organisations knew fully about the level of commitment they were being asked to give and in return, my commitment to them (to protect the identity of the organisation and individuals and represent their views objectively in the final thesis).
To ensure that individual interviewees were informed prior to their participation, I explained: what the purpose of the study was; the importance of their views; and how these might inform the final write-up. At this point, I went over the principles of confidentiality that would be employed regarding them and their contributions. This included affirming that what they said in interviews was not reported back to the organisation and how any expressed views would be anonymised in the thesis (including altering details that might identify organisations). Talking about confidentiality before the interview begins may also increase the richness of data where a participant feels more confident about making fuller responses.

I also explained my request for recording interviews, firstly to support a conversational style (uninterrupted by written note-taking) and secondly to ease the process of writing up. I indicated that these recordings would be for my use only, to listen to and write up (transcripts) and any documents produced would be held securely. After the interviews were completed, I decided to use professional transcribing services for some interviews. To honour the commitment I had made to participants, I removed identifying features from the files prior to their submission.

Due regard also needs to be taken so that homeless people do not feel under pressure to share explicit details about their personal experiences. Likewise, where staff are offering insights into deeply held beliefs, this should be done sensitively. ESRC (2015) indicates:

_In all cases of research, researchers should inform participants of their right to refuse to participate or withdraw from the investigation whenever and for whatever reason they wish._ (2015, p 30)

Before the interviews started, I made clear to interviewees that they could opt out of answering questions that they were not comfortable with answering. I then asked interviewees if they had any questions about the research or wanted me to clarify any points before we began and offered them the information sheet to take away with them. After these stages, I then sought and gained verbal consent (which I recorded before the interview began after explaining what informed consent was and the way I was seeking to achieve it), to proceed with interviews and record them. The process of verbal consent was chosen because I thought it less stressful for service users who may not regularly participate in studies (and who might find forms intimidating) (Bryman, 2013). Moreover, I wanted to treat all interviewees equally by applying the same principle across all interviews.
Respect for participants

Service users go about their daily routines or lives in accommodation units, day-centres and drop-ins. It is important therefore to ensure the researcher respects the privacy of the people using these spaces and is as unobtrusive as possible. The RESPECT (2014) project notes ‘Privacy basically means that people can expect to be free from intrusion.’ (2014, p77). When I met with the organisations prior to the fieldwork, I realised that formal observations (a method identified in the research design) could potentially be intrusive in such locations and therefore elected not to use this approach.

SRA (2003) make a point relating to respecting participants in the diligence of a researcher in ‘alerting potential users of their data to the limits of the reliability and applicability of that data.’ (2003, p24). Before I started the interviews, I emphasised it was a PhD study and explained how data would be collected from interviews, analysed and represented in the thesis. I also indicated that their perspectives (unique to them) would inform the thesis in a general sense.

Confidentiality

Upholding the confidentiality of participants is key to a research study and includes safeguarding the identity of participating organisations and individual interviewees. The application of these principles therefore requires thorough consideration from the design stages onwards and taking cognisance of Data Protection legislation (the 1998 Act). Heriot Watt (2015) states:

Researchers are expected to protect the confidentiality of the participant’s identity and data throughout the fullness of the research project. (2015, p5)

ESRC (2015), draw out some of the points that constitute what practices assist this process:

For example, descriptions of participants (eg in case studies) need to take care to ensure that they do not risk making those who take part identifiable, particularly if sample sizes are small or participants have distinctive characteristics that may make them recognisable. (2015, p29)

This point was particularly relevant for my research because the fieldwork focused on a relatively small cohort of organisations and many of the service users had long associations with services and the homeless system, which might have made them recognisable. Lewis (2003), also underlines how attributing comments at the writing stage may be a challenge:
Both direct attribution (if comments are linked to a name or a specific role) and indirect (by reference to a collection of characteristics that might identify an individual or small group) must be avoided. Indirect attribution requires particular care. (2003, p67)

To mitigate the risks attached to the points above, I gave organisations pseudonyms which differed from the originals in length, syllabic construct and religious content. I made no reference to their location (including whether they were urban or rural) other than that they were Scottish based. All organisations delivered a range of services, so identifying factors for the individual services on which the case focused were altered. With regard to individual participants (including the key informants), I ascribed them codes and slightly amended their job titles where that could identify a member of staff or the organisational hierarchy. I used aliases for service users and I minimised the detail of their ages to further protect their identities. These efforts were all made to counter what the SRA (2003) appears to suggest is an innate prominence that participants may have:

A particular configuration of attributes can, like a fingerprint, frequently identify its owner beyond reasonable doubt. So social researchers need to remove the opportunities for others to infer identities from their data. (2003 p39)

All three case study organisations supported participants’ confidentiality because they provided private spaces, separate to the main service areas, for the individual interviews.

2.8 Conclusions: reflections on the research methods employed

This study was a qualitative investigation into the place of faith-based organisations in the Scottish homelessness sector. This concluding section reflects on the effectiveness of the research in doing that, by identifying the challenges raised in implementing qualitative methods, the limitations of its scope and the lessons learnt.

Literature reviews

Theological literature was reviewed, in addition to studies about FBOs, to examine the ways in which theological principles could impact on how FBOs constituted themselves and the collective and individual motivations for delivering homelessness services. This approach was strengthened by my previous studies in theology which meant I knew where to locate texts and sources and I was comfortable in reading religious texts, such as the
Bible, Qur’an and ecclesiastical documents, which can be challenging because of the presences of archaic language and embellishments.

**Service profiling**

In this research, the service profiling method was applied as a form of literature review (of grey materials). The data collection was therefore limited to organisations who appeared in information sources (and it is likely that some FBOs will not appear in these).

In its entirety, the service profiling encompassed a line by line analysis of over a thousand data entries found in the various information sources, thus generating substantial amounts of data (and more than expected). At times, great care was needed to ensure that this did not become the primary method of data collection at the expense of progressing fieldwork. This was accomplished by limiting the number of characteristics examined, whilst still ensuring these were sufficient for comparing the spectrum of organisational ‘faithness’.

**Fieldwork**

Communication is key to effective research because it underpins the whole process, from the researcher making a case to external and prospective participants to encourage their involvement to, presenting the results. In retrospect, there were times where communications could have been more impactful, particularly in relation to service user involvement. Although direct representations were made to organisations about the value of speaking to service users, the message perhaps was not conveyed in a convincing enough manner. Perhaps in retrospect, and with ethical considerations in mind, factoring in more time for informal communication with service users ahead of the fieldwork might have increased involvement.

Conducting fieldwork had to be done in a manner that was representative of the fields of homelessness and ‘faithness’. The objective of key informant interviews was to set the context of organisations delivering homelessness and allied services. This was achieved because the informants were drawn from national and regional homelessness organisations (faith and non-faith based) and were in a position (senior management/management/service coordinator) to comment. As mentioned above in section 2.5, three key informants were unable to attend an interview and they provided written responses based on topic guides questions. This produced a limited amount of data and, in future, I would be more active in seeking telephone interviews in these circumstances.

The time taken to complete the case studies was longer than originally envisaged. This
was due to the nature of the organisations (small) and services (front-line). Emergencies requiring additional staff time or staff shortages meant that some interviews had to be rearranged or visits rescheduled. Situations such as these however were accommodated because of the long period in which a PhD study is conducted.

The spectrum of ‘faithness’ was covered through the three case studies as one was overtly faith-based, one had previously had strong connections to faith and one was non-faith based. With regards to the position of the case studies, all three organisations were linked to the statutory homeless system in that they were funded by public sector bodies, this included Trinity 3, an FBO with an overt religious identity and mission. One further area that may be have been interesting to gain insights into was how faith influenced FBOs which did not receive government funding.

The staff interviewees were representative of each organisation as I interviewed the majority of staff members in the Trinity 3 and Joseph’s Place teams and in Kana the relevant perspectives were gained from interviewing the chief executive and individual members of the management team responsible for three out of four service areas. I therefore felt confident that saturation was achieved in respect to the data generated about organisations, their services and where ‘faithness’ impacted on their operations.

The service users had a range of experiences with some having connections to faith and non-faith based services (statutory and allied) dating to decades whilst others, months. The eight semi-structured interviews with service users were more effective than the focus group. Although all encounters were based on the same service user topic guide, it was more challenging to draw out perspectives from all focus group participants one group member had a tendency to talking over other people at times.

Despite several attempts being made (including visits to the drop-in premises), I was unsuccessful in interviewing service users in the third case (the non-faith based organisation). This meant that I was not able to directly compare service user experiences from the non-faith service to those of the overtly faith-based and secularised services, and thus cover, as I had hoped, the entire ‘faithness’ spectrum from this perspective. I am therefore necessarily circumspect about the firmness of my conclusions on this particular aspect of my study. I feel nonetheless that there are relevant insights from the service user interviews which I did manage to complete, especially once 'triangulated' with the other data that I generated or analysed.
PART 2: UNDERSTANDING THE SUBJECT
Chapter three: The development of the Scottish homelessness system

3.1 Introduction
The current homelessness system in the UK has developed by way of legislation, statutory frameworks, policy initiatives and the contributions of a range of stakeholders from the statutory and voluntary sectors. Since devolution in 1999, responsibilities for homelessness have largely been situated within the jurisdiction of each home nation.

The purpose of this chapter is to outline the evolution of the UK homelessness system up to 1999 before focusing on Scottish developments following devolution. It will consider the roles played by the public, voluntary/third and private sectors in these systems, and highlight the role of FBOs in these developments. The themes covered in this chapter are examined in detail in the works of Prochaska (1988), Anderson (1993, 2003, 2007), Fitzpatrick et al (2000), Quilgars et al (2008), Jones and Pleace, (2010).

Section 3.2 outlines the period up to 1977, where people in need were supported through the provisions of the poor laws and early social care programmes. Section 3.3 describes the developments in the period, 1977 until 1999, in which the first piece of homelessness legislation was passed. Section 3.4 highlights key markers during the period of devolution from 1999. Section 3.5 identifies the key developments in the Scottish homelessness system leading up to and beyond the abolition of the priority need test in 2012. Section 3.6 concludes the chapter.

3.2 The poor laws and the beginning of social care (pre-1977)
This section sets out the early context of social care/welfare provisions bound within the Poor Laws. Cooperation between the Church and State marked this period, with the former acting as administrator and provider and the latter as legislator. The sacred and secular arrangement to deliver a ‘social care system’ was not new. Chadwick (1993) describes the fourth century emperor Constantine as someone seeking out the use of ‘Christian ideals in some of his laws, protecting children, slaves, peasants and prisoners.’ (1993, p128). The section then goes on to describe how, in the late nineteenth century, a shift in emphasis saw the emergence of local authority responsibilities for services (during this period, the term ‘local authority’ referred to a collection of various boards etc). A national informant reflected on their understanding on how these systems evolved:
When there was nothing there, the church was one vehicle for making things happen so when people look back hundreds of years ago, even if you go back to the start of the NHS and things like that, a lot of that was the church took responsibility I guess in the way that the state eventually did. (National stakeholder, manager voluntary sector homelessness provider)

The Poor Laws

The Poor Laws, created between the fifteenth and the twentieth centuries, set out early provisions for people in need. Prior to the Act of Settlement 1707, Scotland had jurisdiction for its own poor law provisions. Early legislation provided definitions of those who were/were not entitled to poor relief. Beggars fell into the latter groups with the exception of the poor adjudged ‘by the council of the town that they cannot make their living in other ways’ (RPS, 1425/3/22). The 1579 Act entitled ‘For punishment of the strong and idle beggars and relief of the poor and impotent’, had a similar tone. The first category, the ‘strong and idle’, who had the means to sustain themselves (or were bonded) and did not do so, were punished (put into irons). Beggars who could not be supported to live independently, were subjected to ‘Branding pokers, fines, being banished and hanging (for continuous offending)’. The provision for ‘deserving’ poor included accommodation and ‘outdoor’ relief (for the poor who could be sustained at home) (RPS, 1579/10/27). The procedures for administering poor relief included making enquiries into peoples’ circumstances and returning them to the parish of their birth or where they had connections.

Following the Union of the Scottish and English parliaments in 1707, the Westminster Parliament was responsible for establishing subsequent Poor Laws. The poor laws of earlier centuries were re-visited through ‘The Poor Law Amendment Act 1834’ (covering England and Wales with an amendment to extend provisions to Ireland made in 1836). This Act was important because it created the structure for local Poor Law Unions, an early example of a quasi-governmental body replacing parish administered relief. The Act also formalised the provision of workhouses and harsher conditions placed on people obtaining poor relief (4 and 5 William IV, c 76). Since the early nineteenth century, ‘Hansard Reports’ have provided records of parliamentary proceedings. Debates about the 1834 Act were recorded in the report of the 9th May 1834 (Hansard,1834, Vol 23, cc 805 - 842). The report describes the spiralling costs of poor relief and the support of working people (1834, Vol 23, c cc821 – 831).
‘The Scottish Poor Law Act 1845’ diverged from other UK poor laws in that it made provision for the formation of a centralised ‘Board of Supervision’. Membership of this board included provosts from different cities and towns and law makers. Local Parochial Boards (with members drawn from civil government and kirk sessions) were also set up to raise funds and administer relief to the poor. Poor-houses, the Scottish equivalent of workhouses, differed in that their establishment was not mandatory as was the case in the rest of the UK. Relief could also be provided to those considered ‘occasional as well as permanent Poor’ (8 and 9 Victoria, c 83) and was granted to people who were not poorhouse residents.

**The growth of state-based systems to deliver social and housing services**

Concerns that the Church and parish structures were not capable of managing poor relief systems grew in the nineteenth century. Legislation implemented in this period focused on consolidating the function of local government, for example the Local Government Acts of 1894. The Act in Scotland was important in establishing local government control because it abolished the parochial board system and standardised provisions which were to be managed by local authorities. The ‘Public Health (Scotland) Act 1897’ (c. 38), for example, included ‘local authority’ duties for regulating common lodging houses.

In the early twentieth century, the drive for state control of services continued with housing included as part of this. In Scotland, a Royal Commission was set up in 1917 to examine housing conditions. The Commission made connections to the Health Act of 1897 by including common lodging houses in their examination, describing its various forms as follows:

> .... a small house in the country village or rural town which may accommodate a few tramps, vagrants, out-of-works, or casual workers, to the houses in the large cities accommodating perhaps several hundreds of lodgers, composed of all sorts and conditions of men and women from the tramp, vagrant, or casual worker to the labourer and the artisan. (1917, p118)

The Commission also measured the scale of local authority managed stock, reporting that eleven authorities were housing a total of 3484 families (1917, p387). One of the Commission’s recommendations provides their thoughts on the role of local authorities in developing and managing housing:
We recommend that Local Authorities should give all the assistance in their power in the initial stages of housing schemes; and that they should do so, not only by the purchase and development of building land where circumstances are favourable, but also by giving technical advice to intending builders and by instituting municipal registers of small houses. (1917, p 402)

The ‘Tudor Walters Committee’ in England was similarly significant because it was the driver for creating the ‘Housing, Town Planning, &c, Act, 1919’ pertaining to England and Wales emerged as a result of the. The 1919 Act amended previous Acts known collectively as ‘Housing of the Working Classes Acts, 1890 to 1909’ (1919, p34).

Alongside a growing focus on housing issues, legislation continued to amend the Poor Laws and strengthen the role of local government. The Local Government (Scotland) Act 1929 changed the form of poor relief administration by abolishing parish councils (the successor of the Parochial Boards from 1894). The Act was responsible for moving poor relief management from the church to civil government.

Another piece of legislation key to supporting the growth of local authority control was the ‘National Assistance Act 1948’ which strengthened local authorities’ responsibilities in providing welfare services and included duties for dealing with homelessness. The Act was important for three reasons, first it established a state centralised management body, the National Assistance Board (NAB); second for housing and homelessness, the Act introduced a new model of temporary accommodation, the ‘reception centre’; and third it placed a duty on local authorities to provide ‘temporary accommodation for persons who are in urgent need thereof’ (1948, part III, 21, (I) (b)).

The National Assistance Board itself was important for homelessness because it was responsible for undertaking the first national study into single homelessness in 1965, publishing its report in 1966. The survey was carried out ‘with the co-operation of other Government Departments and voluntary bodies, between October 1965 and March 1966’ (HMSO, 1966). A Hansard report for the 27th July 1966 provided detail about the types of provision and the numbers of homeless people identified:

The lodging houses and hostels comprised some 550 establishments, which catered, even if only marginally, for the type of unsettled single person with whom the Survey was concerned. The 550 establishments provided accommodation for about 32,000 men and 2,600 women. (1966, vol 732 c 273W)
This section has mainly focused on statutory developments within social care and latterly the recognition of homelessness as a specific issue. However, mention should be made about a funding mechanism ‘Urban Aid’ which was set up in 1969, just three years after the NAB 1966 survey. Batley and Edwards (1974) described the purpose of the programme as bringing:

...rapid and additional aid to small urban areas which exhibited signs of 'urban stress', 'multiple deprivation' or 'additional social need', by means of exchequer grants to local authorities and voluntary organizations to establish projects designed to alleviate the stress. (1974 p306)

The ‘Urban Aid’ model of funding was important because, firstly it provided central government funds (administered through local government) for projects delivered by public sector agencies and voluntary sector organisations; and secondly it established services outwith the then statutory services (education, social work).

More importantly for housing and homelessness, Urban Aid funded voluntary organisations dealing with homelessness issues before the statutory homelessness system was established. Women’s Aid, and other voluntary organisations including advice giving services, were supported through Scottish Urban Aid funding in this period. FBOs were also in receipt of Urban Aid in this period (Laird et al, 2003). The Urban Aid programme therefore appears to have been an early form of ring-fenced funding aimed at delivering specific policy objectives.

There were other reasons for the development of the voluntary sector’s interest in homelessness in this period as Warnes et al (2003) note:

In Britain, the growth of nationwide and professional voluntary sector homeless organisations during the last quarter of the twentieth century began with the closure from the 1970s of the government’s Resettlement Units (2003, p133)

One of the national stakeholders interviewed provided their perception of what accommodation was available in this period:

There was a time when single homeless people, and particularly men, had no place to go but awful ware-houses, places with chicken wire separating booths, really dangerous places. (National stakeholder, voluntary sector homelessness organisation)
In 1974, eight years after the National Assistance Board published its report on their 1965 homelessness census, the Government produced a consultation paper (Department of the Environment, Department of Health and Social Security, Welsh Office, (1974) ‘Homelessness: A consultation paper’ in which homelessness was defined as:

\[
\text{It includes not only those who lose their homes through the action of landlords etc, but victims of disasters, refugees, people suffering poverty, those who have moved to find work and those whose homelessness has been induced by factors such as broken family relationships, behavioural difficulties, illness, old-age and the difficulties associated with single parent or exceptionally large families.} \quad (1974, \text{para 3}).
\]

In summary, this period saw a gradual shift in the way that social care provision was managed and delivered. State control over systems of welfare increased as joint arrangements between Church and State diminished. Voluntary sector organisations (including FBOs) were also found working alongside the State to deliver the emerging agendas.

### 3.3 Developing the statutory homelessness system in the UK (1977 to 1999)

This period was important for three key reasons, which are each considered in turn.

First, legislation was introduced which focused specifically on homelessness. This importantly included the Housing (Homeless Persons) Act 1977, giving a legal definition of homelessness and the responsibilities local authorities had to homeless households. Fitzpatrick and Pawson (2016) elaborated on the definition of homelessness set out in the Act:

\[
\text{...the definition of homelessness it employs is exceptionally wide. You are legally defined as homeless if you have no accommodation in which it is ‘reasonable’ to expect you to live together with your family} \quad (2016, \text{p544}).
\]

The 1977 Act therefore introduced a basic right to rehousing for homeless households in certain circumstances, that is, those who were assessed as homeless and in priority need. Along with the definition of homelessness, the 1977 Act set out the investigations that authorities would make in determining whether they had a duty to discharge, that is whether people were ‘homeless or threatened with homelessness’, ‘in priority need’, their homelessness was unintentional and they had a local connection to the area in which they
presented. The Department of the Environment produced guidance at the end of 1977 to support authorities in understanding the legislation and performing their duties under its requirements (1977, Circular 116/77). Goodlad (2005) suggests that homelessness ‘was qualified in three ways, with reference to people, locality and intention.’ (2005, p2). The priority need test, in particular was seen to be limiting because it precluded single homeless people from the main rehousing duty unless they had a specific vulnerability (Goodlad, 2005). Foord et al (1998) described the tests as setting out ‘homeless people as ‘deserving and undeserving’ (1998, p9).

Under the Conservative Government, the 1977 Act was consolidated in the 1980’s through part III of the Housing Act 1985 in England and Wales and part II of the Housing (Scotland) Act 1987 in Scotland. In the 1990’s, further changes for England and Wales were made through the Housing Act 1996. The Act set out changes to the way homeless households were allocated social housing by reducing the priority of homeless households in these processes. However, the impact of this legislation was diluted because councils used the discretionary powers the Act afforded them to continue to support the right to housing. Fitzpatrick and Pawson (2016) therefore concluded that the principles of the 1977 Act ‘emerged relatively unscathed from 18 years of hostile Conservative government.’ (2016, p 546).

Another key development in this period was the introduction of the Rough Sleepers’ Initiative (RSI) in 1990, which sought practical ways to tackle the specific issues of rough sleeping. Established in London, its wider implementation followed as a response to rising levels of rough sleeping in cities across the UK. The RSI had three distinct phases in this period, the first implemented from 1990, phase 2 from 1993 and phase 3 in 1996. The RSI was established in Scotland in 1997 (Yanetta et al 1999, Fitzpatrick et al, 2005). The potential benefits of the RSI included the availability of national funding (Anderson, 2007, Fitzpatrick et al, 2005) and increased commitment to identifying the scale of the issue and meeting needs.

The RSI was also significant because it provided resources for single homelessness services which included outreach and street work, resettlement, advice, shelters, day-centres, different accommodation forms, rent deposit schemes (Crane and Warnes, 2000; Warnes et al, 2003; Fitzpatrick et al, 2005). Evaluations of the Scottish projects funded through the programme, showed that over 3500 people used RSI services, with most of them noting recent episodes of rough sleeping (Yanetta et al 1999; Randall and Brown,
Laird et al (2003) drew on material obtained from Scottish RSI projects which included faith-based organisations. RSI was a specific and targeted fund aimed at reducing rough sleeping, which meant that existing service typologies were being delivered in different ways, for example assertive approaches in outreach services (Randall and Brown, 2006, p31). Although RSI funding was available to local authorities and housing associations, the public sector relied heavily on the voluntary sector (including FBOs) for its implementation (Warnes et al, 2003; Wilson, 2014). As such, RSI could be seen to follow a similar model to Urban Aid in that it consolidated joint working between the public and voluntary sectors to deliver non-statutory services in addition to those provided within the statutory safety net and this model of joint working was supported by successive governments in this period (Knapp and Kendall, 1993; Anderson, 2007).

In 1997, a target to reduce levels of rough sleeping by two thirds (by 2002) was introduced in England. The target in Scotland two years later was perhaps more ambitious in that it set out to eradicate the need for rough sleeping by 2003. Under the Labour Government, homelessness policy development focused on the wider pursuit of combatting social exclusion/inclusion. The Rough Sleepers’ Initiative continued for a couple of years before being replaced with Labour’s ‘Homelessness Action Programme’ (HAP) in 1999. HAP provided £34 million in the first instance with a similar focus as previous funding for services including outreach and resettlement, prevention and other housing advice services (Wilson, 2017). Again, HAP funded voluntary sector services (DETR, 1999) in which ‘schemes which were supported by their local authority as part of their local strategy for preventing and dealing with rough sleeping.’ (1999, p11)

The last development of note in this period is that national data collections were introduced to monitor the effectiveness of the legislation. Although limited in scope (they only measured households who presented as homeless and for whom an outcome was known), they could be used to target resourcing in areas with high levels of homelessness identified. Recorded homelessness in England almost doubled from 55,530 to 105,870 (1979 to 1999) and in Scotland increased from 29,068 to 45,723 (1989 to 1999). Despite their limitations, the national data collections highlighted the scale of the issue and therefore potential demand on resources (public and voluntary sectors).
3.4 Developing homelessness systems in a time of new constitutional arrangements (1999 to 2007)

The landmark in this period related to changes in the UK’s constitutional arrangements. From 1999 onwards, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland had powers devolved to their Parliament, Assembly and National Executive. For Scotland, devolution brought autonomy in developing housing and homelessness legislation and policy (although the social security benefits system was reserved to Westminster), with the Scottish Parliament being the legislative body. In Northern Ireland and Wales, greater legislative responsibility for both areas was transferred in stages.

The priority need and other tests set out in legislation were revisited in this period, for example through ‘The Homeless Persons (Priority Need) Wales Order 2001’ (extending the definitions of those in priority need) and ‘The Housing (Northern Ireland) Order 2003’ (to amend 1988 definitions of intentionality).

Labour’s Homelessness Directorate, formed in 2002, subsumed the Rough Sleeping Unit (established in 1999) in England. In Scotland, the formal RSI programme was brought to a close in 2003 although the Scottish Executive continued to fund local authorities for work in this area. The Housing (Scotland) Act 2001 laid out duties on local authorities to produce a homelessness strategy which had to include measures to address rough sleeping. In Northern Ireland, two strategies to tackle rough sleeping were implemented - the first (nationwide) in 2004 and the second in 2010 focusing on Derry.

Interventionist approaches for tackling rough sleeping were also gaining ground in England in this period (Warnes et al 2003, Anderson 2007, Benjaminsen et al, 2009) These approaches, underpinned by Government policy drivers, consisted of a range of measures aimed at preventing people from sleeping rough or coercing them into changing behaviours seen as having an undesirable impact on the environment in which they were present, or were harmful to them as individuals (Johnsen and Fitzpatrick, 2007, 2008, 2010). Hard-line measures included the use of law enforcement agencies and the criminalisation of street activities (Amster, 2003; DeVerteuil, 2006; Tosi, 2007; Fitzpatrick and Johnsen, 2009), ‘designing out’ or the removal of street furniture/spaces used by rough sleepers (Doherty et al, 2008; Fitzpatrick and Johnsen, 2009), with ‘softer’ methods including diverted giving schemes to reduce the amount of money given to beggars.
Prevention approaches were prioritised across the UK because preventative work was seen firstly to be better for individuals and secondly, it could be cost effective (DCLG, 2006, 2012, Scottish Government and CoSLA, 2009). The concept of ‘early intervention’ also gained credence, a term used to describe strategic levers focusing on low level interventions to build up peoples’ resilience to reduce their need for more overt (and costly) interventions at a later stage (Pawson, et al, 2007, Scottish Government, 2009). In England, part of the remit of the Homelessness and Housing Support Directorate was promoting homelessness prevention. Chapter 2 of the Office for the Deputy Prime Minister’s (ODPM) ‘Homelessness Code of Guidance for Local Authorities’ (2002) focused on prevention activities. The Welsh Government produced an advice note (non-statutory) ‘The Prevention of Homelessness’ in 2004 to support voluntary sector activities in this area. There was evidence that the development of Scottish prevention activities, emerging from around 2003, was slow paced (Pawson and Davidson, 2006).

In 2003, the UK Government launched the Supporting People programme. This was an important initiative because: firstly it gave housing related support services a distinct housing identity (separate to social work’s care at home); secondly it was preventative in nature in that support was designed to enable independent living and tenancy sustainment; and thirdly it adopted definitions of vulnerability that meant that single homeless households could access services. Its implementation was achieved through different pieces of enabling legislation including the ‘Local Government Act 2000’, the ‘Housing (Scotland) Act 2001’ and ‘The Housing Support Services (Northern Ireland) Order 2002’. The new ring-fenced funding mechanism brought together several different funding streams, for example Special Needs Allowance Package (SNAP) and the support element of housing benefit and was described by Jones and Pleace (2010) as ‘a far more coherent system of financing and planning for housing support services’ (2010, p37). Scotland received £426 million as its first Supporting People fund and England, £1.8 billion. This meant that the Scottish fund exceeded the Barnett consequential of ten percent (the usual financial formula between Westminster and Scotland). Supporting People was also important because it increased understanding about the scale of people with support needs, and delivered services to single homeless people.

From 1999 until 2007 Labour and the Liberal Democrats formed a coalition government (led by Labour). One of the immediate effects of devolution on homelessness systems could be seen in the establishment of working groups to support and formulate Scottish policy.
The Homelessness Task Force (HTF), a cross sector group established in August 1999, was instrumental in setting in motion the extension of priority need and subsequent abolition of the distinction over a ten-year period. The HTF published two reports, in 2000 and in 2002. The report recommendations were important in themselves because they first underpinned the homelessness provisions of the Housing (Scotland) Act 2001 and the second as foundations for the Homeless Etc. (Scotland) Act 2003. Two national stakeholders spoke about the impact of the second HTF report in 2002 and the development of their relationships with national government:

*My role arose out of the 2002 report, to work with local authorities and housing associations and other organisations trying to get them to work in partnership together* (National stakeholder, manager, national homelessness initiative)

*We are hugely supportive of the work that came out of the task force in 2002. We wanted to work alongside the Scottish Executive in promoting those things and pushing them to go further* (National stakeholder, faith based voluntary sector organisation)

*After the HTF 2002 report came out, the Scottish Executive said “we need someone to take this forward, you’ve got stuff on the ground that you are actually doing would you do it”?* (National stakeholder, manager, national homelessness project)

The 2001 Act was important because it introduced a legal mechanism known as ‘Section 5’ (S5) through which LAs could request RSLs to house a homeless person. The 2001 act also introduced the mechanism for establishing a ‘Single Regulatory Framework’ (SRF) with Communities Scotland assuming the role of regulator. The 2003 Act consolidated provisions around priority need, firstly in extending the definitions of priority need groups; and secondly it set the timescales and key milestones for abolishing the priority need test by 31st December 2012. The Scottish Executive also published different pieces of guidance to accompany the 2001 and 2003 Acts. In 2002, they produced the ‘Guidance on Homelessness Strategies’ followed by the ‘Code of Guidance on Homelessness’ in 2005.

The ‘Homelessness Monitoring Group’ (HMG), set up by the Scottish Executive, was convened from 2002 to 2006 and again from 2007. The HMG had a significant role in developing policy. Firstly, the group was charged with ensuring that the work of the HTF was taken forward. Secondly they monitored the implementation of the new legislative
measures established through the 2001 Act. Thirdly, they set out national outcomes to cover areas such as rough sleeping and prevention, for example rough sleeper counts were added into Scottish data collections by the Scottish Executive. This data collection, like others, had its limitations as it only captured the number of households indicating that they had slept rough the night before their presentation. In 2002/03, the average number of rough sleepers recorded was 443, which by 2007 had reduced to 285. Other Scottish methods for monitoring rough sleeping included RSI services by Glasgow Homelessness Network (GHN). George Street Research carried out bi-annual surveys between 2001 and 2003 in which they asserted the target was met overall (George Street Research, 2003, p9) even though they also indicated regional variations existed in which people were sleeping rough.

In 2006/07, as part of the preparation for the priority need abolition, the Scottish Executive provided £230,000 to establish eight prevention innovation projects. As well as testing new prevention approaches, the funding covered an evaluation of the projects’ effectiveness. Although the evaluation indicated the programme was limited in its scope (Sharp and Robertson, 2008), it was important because it reinforced the Executive’s commitment to tackling homelessness in different ways.

3.5 Consolidation of Scottish homelessness systems and the abolition of priority need (2007 onwards)

From 2007 to date, the Scottish National Party (SNP) formed the government in Scotland, twice as a minority administration (2007 to 2011 and 2015 to date). They continued to implement the previous administrations’ homelessness agenda with regards to the abolition of priority need. They also continued to encourage joint working approaches to tackling homelessness. The new Scottish Government largely replicated the previous administrations’ methods for framing national policy developments (legislation, guidance and working groups) such as a second iteration of the Homelessness Monitoring Group established in 2007 to monitor progress against national outcomes and towards the 2012 target.

However, the Scottish Government diverged from previous administrations regarding policy matters. An example of this being the changes made to The Local Housing Strategy (LHS) framework in which homelessness and support strategies were reintegrated into a single strategic framework in attempts to make better use of the whole housing
market and housing assets, including through joint working arrangements between Local Authorities and other housing providers. The Scottish Government also made significant changes in the ways in which it formed its relationship with local government. One of the national informants provided an outline of these arrangements worked in practice:

If they [Scottish Government] are thinking about a new policy, reviewing an existing policy... they want to make sure I guess that they don’t go too far down the road without having the local government input. (National stakeholder, local government body)

The Concordat
The ‘Concordat’, introduced in November 2007, was an agreement between the Scottish Government and the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (CoSLA), the national membership body safeguarding the interests of local authorities. The form of the new relationship was set out in the Concordat document (2007):

....it [Scottish Government] will stand back from micro-managing service delivery, thus reducing bureaucracy and freeing up local authorities and their partners to meet the varying local needs and circumstances across Scotland. (2007, p1)

The Concordat was drawn up as part of the Scottish Government’s spending review and the measures it set out (‘The Package’) included the ‘Single Outcome Agreement’. This was the mechanism whereby each local authority set out their plans and costs for meeting the requirements of the ‘National Performance Framework’ (a series of high level targets, national outcomes, indicators and targets). One of the national indicators focused on the abolition of the priority need test ‘All unintentionally homeless households will be entitled to settled accommodation by 2012.’ (2007, p11). This goal influenced the way that homelessness was tackled strategically at local level.

The Scottish Government also introduced a new regulatory framework for housing in which the Scottish Housing Regulator (SHR) became the body tasked with monitoring the performance of social landlords in delivering services including the statutory homelessness duties. The Regulator measured performance against the ‘Scottish Social Housing Charter’ (the Charter) and through qualitative thematic studies and other enquiries.
**Prevention, early intervention and person-centred approaches**

The Scottish Government and CoSLA published the ‘Prevention of Homelessness Guidance’ in 2009. The Guidance set out the connections homelessness prevention had with other government priorities. Firstly, the achievement of the 2012 target (the abolition of the priority need distinction) and secondly, the adoption of the principles of ‘early intervention’ (a key objective underpinning the SG’s overall programme for government):

*Preventing homelessness through early intervention can contribute to all five strategic objectives by promoting equality, reducing costs by improving efficiency, improving health and wellbeing and supporting and empowering individuals and local communities* (2009, p3)

One national informant spoke about the practice of prevention and its value, as well as a recognition of how this work needed to develop further:

*There is a need to get better at preventing homelessness, as well as ensuring that help and support is available for people whose homes are already at risk.* (National Stakeholder, voluntary sector agency)

Early intervention, within the context of homelessness prevention, was described as ‘services provided to support the person and their environment before incipient problems or disputes escalate beyond repair.’ (2009, p11). The Guidance also identified relationships between homelessness prevention, notions of housing options and person-centred approaches (rather than process driven), where housing options was described as ‘a “diagnostic” approach’ (2009, p 17) in which:

*a personal housing plan can be developed and agreed with the applicant, which more clearly lays out how their housing needs can best be met.* (2009, ibid)

Housing options approaches had been in place in England and Wales since 2003 (Pawson et al, 2007). In 2010, the Scottish Government consolidated its interest in these approaches (Scottish Government, 2008 and 2009) by setting up a national structure to support the development of housing options. Implementing a national approach to housing options at this time supported the implementation of the 2012 target because it attempted to mitigate the pressures local authorities faced as a result of declining stock (Fitzpatrick et al, 2015).
2012 to 2017

2012 was a significant year for two reasons, firstly, the provisions in the Homeless Etc. (Scotland) Act 2003 to abolish the priority need test were implemented and secondly, the Scottish Parliament passed secondary legislation in relation to housing support services.

Since the 31st December 2012, local authorities have had a duty to provide settled accommodation to any person assessed as being unintentionally homeless. As such this date particularly significant for the Scottish homelessness sector (Cameron and Balfour, 2012; Fitzpatrick et al, 2012; Anderson and Serpa, 2013) in that it strengthened the principles of rights based approaches. It afforded greater rights, firstly to settled accommodation for homeless households who previously had not had that entitlement (mainly single people) and secondly, its eradication reduced the number of tests to which homeless people were subjected to prove their entitlement. Although three of the original tests set out in 1977 are still operational, that is whether a person is homeless, whether it is intentional and is there a local connection. Although the removal of the last two was enacted through the 2003 Act, to date these changes have not been brought into force.

‘The Housing Support Services (Homelessness) (Scotland) Regulations 2012’ placed a statutory housing support duty on local authorities to assess the housing support needs of households assessed as homeless and provide (or commission) support where there was an identified need. Its implementation however did not cover households adjudged as intentionally homeless, although that position may be indicative of people needing support. Indeed, practice to a certain degree remained unchanged (Shelter, 2012; Fitzpatrick et al, 2015)

The last key marker to consider in this section was the introduction of the Health and Social Care integration agenda. The notion of integrated public services emerged from the Christie Commission, established in 2010, as part of the wider public sector (and welfare state) reform agenda (and relating to the 2007 Concordat). As Health and Social Care partnerships were to become responsible for adult social care, this agenda potentially had an impact on homelessness services. Two national stakeholders had different perceptions about the bearing of this new policy, the first seeing it as a way to widen service access to homeless people:

*Sometimes it is not even primarily a housing problem and I am really hoping that we can embed in the commissioning processes of the new partnerships that homeless people are entitled to a joined-up service, not just from housing but from social care*
and health both primary care and acute, for people who find it difficult to register
with GPs. (National stakeholder, local government body)

The second informant had a more cautious perception of how it would come together:

There’s been a gradual but very significant culture change in the way we approach
homelessness, the way we understand homelessness which has been really well
embedded in LAs and I think that same culture change will take time to be embedded
in the new arrangements. (National stakeholder, voluntary sector homelessness
organisation)

3.6 Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter was to identify and detail key markers in the development of
the Scottish homelessness system. The chapter has elaborated on how the role played by
the Church in historical provisions for vulnerable people, was taken over and transformed
by the State into a system with specific responsibilities for affording homeless people their
rights. However, the chapter also showed that when the formal arrangements between
State and Church ended, religious influences continued with the development of FBOs and
the contributions they made to homelessness services.

The chapter has also shown that in the modern era, from 1977 onwards, the homelessness
system had a legislative framework formed by the Housing (Homeless Person’s) Act 1977
and supported in Scotland by the Housing (Scotland) Act 2001 and the Homelessness etc
(Scotland) Act 2003. The Housing (Homeless Persons) Act 1977 was the most significant
marker of this period as it provided an explicit right to rehousing for homeless households
assessed as having a priority.

Further, the chapter described key initiatives managed by national and local government
(sometimes through non-statutory means) to tackle particular issues (such as rough
sleeping) or promote particular responses (prevention projects). The Supporting People
programme, enshrined in legislation, was significant for homeless households because it
introduced new definitions of vulnerability which were different to those set out for the
priority test in homelessness legislation.
From Urban Aid funding in the 1960s and RSI programmes emerging in the 1990s to Supporting People and prevention funds in the twenty-first century, successive governments provided funding to support the development of different services including those that ran parallel to the statutory framework. These programmes were underpinned by a growing focus on cross sector collaborations to plan and deliver public services that could achieve positive outcomes for homeless people and therefore meet national objectives around improving peoples’ life chances. This increased focus on collaborations gave greater prominence to voluntary/third sector organisations (including FBOs) and meant that the statutory homeless system has developed in different ways to other functions such as health, education and social work which remain largely within state control.

This chapter has detailed the formation of the statutory homelessness sector and highlighted the increasing role of the voluntary sector in this system. We now turn to consider the contributions that FBOs, in particular, make to homelessness services.
Chapter four: The evolution of faith-based involvement in UK and Scottish homelessness services

4.1 Introduction

Faith-based organisations, as distinct entities separate from institutional religious organisations, started to emerge as the involvement of the Church in early welfare provisions diminished in the mid to late nineteenth century. Since that time, FBOs have developed and evolved in the ways that they make contributions to homelessness services.

The purpose of this chapter is to consider the ways in which FBOs in the UK, with particular reference to Scotland, have developed provisions for people in need and whether these activities are recognisable as practical applications of ‘faith in action’.

There are six sections in this chapter. Sections 4.2 to 4.4 set out key developments within three key time periods (up to 1977, 1977 to 1997, and 1997 onwards). The current contributions that FBOs make to specific service types – including street-based services, day services, accommodation-based services – are described in section 4.5. Section 4.6 concludes the chapter by drawing together the key points.

4.2 The formation of faith based social care (up to 1977)

This section highlights the emergence of organisations with a faith base whose purpose was different from the Church and State which had managed and delivered ‘Poor Law’ provisions. In his examination of the historical links between religious institutions and social work, Bowpitt (1998) highlights an early instance of this divergence in the eighteenth century:

*The Strangers' Friend Societies became a network of charities based on local Methodist circuits which attempted to provide emergency relief to those who, having migrated to the industrial towns, lost all claim on the Poor Law locally, and who were thereby rendered destitute.* (1998, p680)

Different types of faith based social services emerged in the nineteenth century with organisations including the Glasgow City Mission established by David Nasmith in 1826 and the St Vincent De Paul Society in Paris set up by Frédéric Ozanam in 1833. The Mission to Seafarers was created by John Ashely in 1836 and the YMCA in 1844 by
George Williams, with William Booth responsible for establishing The Salvation Army in 1865. These were different from the Church’s role in poor relief provisions in two ways. Firstly, they were formed by individuals who wanted to provide social care as part of a response to personal belief rather than working for the religious institutions to which they adhered; and secondly, they tried to provide different services to those that the Church had traditionally provided through the poor laws.

In the 1960s and 70s, new campaigns raising the profile of homelessness sat alongside innovations in service provision. Faith bases featured directly and indirectly in this movement. The Catholic Housing Aid Society’s Advice and Information centres established a new type of service in 1961. The campaigning group Shelter was set up in 1966, by a minister of religion, Bruce Kenrick. Other non-faith based service providers availed themselves of the assets of faith communities, for example the first night shelters of the Simon Community in Edinburgh, (1967) and the Aberdeen Cyrenians (1968) operated in buildings owned by faith communities. St Mungo’s (1969), a secular organisation, chose a religious name. Faith influences were found in the origin of housing associations as well during this time. As large stock holders in Scotland, these Registered Social Landlords have a role to play in the homelessness sector. An informant noted that a housing association in their experience ‘was set up nearly 50 years ago by a priest and had a Christian name’ (National stakeholder, local government body).

In this period, it is evident that the faith bases were already evolving, moving from the large instruments of Church and State, to smaller organisations making various contributions.

4.3 The contributions of FBOs within the new statutory homelessness system (1977-1997)

The Housing (Homeless Persons) Act 1977 introduced a statutory definition of homelessness and duties placed upon local authorities. The duties were placed on the ‘housing authority’ thus moving homelessness away from general social services provision. The 1977 Act established a state managed homelessness framework, although single homeless people were not recognised as a priority group (Foord et al, 1998, May et al, 2003). State provision in this period was changing, with moves to different accommodation models delivered by non-state providers to replace resettlement units.
The scope for faith based services was ever present in systems that continued to marginalise single homeless people, a point reflected on by one informant:

_Years ago, really the only provision was faith based organisations, charities and churches who provided a safety net for vulnerable people you know._ (National stakeholder, homelessness membership organisation)

New forms of faith based contributions included umbrella organisations supporting Christian homelessness service providers, smaller units of hostel based provision, and refurbishments of large hostels (May et al, 2003). The Church of England introduced a strategic approach to ‘faith in action’ in the publication of ‘Faith in the City’ (1985), a report concerned with social exclusion and societal gaps which advocated for change in its own structures and in how government addressed the issues (Dinham, 2008).

The Rough Sleepers Initiative (RSI), established in 1990 (Anderson, 1993, 2007; Wilson, 2014) as a co-ordinated response to rough sleeping, created opportunities for the involvement of faith-based organisations as service providers. Firstly, because local authorities (as the fund holders) relied heavily on the voluntary sector (which included faith-based organisations) for its implementation (Warnes et al, 2003, Wilson, 2014). Secondly, RSI funded services such as outreach and street work, resettlement, shelters, day-centres and different accommodation units (Crane and Warnes, 2000; Warnes et al, 2003; Fitzpatrick, et al, 2005) were the service models preferred by faith-based organisations. However, RSI challenged faith practitioners by introducing structural differences in the way that services were delivered, including assertive approaches in outreach services (Randall and Brown, 2006, p31), service interventions with an emphasis on actively changing the lives of homeless people (Warnes et al 2003; May et al, 2003), or physically moving people off the street (Foord et al, 1998). The RSI programmes with services for rough sleepers included the Edinburgh City Mission Care Van (Johnsen et al, 2002c), the Glasgow City Mission, the Lodging House Mission (Morrison, 2003) and the Wayside Daycentre in Glasgow (Fitzpatrick et al, 2005).

FBOs continued to emerge in this period including local church action groups and faith networks, with the potential for collaborative action. Service developments within these groups also indicate service progression, for example the All Souls Local Action Network (ASLAN) in London provided a basic tea run in the late 1980s, later establishing social activities and then visiting support. Churches Action for the Homeless (CATH) in Perth
showed a similar pattern, starting with a soup kitchen in 1991, then a Day Centre in 1995, before working in partnership with Perth and Kinross Council through the council’s Local Housing Strategy. The Rock Trust, a secular organisation in Edinburgh, was set up in 1991 by the congregations from a group of churches who wanted to support young homeless people. Like other organisations with faith histories, the Rock Trust now operates on a secular basis (their objectives and personnel are no longer required to have a live religious commitment) and currently delivers various forms of transitional accommodation. Scottish Churches Housing Action (SCHA), set up in 1994, is a multi-faith organisation supporting other faith organisations involved in homeless services.

Once again, in this period, FBOs were active in making contributions to services supporting single homeless people. Service providers that emerged to fill a perceived gap moved on to innovating new services. In addition to this, there was a growth in the focus on broader outward action and capacity building through local and national church housing/homelessness action groups.

4.4 Neoliberal politics and opportunities for faith-based contributions (1997 onwards)

The manifesto priorities laid out by the Labour party which formed the Government in 1997, included reforming the welfare state (Powell, 2001). The new Labour Government adopted a neoliberal approach along with a rhetoric of the ‘Third Way’ (Giddens, 1998, Esping Andersen et al, 2001; Powell, 2001; Peck and Tickell, 2002) to support their achievement of this aim. The approach included embracing non-state service provision which the previous Conservative Government had encouraged (through legislation) and which Kendall and Knapp (2000) noted as being:

...a policy of supply-side diversification, although the language of competition and market forces has been replaced with that of co-operation and partnership. (2000, p9)

General changes to working relationships between government and third sector organisations as a result of neoliberal policies also included FBOs (Lowndes and Chapman, 2005; Jamoul and Wills, 2008; Cloke et al, 2009; Cloke et al, 2010).
An example of joined up approaches between government (national and local) and third sector organisations was found in the introduction of Supporting People in 2003. FBOs operating in Scotland were also commissioned through the Supporting People programme, making contributions through supported housing, floating support, outreach and advocacy, mixed accommodation types, and services for single homeless women (SG HouseKey, 2014). Examples of national faith organisations funded to support homeless people through Supporting People in Scotland included the Church of Scotland’s Cross Reach agency and The Salvation Army. The former provided different forms of accommodation and the latter, resettlement services, accommodation and visiting support (SG HouseKey, 2014).

4.5 Faith based contributions to specific service types

In this section, consideration is given to four broad service types in which contemporary FBOs make contributions to single homelessness. A distinction is made between those that are: ‘street based’, including outreach and soup runs; ‘accommodation based’, comprising hostels and shelters; ‘day services’, incorporating day and drop in centres and soup kitchens; and ‘rehabilitation and recovery’ programmes focussing on homeless people with substance misuse problems. Although each element will be considered in turn, connections between them should be noted. Outreach work, for example, may be delivered on the street/through soup runs, in a day centre or as part of a hostel service (Warnes et al, 2003).

**Street based single homelessness services**

Street based services are forms of provision, for example outreach work and soup runs, delivered to single homeless people on the streets and in different locations. They are delivered at points of crisis or as a mechanism of sustained connection (Randall and Brown, 2006). Street based services that make no demands on service users may offer safety nets for those who do not/will not engage with, or mistrust, formal services or are isolated by their homelessness (Warnes et al, 2003; Lane and Power, 2009), but there remains some debate regarding whether such ‘unconditional’ forms of service delivery may facilitate harmful street lifestyles (Watts et al, 2017).

Street outreach and soup runs offer services to people with different issues such as health, housing crisis, domestic abuse (Foord et al, 1998, Jones and Pleace, 2010) or those wanting basic sustenance (Lane and Power, 2009). Street based workers may visit sites associated
with the homeless/rough sleepers, to provide them with advice and information, or signpost them to other services (Foord et al, 1998, Jones and Pleace, 2005). Although street based by definition, workers regularly operating in specific areas connect to other service locations, for example GPs/health bases, prisons, schools and other service delivery points such as day centres and shelters run by voluntary organisations (Warnes et al, 2003). Spread throughout the UK (Johnsen et al, 2002a, b and c), their distribution is somewhat uneven including in large cities (LHF Atlas, 2013).

Street based services have evolved gradually, the antecedents of outreach work and soup runs perhaps being found in the outdoor relief delivered to the poor outwith workhouses. Soup runs are a basic form of food distribution where typically the organisation uses a van to dispense soup and other basic necessities in different locations at night time (Lane and Power, 2009). The development of soup runs demonstrates some continuity with historical food distribution practices (May et al, 2003), including that of The Salvation Army in the early twentieth century (Warnes et al, 2003). Changes include moves into newer governance and practice frameworks so that some soup runs operate as part of local networks, collaborate with local project outreach staff services, signpost homeless people to other services and are involved in local government street counts (Warnes et al, 2003, Lane and Power, 2009). Contemporary soup runs support not only rough sleepers, but also vulnerable people other than the homeless, such as EU migrants and formerly homeless people (Warnes et al, 2003, Lane and Power, 2009).

Outreach work, now often part of strategic frameworks and in receipt of government funding, has changed significantly in some contexts since the 1980s and through the rough sleeping initiatives of the 1990s/2000s (May et al, 2003, Warnes et al, 2003). Policy initiatives such as ‘No Second Night Out’ (DCLG, 2011), a form of outreach used to preempt sustained episodes of rough sleeping, attempted to reconnect homeless people to previous support networks in planned ways (Warnes et al, 2003, Jones and Pleace, 2010). Outreach work has also been reformed with the emergence of ‘assertive outreach’ through rough sleeping or other government backed programmes (Phillips and Parsell, 2012). This form of outreach includes sustained efforts to engage with the person, to encourage them to move away them from rough sleeping and into accommodation (Murray and Johnsen, 2011; Phillips and Parsell, 2012; Johnsen et al, 2016), including the use of resettlement workers (Foord et al, 1998). Assertive outreach in England has been used in conjunction with ‘Building Based Services’ a policy initiative which focuses on efforts to persuade
homeless people they are better served off the streets (Lane and Power, 2009, Broadway/City of London, undated).

FBOs and secular organisations both deliver street based services of outreach and soup runs for single homeless people and former homeless people (Johnsen et al, 2002c, LHF Atlas, 2013). There are FBO outreach services that have integrated into larger service frameworks whilst soup runs remain nearer the periphery of other structures, as well as being part of new food distribution chains arising as a result of welfare cuts, austerity measures and continued EU migration (Sosenko et al, 2013). Some FBO contributions have evolved from a foundation of operating soup runs (Johnsen, 2014).

**Buildings based services for single homeless people**

Day services typically comprise a range of provisions and activities which may be delivered within day centres or drop-in facilities. Day centres may provide basic living amenities including showers, laundry facilities and food, as well as leisure and social activities (Homeless Link, 2004; Warnes et al, 2003). There are different ways in which day centres operate, for example through an open-door policy or agency referral systems (Johnsen et al, 2002a and 2005). These differences may be determined by their development, current context and the clients they support, for example wet centres for people with alcohol issues or the converse, dry houses in which substance use is banned (Johnsen et al, 2002a, Homeless Link, 2004, Randall and Brown, 2006). Day centres operate different hours which range from opening a few hours a week on set days to access throughout the day (Johnsen et al, 2002a, LHF Atlas, 2013). Where part of a wider service structure, day centres may open for most week days, whilst those found within less formal settings or operating independently may open for a particular activity or for two or three days a week (Warnes et al, 2003, GHN, 2005).

If day centres are funded by the state/local authority or they are part of local strategic frameworks, it is likely they will have to carry out monitoring and regulatory requirements (Johnsen et al, 2002a Homeless Link, 2004). Independent organisations may have a steering group or management board to oversee structures for safeguarding the people using the centre and workers (paid and volunteers), such as health and safety policies, training (Housing Justice, 2009).

There are some examples of day centres with a long history, for example the Glasgow City Mission, established in 1826, but the majority have more recent origins including those set
up through rough sleeping programmes and other government initiatives, for example the ‘Buildings Based Scheme’ and Hostels Capital Improvement Programme (HCIP) (Johnsen et al, 2002a, Randall and Brown, 2006, Lane and Power, 2009, Jones and Pleace, 2010).

Day centres and drop-ins are typically run by voluntary organisations and FBOs, with many of them also having previous connections to religious organisations (Johnsen et al, 2002a; Johnsen with Fitzpatrick, 2009; LHF Atlas 2013). FBOs may actively seek provision types based on notions of hospitality and therefore run day centres and drop-ins where clients who have low support needs are provided with general advice and information and social support. Day centre services, like street based services, demonstrate evolving contributions as well, for example in hosting food banks/aid which includes faith based providers (Sosenko et al, 2013) or being part of local service networks (Johnsen et al, 2002a).

Day centres may also subscribe to models which incorporate more specialised services based on ‘meaningful activity’ focusing on engaging clients in tasks and learning opportunities which support their personal development, well-being and the potential of sustainable outcomes (Homeless Link, 2004, Jones and Pleace, 2005). This form of support includes adult education classes, training courses and employability/other forms of specialist advice (Johnsen et al, 2002a, Homeless Link, 2004, Jones and Pleace, 2005, Randall and Brown, 2006). The ‘Crisis Skylight’ training centres (which also involve faith services) are an example of how day centres might shift their focus from providing basic support services to ‘meaningful activities’ leading to qualifications (Homeless Link, 2004, Jones and Pleace, 2010). The latter element may be provided through external facilities such as colleges (Randall and Brown, 2006).

Buildings based services may also offer access to recovery programmes for people who have issues with substance misuse (drug and alcohol). This may be part of complex, chronic or entrenched homelessness (Tsemberis et al, 2004; Wilson, 2017) although their presence alone may not cause homelessness (Randall and Brown, 2002; Fitzpatrick et al, 2011). Recovery programmes though, also support people with substance issues who may not be/have been homeless as well (Tondora and Davidson, 2006; Pleace, 2008). The structure of recovery programmes varies and include one-to-one support meetings, peer-led activities such as mentors and mutual aid groups (White and Kurtz, 2006), and residential rehabilitation settings (Nealon-Woods et al, 1995). However, there is a common principle underlying these different elements, that is, recovery processes are personal and should
provide the individual with choice about what form their recovery takes and the support they require (Tondora and Davidson, 2006).

**Accommodation based services**

Different forms of temporary/emergency accommodation were identified in the literature reviews of faith-based homelessness provision. Many FBOs deliver hostel accommodation as part of statutory and non-statutory provision. Access to hostels varies with some being direct-access or referral-based (Pleace and Quilgars, 2003), meaning that service users could only access these through the local authority. Traditional large-scale hostels were based in large old-fashioned buildings with dormitory style sleeping quarters, accommodating high numbers of people (Morrison, 2003), but these have increasingly been replaced by smaller units providing private rooms (Fitzpatrick et al, 2015; May et al 2005). Hostels are provided by a mix of (larger) faith-based and secular organisations (Johnsen et al 2002b; Johnsen, 2014).

Supported accommodation, also temporary in nature, started to emerge and was increasingly used in re-provisioning resulting from hostel closures programmes such as in Glasgow from 2003 to 2008 (Fitzpatrick et al, 20110). The newer units were normally smaller in size with residents generally having their own room with communal space. It was a model of accommodation which was viewed as preparing people for independent living (Kennedy et al, 2001). The provision of life skills learning and leisure activities supported that aim. As a transitional model of accommodation with support, this form of accommodation has been widely used for young homeless people (Quilgars et al, 2008). FBOs (large and small) have been involved in delivering supported accommodation services (McDonald, 2011, SG HouseKey, 2014).

Another form of accommodation based services are night shelters, which are very basic spaces, only open at night and offering overnight accommodation, or in cold weather conditions (Johnsen et al, 2002b). Some night shelters limit the number of consecutive nights a person can access them. Spaces are generally available to people who cannot/do not want to access other forms of accommodation (Warnes et al, 2003). Clients are provided with beds or bedding for the night along with basic food provision. Winter shelters tend to operate nightly over a short season (from around November to March) (Johnsen et al, 2002b). As with other forms of homeless accommodation, night shelters may be direct access or part of an inter-agency referral system. Faith based services make significant contributions to the provision of homeless accommodation and, in particular,
shelter programmes (May et al, 2003; Johnsen with Fitzpatrick, 2009). Shelter programmes are delivered by organisations operating individually or through partnering arrangements between churches and charities.

Accommodation services faced criticism for different reasons. The size and poor living conditions and the limited outcomes achieved in large scale hostels saw the implementation of programmes for hostel closures for example, as mentioned above, the Glasgow hostel closure programme (Tate et al, 2001, Fitzpatrick et al, 2010). Within the current hostel models, concerns remain about homeless people being surrounded by other vulnerable people (May et al, 2003). Night shelters also have their critics, because of their differences to other forms of homeless accommodation (Jones and Pleace, 2005; Johnsen with Fitzpatrick, 2009). As they are based in church halls which are not designed for sleeping, homeless people using them lack private or homely space (May et al, 2003, p23).

Like other emergency accommodation, they are short stay (evening entry to morning departure), which means that people have to move on during the day and unlike some forms of emergency accommodation, they may not signpost services or make inter-agency referral systems or connections to day centres (Lane and Power, 2005).

4.6 Conclusion

This chapter has drawn on literature to show how FBO contributions to UK, and especially Scottish, homelessness systems have evolved. Churches and faith organisations have a long history of supporting vulnerable people, including those who are homeless (Johnsen, 2014), and therefore organisations operating within voluntary/third sector service environments often have some form of a faith provenance as noted by one of the national stakeholders interviewed:

\textit{Faith organisations were the roots of the voluntary sector and many organisations have histories that reflect that. It’s in the nature of FBOs to get engaged in voluntary sector activities.} (National stakeholder, voluntary sector body)

The development paths of FBOs vary, some have chosen to remain small scale, offering access to their services as part of a wider religious commitment to social action, such as
soup runs or church based food distribution points and are reliant solely or predominantly on donations, use of religious buildings and volunteers from congregations.

On the other hand, some FBOs have diversified and provide a higher number or specialist services (resettlement, recovery) and do this by generating income through public funding. Where organisations have entered into public sector contracting arrangements, they have become more ‘professionalised’ to ensure they have the structures necessary to comply with the requirements of public sector contracting arrangements.

Despite these different development trajectories, FBOs as a whole, have retained an interest in providing basic services through day-centres, drop ins, food distribution points and soup runs which are high volume and low intensity in nature (Johnsen with Fitzpatrick, 2009). The appropriateness of all of these forms of provision is a source of ongoing debate within the homelessness sector in the UK (Bowpitt et al., 2013; Watts et al., 2017).

This chapter has focused on examining the ways in which faith-based organisations have evolved in the UK (and Scotland in particular). Chapter five below considers theological principles upon which FBOs might develop their organisational ethos and operations and which might influence their thinking about which types of services to deliver.
Chapter five: An introduction to theology and religious teachings

5.1 Introduction
The focus of this thesis is to examine the contributions made by FBOs in service provision for single homeless people in Scotland. Chapter 3 detailed the early role that the Church had in administering the poor law provisions the UK.

The purpose of this chapter is to provide the broad theological context for the research by examining the prevalence of different religious groupings in the UK; consider how the main religious systems of belief in the UK (the monotheistic 'Abrahamic' faiths) are constructed and conveyed to adherents; and to examine how practical theologies seek to apply religious principles in specific contexts such as poverty, social need and homelessness.

The chapter is structured as follows. Section 5.2 uses census analysis to highlight key points about the prevalence of religious persuasions in the UK. Section 5.3 focuses on the core tenets of the Abrahamic faiths. Section 5.4 outlines different forms of religious teachings within these monotheistic faiths. Section 5.5 considers practical theologies and their attempts to construct religious meaning in public spheres. Section 5.6 concludes the chapter.

5.2 Religious belief in the UK

Since 2001, UK censuses have contained a voluntary question about religion (in England and Wales) and religion and denomination (Scotland and Northern Ireland). National reports analysing responses, published in 2005 and 2011 (covering Scotland) allow comparison of changes between 2001 and 2011.

In 2011, a Christian affiliation was reported by 59% of the total population in England and Wales, which was 13% fewer than in 2001. The second largest religious group in 2011 was Muslims at 5%, showing a two percentage point increase from 2001. A quarter of the population in England and Wales indicated having no religion, an increase of 10 percentage points from 2001.

In 2011, a Christian affiliation was reported by 59% of the total population in England and Wales, which was 13% fewer than in 2001. The second largest religious group in 2011 was Muslims at 5%, showing a two percentage point increase from 2001. A quarter of the population in England and Wales indicated having no religion, an increase of 10 percentage points from 2001.

The census analysis in Northern Ireland reports on groupings, ‘Catholic’, ‘Protestant and Other Christian’, ‘No religion/not stated’ and ‘other religion’. In 2011, 41% of the population indicated a Catholic affiliation, which was a marginal increase of 0.4% from
2001. Also in 2011, 42% recorded an affiliation to Protestant/other Christian religion, a decrease of four percentage points from 2001. 17% of the population indicated no religious affiliation or did not state a religious affiliation, an increase of three percentage points from 2001.

The Scottish report indicated that, in 2011, 2.8 million people or 54% of the total population stated they belonged to a Christian denomination (a decrease of 11 percentage points since 2001). Over one third (37%) of the Scottish population (1.9 million people) stated that they had no religion, an increase of 9 percentage points from 2001. People recording that they had no religious affiliation was the single highest group in Scotland because the Christian denominations were split into three categories, with 32 per cent of the Scottish population (1.7 million people) indicating that they belonged to the Church of Scotland (a drop of ten percentage points from 2001); 16 per cent (0.8 million) stating that they were Roman Catholic (the same proportion as in 2001); and the ‘Other Christian’ group accounted for 6 per cent (0.3 million) of the population in 2011, a one percentage point decrease since 2001. The number of people in Scotland indicating that they were Muslim rose to 1.4% in 2011, an increase of more than half a percentage point from 2001. People in Scotland who reported that they were part of the Jewish community was less than 0.1% (6000), indicating a slight decrease in the proportion.

As the census questions about religion are voluntary, reports can only act as indicative of the prevalence of religious positions rather than providing absolutes. The growth in the number of people who have no religious affiliation or those who hold a non-Christian affiliation, such as Muslim, Buddhist, Hindu and Sikh shows evidence of a growing religious and non-religious pluralism in the UK.

5.3 Monotheistic belief systems

The ‘Abrahamic Faiths’

This section focuses on the religions of Christianity, Islam and Judaism, collectively known as the ‘Abrahamic Faiths’ (Haynes, 1995, Turner, 2010), which share important similarities in the construction of their belief systems. Armstrong (2001) asserts that Muhammad’s message was ‘the same as that of Abraham, Moses, David, Solomon or Jesus’ (2002, p7).

The ‘Abrahamic Faiths’ are monotheistic, which means their belief systems are based on worshipping one God. This message is conveyed to Christians through the Bible and in
particular the New Testament ‘In the beginning was the Word, the Word was with God and the Word was God’.’ (John 1:1), to Muslims through the Qur’an ‘Thee (alone) we worship; Thee (alone) we ask for help.’ (Qur’an 1:5) and to Jews through the Old Testament ‘You shall have no other gods to rival me.’ (Exodus 20:3).

The three religions all have sacred texts that are considered as being the word of God. In Christianity, there is the Bible (Old and New Testaments), in Islam the Qur’an, and in Judaism the Torah. Each of these religions uphold that certain characters have an elevated position in relation to God. In Christianity, Jesus is believed to be ‘God Incarnate’ (John 10:30). In Islam, Mohammed is viewed as the vessel for God’s word. In Judaism, Abram became known as Abraham ‘father of many nations’ because it is believed that he received the covenant directly from God (Genesis 17: 1-7), and Moses is thought to have received the ten commandments directly from God (Exodus 20: 1-17).

The religions of Christianity, Islam and Judaism all have denominations or branches. The basis of these sub divisions include: different interpretations of religious texts and doctrines; geographical location; the understanding of leadership; and how worship is conducted (O’Callaghan, 2010). Baptists, Methodists, Anglicans, Episcopalian and Presbyterian are amongst the Christian denominations in the UK that have emerged at different stages since the Reformation (Chadwick, 1995). There are orthodox, conservative and reformed branches of Judaism (O’Callaghan, 2010). Reformation and conservatism also feature in the branches of Islam (Armstrong, 2002; O’Callaghan, 2010). The Sunni (the most prominent branch of Islam in the UK) and Shi’a are examples of the branches of Islam with different understandings of the history of their leadership, or as O’Callaghan (2010) states, ‘who they thought should have succeeded Muhammad’ (2010, p58).

**Constructing a divine being**

Monotheism constructs both a single omnipotent (and transcendent) divine being that is presented as unknowable, or as Paul writes to the Romans ‘who has ever known the mind of the Lord?’ (Romans 11:34), and a belief in a divine entity that is close by (or ‘immanent’) and governs everyday life and the principles by which people live. It might be expected that these two concepts would be considered theological counterparts as they convey a message that the divine nature is multi-dimensional. However, Benedict XVI (2009) speaks about them as competing forces or ‘a choice between two types of reasoning: reason open to transcendence or reason closed within immanence.’ (2009, p
This statement could be interpreted as showing concern that deference to ‘Thou’ (a theological reference to a relationship with a transcendent being) is subverted by theologies based on God within (and which may result in social action). It is the ‘state’ of immanence that is of greatest interest to this thesis because of its potential as a motivation for human action. Notions of immanence can be found in sacred texts and other forms of literature.

Where a sense of immanence is conveyed through sacred texts which adherents believe to be the divine word, these statements can be interpreted as showing that God/Allah acts in the world. In Christianity, the theology of God’s incarnation, in which adherents may believe, is that God became human through Jesus, which shows that God is present and involved in the world. Matthew, for example, recounts the prophetic words of Isaiah about Mary’s son ‘whom they will call Immanuel, a name which means God – is – with – us’ (Matthew 1:23). In the Qur’an (2006), writings about human creation include statements of the divine presence in that process ‘We verily created man and We know what his soul whispereth to him, and We are nearer to him than his jugular vein’. (Qur’an 50:16).

Descriptions capturing the notion of God also appear to highlight a process in which the adherent inwardly reflects on the divine proximity as part of their spiritual life. Absolon (1912) describes immanence in Judaism as ‘a belief in a Father that indwells him and indwells the universe’ (1912, p12). In the Old Testament, the Psalmist David writes ‘A word is not on my tongue before you, Yahweh, know all about it.’ (Psalm 139:4). The ‘Carmina Gadelica’ is a book of hymns and incantations from across Scotland. Its author, Carmichael (1940) writes in a daytime prayer ‘In mine own heart may I feel Thy presence’ (1940, vol 111, pp 60-61) and in a night time prayer ‘Keep Thou me in the presence of God’ (1940, vol 111, pp330-331).

Creating a divine image to which adherents can connect requires imagination on the part of religious institutions, because they are trying to convey the other-worldliness of the divine and giving people an image they can believe in. This means that the language used in sacred texts is often archaic and obscure (even when plain English is used as in some modern translations). In the Old Testament, the use of the phrase ‘I am he who is’ (Exodus 3:14) is stated to indicate that God revealed himself to Moses. In the New Testament, John alone (from the four gospel writers) uses the phrase, for example, ‘When you have lifted up the Son of man, then you will know that I am He’ (John 8:28) to advance the theological message from the Old Testament writer by stating that Jesus the human and God are one and the same essence.
One of the methods that has been used to circumvent the problems of opaque language is ascribing the divine with human attributes. In the Old and New Testaments, writers refer to God ‘speaking’ frequently. In the first instance, this is to individuals such as Moses, Abraham, Sarah and David and, secondly, to whole societies where the writer used the first-person singular to convey urgent messages (often concerning divine retribution) as found in Isaiah chapter 14 ‘I shall trample on him on my mountains’ (Isaiah 14:25). In the New Testament, there are instances where this linguistic device emphasises the nature of the divine/Jesus relationship. Mark writes ‘And a voice came from heaven, “You are my Son, the Beloved, my favour rests on you.”’ (Mark 1:11). Creation stories also include anthropomorphic language. In the Qur’an, the human quality of breathing forms a theology of creation in which Allah gives life to humankind for example, ‘So, when I have made him and have breathed into him of My Spirit’ (Qur’an 15:29). The writer of Genesis heralds in the story of the fall with the words ‘The man and his wife heard the sound of Yahweh God walking in the garden’ (my emphasis) (Genesis 3:8). Another Old Testament example of personifying divine attributes is found in a blessing (or the commonly used ‘Benediction’) set out in Numbers ‘May Yahweh show you his face.’ (Numbers 6:26).

5.4 Methods of religious teaching

Religious institutions aim to educate adherents to the relevance of the sacred, abstract, ancient, metaphorical in their tenets of faith within the contexts in which they live (Boeck et al, 2009). Religious teaching is an integral part of that process and happens in places of worship through sermons, prayers, readings and story-telling (Armstrong, 2000, Afriyie, 2009). Churches provide social activities for adults and children which are held in spaces in which religious elements are present. The faithful are supported to build up their knowledge through interest groups (bible study, prayer, peace and justice) (Church of England, 1985). Instruction books, religious letters, speeches and reports are also used in religious teachings. Faith principles may be taught in the home (through religious observations) (O’Callaghan, 2010) and in some schools through curricular activities (Scottish Government, 2011). There are formal ecclesiastical convocations, national and local, where principles and doctrines are debated and agreed upon as well as the ways in which these should be taught (Church of England, 2006).

There are different methods of formal religious instruction found in Christianity, Islam and Judaism. Catechisms are one example found in Catholic, Anglican, Episcopal, and Protestant churches. A catechism outlines key principles and doctrinal matters to guide
adherents (clerics and laity) in the tenets of faith. In Islam, there is the Hadith, a reflection on Muhammad’s life and sayings which is, Siddiqui (2011) argues, ‘attributed either to Muhammad or his companions; hadiths are prophetic in origins not divine like the Qur’an’ (2011, p40). Relating to the Jewish Torah (the first five books in the Old Testament), Friedman et al (2005) note its role in supporting adherents in ‘maintaining their identity as Jews by following Jewish commandments.’ (2005 p82)

When entering into membership of a religious institution, the new adherent is required to make a profession of their faith. The Church of England’s ‘Book of Common Prayer’ contains instructions which the ‘catechumen’ learns prior to their confirmation and during which their understanding of these articles of faith are explored. The sacrament of the Eucharist may accompany confirmation within the Church of England (it is a standard part of the Roman Catholic services), which signifies to adherents that their confirmation is infused with God’s spirit. When joining the Church of Scotland, ‘communicants’ attend classes to learn about the Christian life and beliefs, which they then affirm at the confirmation service. The Shahadah, is a declaration of faith which is used for those wishing to become a Muslim. In Islam, the convert has to learn and understand the meaning of the Shahadah and repeat it publicly three times. As with other faiths, the Shahadah confirms the central tenets of Islam, that there is only one God and Muhammad had an elevated relationship with God. O’ Callaghan (2010) asserts that the Shahadah ‘is a simple sounding statement that reflects a profound spiritual reality’ (2010, p 64). The Jewish Bar/Bat Mitzvah is a rite of passage where a young person moves from childhood to adulthood. It has a deeply held religious sense in that Bar/Bat Mitzvah literally means ‘sons/daughters of the commandments’ which the young person becomes through the ritual. The young people (boys aged 13 and girls aged 12) attend classes to receive instruction about the Torah and must recite passages from it at the ceremony. As with the other rites of passage, an outward symbolism and inward spiritual transformation sit together in the Bar/Bat Mitzvah which Vogel and Reiter (2003) indicate ‘transcends daily life experiences and provides a sense of meaning’ (2003, p 320).

Adherents also receive instruction about modern issues. The Catholic Church’s ‘Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church’ includes a section on human rights. The basis for the stance on human rights is described as ‘the Personalist Principle’, because humans are viewed as the ‘Imago Dei’ (having been created in the image of God). A Church of Scotland report ‘Human rights: what does God require of us? Justice informed by Love’ (Church of Scotland’s ‘Church and Society Council’, 2013) also explores this
Another religious teaching device is the parable or moral story. The parable is typically a narrative, with imagery depicting everyday life situations. The people in these stories normally have to make choices for the betterment (or otherwise) of themselves or others (often strangers). Parables explore a range of themes, for example: love, forgiveness, healing, humility, greed and hardship. In the bible, Mark states ‘He [Jesus] taught them many things in parables’ (Mark 4:2). Parables contain two types of meaning, the first a simple truth imparted through the story and the second in which an aspect of the divine is revealed. This form of instruction is not confined to Christian teaching. Holloway (2001), describing the parable about Lazarus, notes ‘versions of which [parables] are found in various religious traditions’ (2001 p 81).

Religious adherents might be taught that parables have relevance to social issues such as homelessness, for example the ‘Parable of the good Samaritan’ (Luke 10: 29-37) in which Luke casts Jesus as responding to a question about what it means to be a neighbour to someone. The story is about a man is lying at the side of the road, helpless because he has been beaten and robbed. Two men pass by, but a third stopped and saw to the man’s wounds, took him to an inn and gave him money. In the context of homelessness, the parable is widely interpreted as advocating social action and concern for the ‘other’ which is bound within notions of ‘charity’ and ‘hospitality’ commonly regarded as key principles underpinning the practice of FBOs (Johnsen, 2014). In this vein, Christians in Parliament (2013) assert that biblical teachings about love ‘compel believers to action’ where ‘love is a practical response to care for the poor’ (2013, p44).

Religious letters are complex writings used for transmitting tenets of faith (the doctrines, theological principles and history). The earliest form of Christian letters were the Epistles of the New Testament. In his letter to the Romans, Paul writes about the concepts of salvation. He first of all addresses his audience and confirms his status as an apostle before setting out his teaching about salvation (1985, p1308), which is followed by exhortations to the Jewish and Gentile communities to which the letter was directed (1985, p 1319). The structure of the Pauline epistles is emulated in the papal letters of the twenty first century. One of the letters written by Pope Francis in 2014 was addressed ‘To The Christians in the Middle East’. This starts with a statement identifying himself (2014, p1), a greeting (ibid), and ends with an exhortation to the ‘international community to address
your needs and those of other suffering minorities’. (2014, p4). In the letter, the Pope draws attention to the impact of the hostility and conflicts in the area, as well as asserting that the sign of God’s Kingdom is visible in ‘the communion which you experience in fraternity and simplicity’ (2014, p2).

The chapter has concentrated so far on the ways that belief systems are constructed and conveyed within religious settings. In section 5.5 below, consideration is given to practical theologies which seek to teach theological concepts to adherents (and others).

5.5 Practical theologies and religious teaching

‘Practical Theology’ is an academic subject in which students are taught about how religious institutions and individual adherents apply their faith in their own contexts. Practical theologies are a method that people use to construct belief systems for application outwith religious settings (although religious institutions may be involved in their dissemination). Practical theologies are seen by advocates as inclusive of people across all walks of life and from different cultural backgrounds (Latham, 2009).

This form of religious construct merits consideration in the context of this thesis because it can be used to provide guidance to adherents about the applicability of theology in social action which might include those motivated to work in homelessness. One of the national informants drew out the subtleties of this form of theology in practice:

We’ve always been quite clear that this work is not part of evangelisation, we are doing this because this is a gospel imperative. We are not here to win souls for Christ. (National stakeholder, faith based homelessness organisation)

In their study about FBOs, Johnsen with Fitzpatrick (2009) found that adherents they spoke to, thought:

Faith is integral to the motivations underpinning FBO provision, which is regarded as an active response to teachings (shared across many religious traditions) that adherents should actively combat social injustice and care for vulnerable members of society. (2009, p3)
Another of the key informants, from an FBO had a view about the different understanding within regarding the relationship between operational practice and the Bible:

*The scriptural principles of the bible are, seem to be applied by some Xtian organisations more than others, more than charities that are don’t have a spiritual or Xtian ethos. They’ll base sometimes their values and to some extent, their strategy on almost biblical principles. I have no opinion on whether that is a strength or a weakness.* (National stakeholder, manager 2, voluntary sector homelessness provider)

Lancione (2014) also reflects on characteristics of ‘God’s commandments transmitted through the teachings of Jesus’ which are found at ‘the heart of Catholic social interventionism’ (2014, p9).

Interfaith collaborations may be seen as another form of practical theology in which it is argued that bringing different faiths together help people find out about different traditions/viewpoints. Oecumenism (where Churches of different doctrinal traditions work together) were shaped in the 1940’s with the ‘World Council of Churches’ (WCC) established in 1946/48. This was a single international entity to unite different religious perspectives. These new national movements in religious co-operation were then translated to adherents of faith at local level so that they too were learning about belief systems different from their own. The interfaith movement was seen to reduce conflict/misunderstanding (Christians In Parliament, 2013). A Scottish Government report (Scottish Government, 2011) asserts that interfaith work helps ‘to promote understanding, break down prejudice and misunderstanding, reduce discrimination and foster collaborative social action.’ (2011, p6). Pearce (2012) draws together both the above strands indicating that some advocates of interfaith work ‘want to learn more about one another’s religious traditions’ and others take forward the ‘multi-faith character of their localities and engage on this basis with the local authority and other public bodies.’ (2012, p152).

There are two different strands of theological thinking, currently in evidence in the UK, which could be understood as practical theologies, known as ‘urban’ and ‘public’ theologies. Exponents of the former examine how the issues and challenges within an urban context might be explained through theology or addressed by faith. One example of how these processes work are ‘Urban Theology Forums’ which involve practitioners from a variety of church traditions and denominations, third sector associations or community
organisations. There are forums in London (established in 2007), Birmingham (set up in 2008), and Manchester (operating since 2014) and there is an Urban Theology Unit based at Sheffield University. The Church of England (2006) ‘Faithful Cities’ report asserts that theology should work ‘for the good of the city’ (2006, p6). However, they use the term ‘public theology’ which is described as ‘a theological account of the nature of human community’ (2006, p 13), implying a pastoral model of theology which could be applied in other non-urban contexts. Dinham (2008), comparing the standpoints expressed in two reports published by the Church of England, ‘Faith in the City’ (1985) and ‘Faithful Cities’ (2006), questions whether:

...a differently critical eye, one more like that cast by Faith in the City—might ask, why are there areas still in need of regeneration after all this time? Indeed, why is there so much poverty? Is society even more polarised than it was in the 1980s? (2008, p2171)

In the late 1990s, The Church of Scotland started exploring a public theology approach they called ‘Church without Walls’. A report describing its theological principles was presented to the General Assembly in 2001 (Church of Scotland, 2001). The notion of a ‘Church without Walls’ is based on the understanding that the Church was ‘no longer to wait for people to come to us’ (Church of Scotland, 2001, p56). Theologically constructed practices of ‘reaching out’ are also identified by Drummond (2013) who suggests that ‘Christian groups plan outreach that was rooted in the Biblical call to work with the poor’ (2013, p2). This is potentially an important concept in understanding the place of faith based services operating in Scotland who provide outreach or mobile services.

Transporting theology into everyday settings has many historical precedents. The gospels present the mission of Jesus as having taken place in a range of locations (Matthew 4:23 – 25) and in public spaces, for example temple compounds (Mark 11:17), in houses (Luke 5:29) and on hill sides (John 6:3). Andrews (2009), an advocate of ‘urban theology’ wished to ‘recover the theology and practice of Jesus recorded in the gospels’ (2009, p 18).

5.6 Conclusion

This chapter has described how religious affiliations across the UK are recorded in the census, outlined the ways in which belief systems are constructed in relation to the
monotheistic religions (Christianity, Islam and Judaism), introduced basic theological concepts and the methods that religious institutions employ when teaching these to adherents and the attempts to take theology beyond the confines of religious contexts into the wider world. The purpose of this discussion was to provide the broader theological context within which FBOs operate, and help to explain some of the potential motivations for action, and the belief systems underpinning some of the perceptions and attitudes, that those of faith working in homelessness system may possess.

This chapter has therefore established some of the building blocks around religious thinking and how that in turn is translated into institutional activities in which adherents engage. This provides a foundation for understanding the practical outworking of faith and collective ‘faithness’ within FBOs responding to homelessness which is discussed in the next chapter.
Chapter six: Defining and understanding organisational ‘Faithness’

6.1 Introduction

Chapters three to five reviewed the key theoretical debates in relation to three areas of interest to this research. Firstly, in chapter three, the focus of the examination was on literature relating to developments in homelessness systems in the UK with a particular focus on Scotland, where the role of voluntary sector organisations supporting public bodies in responding to homelessness was found to be significant. Secondly, chapter four identified that the contributions made by FBOs (found within the voluntary sector) were largely focused on offering basic support services through day-centres, drop-ins and food distribution points. Thirdly, chapter five explained the theological principles underpinning religious systems, including identifying the methods used by institutions to impart religious meaning (to both adherents and the wider public).

The three literature reviews were therefore instrumental in setting out the overall research objective to examine the relevance, impact and implications of the continuing role of FBOs in the delivery of homelessness services in Scotland. The review of literature covered in chapter four above also indicated a need to further investigate what FBOs were and the contributions they currently made within the Scottish context, thus prompting the first two research questions. Furthermore, the literature covering theological principles (in chapter five) raised questions about how the element of ‘faith’ itself could be described when it was set within an organisational context. Finally, ‘faithness’ was introduced as the key conceptual framework underpinning the research questions identified through the literature reviews.

This chapter establishes the concept of ‘faithness’ as the main analytical lens in this research and how it will be applied. It consists of four further sections. The next, section 6.2, explains how faith-based organisations (FBOs) have been defined and introduces the working definition of FBO applied in this study. Section 6.3 examines the religious values which FBOs may incorporate. Section 6.4 introduces the concept of ‘faithness’ and considers its pertinence to other typologies of faith found in other research. Section 6.5, the conclusion, draws together the chapter’s key points and their relevance to the context of FBOs operating in the Scottish homelessness systems.
6.2 What are FBOs?

The term ‘faith-based organisation’ (FBO) has been used to describe a range of organisations that operate as service providers. Although modern in derivation, the term FBO is also applied to organisations like The Salvation Army and City Missions which emerged in the nineteenth century. Two of the national informants named some organisations they considered to be FBOs:

*There are the official FBOs, the big ones, the Bethanies, Barnados, Salvation Army who have a mix of public funding and a bit of stuff from their own reserves and from fundraising but you will also still find well-meaning people coming together to try and afford a service.* (National stakeholder, voluntary sector homelessness organisation)

*Scottish Churches Housing Action, Bethany – these are the key faith based organisations I have liaised with most closely. Both organisations support people experiencing or at risk of homelessness.* (National Stakeholder, voluntary sector agency)

Discussions about the place of FBOs in social care and welfare services are evident in academic literature dating back to the 1990s (Jeavons, 1994, 1997; De Vita et al, 1999) reflecting on the growing policy debates about the place of FBOs within welfare provisions in North America (Johnsen, 2014). In particular, the welfare programme known as ‘Charitable Choice’, introduced by the administration of President George W Bush, was much debated. ‘Charitable Choice’, which Wright (2009) saw as a continuation of ‘provisions enacted in the 1996 welfare reform law during the Clinton administration.’ (2009, p25), increased the scope for FBOs to gain federal funding without changing their religious positions (Ebaugh et al, 2003; Smith et al, 2004; Ferguson et al; 2006). The ethicality of FBO involvement was raised as well, with Jeavons (1997) seeking definitions to counter ‘organisations falsely claiming to be religious in order to take advantage of special privileges or avoid more general requirements’ (1997, p93). Monsma (2002) questioned the ethics of the ‘constitutionality and appropriateness of government funding the social service activities of religious congregations.’ (2002, p11).

The North American debates about what FBOs were and what type of FBOs were eligible for funding (Ebaugh et al 2003; Cnaan and Boddie, 2001; Jeavons, 2004; Sider and Unruh,
2004; Biebricher, 2011), have relevance for the UK, context as some FBOs receive Government funding to support the public sector to deliver its homelessness duties. This is a position which emerged when FBOs were seen (by successive Governments) to have a role in policy areas relating to social inclusion (Dinham and Lowndes, 2008) which includes homelessness.

In amongst the elaborate typologies of FBOs established to answer the questions raised about what FBOs were, basic definitions of FBOs were also presented. Jeavons (2002), one of the writers focusing on the North American context, sets out a definition:

*It is very important to distinguish between congregations, on the one hand, and religious service entities of various types, on the other. I will use the term faith-based organizations to refer to this latter group only.* (2002, p93)

The study of Smith et al (2004), also set in the North American context, identified FBOs as:

*... agencies with a relationship to an organized religion, primarily through a connection to a church or denomination. However, some agencies in the sample are “faith-based” and guided by specific religious teachings but not formally affiliated with a church or denomination.* (2004, p3)

Within the European context in relation to the role of FBOs in tackling social exclusion, FACIT (2007) asserts:

*A FBO is any non-governmental organisation (NGO) that refers directly or indirectly to religion or religious values, and that functions as a welfare provider and/or as a political actor.* (2007, p1)

Johnsen (2014) highlights the distinctions between FBOs and religious congregations, noting that:

*One should be careful to avoid conflating religious congregations and FBOs, however, as the former are communities of practicing believers who gather for worship; the latter institutions whose inspiration and origins may be religious but whose activities are focused on the provision of services.* (2014, p3)
This definition also highlights the main difference between the North American and UK contexts, because congregational activities in social care in the UK rarely attract external funding (at present).

For the purpose of this study, and taking the above definitions into account, FBOs are described as: formally constituted charities, operating in the voluntary sector, which provide services for homeless (and sometimes other vulnerable) people and they do this from a faith perspective.

Although this definition answers the research question about what FBOs are, it does not fully explain what constitutes a ‘faith perspective’. This theme is well documented in literature and is now considered in sections 6.3 and 6.4. Section 6.3 considers this questions by highlighting a series of religious values and how FBOs may incorporate these.

### 6.3 FBOs and religious values

Values are multi-faceted, evolving from and into complex configurations of meaning, which can impact on how society is ordered (Fitzpatrick and Stephens, 2014). Organisations and individuals develop and act on values shaped from experience, adherence to beliefs and traditions. Friedman (2002) provides a baseline definition of values as ‘sets of concepts adopted by a group of people that prescribe the actions of that group of people’ (2002, p5) and that these ‘make us want to take action’ (2002, ibid).

Religious values may be understood to be distinctive from secular, because they are seen to reflect on religious beliefs or a sense of the divine. Sider and Unruh (2004) see these visible ‘personal convictions and religious values’ (2004, p117) as characterising FBOs and which ‘give deeper meaning to service work’ (2004, ibid). One of the national informants who was interviewed spoke about the similarities they saw in belief sets:

> If they are coming from a faith base, it might be about their duty to their fellow human being from a religious perspective and from a secular one I suppose they might describe it as doing their best for everyone but in effect it is the same thing!

(National stakeholder, voluntary sector homelessness organisation)

Charitable organisations make public statements about their values in the form of objectives. The stated objectives of organisations were examined as part of the service
profiling analysis (see chapter two above) and the following excerpts are used to illustrate the type of language that FBOs used to describe faith values:

As a response to God’s love

As an expression of the Christian faith

To advance the Christian faith

Offer services in Christ’s name

In obedience to the principles of Christian belief

Sharing the Christian gospel

Considering spiritual and material needs

One national informant gave their thoughts about the impact of faith-based values on the types of services they saw FBOs provide:

*It seems to be that FBOs are very much more involved at the sharp end so, yeah, low threshold, high volume services with low expectations on service users as in you don’t need to engage, ... we are not going to make you, we are not going to put any requirements on you for using this service, it is all very low threshold.* (National stakeholder, homelessness membership organisation)

This section now turns to consider the values of ‘salvation’, ‘love’, ‘charity’, ‘hospitality and sanctuary’, ‘solidarity’ and ‘tackling injustice’. For adherents of the ‘Abrahamic Faiths’, these may be considered a key requirement of their faith. Although the themes are individually described, they have a shared focus of explaining how the other/stranger are understood in theological terms. The Church of England (2006) states that the stranger is, ‘*someone who lacks the resources to sustain a ‘place’ in society*’ (2006, p23/24).

**Salvation**

The ‘Abrahamic Faiths’ all have a doctrine of salvation which is a belief that people (or their souls) are saved through the actions of God. Tillich (1952) considers the parallel between these religions in this belief as ‘*the idea of the descent of a divine being for the salvation of the world.*’ (1952, p 10).
Religious notions of salvation may be found in the context of homelessness if FBOs have an understanding that it is at the root of personal transformation. Sager and Stephens (2005) identify how these approaches may impact on homeless people where ‘the message is that the source of the predicament in which homeless people find themselves must lie in some spiritual failing on their part.’ (2005, p310). Where such a belief was held by an organisation (or individual adherents), pressure might be placed on the homeless person to experience a religious conversion in order to be saved.

**Love**

Human love is a complex, layered and powerful experience which occurs in families, between partners and through friendships. The theological value of love is presented as a bond between the divine and believer. In Judaeo/Christian writings there are commands to love God. The Old Testament’s Book of Deuteronomy contains what adherents may consider as the great commandment ‘You must love Yahweh your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your strength’ (Deuteronomy 6:5). The statement is also recorded in three of the four gospels, (Matthew 22:37, Mark 12:30, Luke 10:27) where the three writers interpret it as the greatest commandment of the law. Luke is different in that he places this encounter before the parable of the good Samaritan which reflects on the statement in Leviticus ‘love your neighbour as yourself’ (Leviticus 19:18). The Catholic Church instructs its adherents about how to build this relationship through Holy Communion which ‘increases our union with Christ and with his Church’ and ‘makes us grow in love for our neighbour’. So the love of God is to be transformed into human love for the neighbour or stranger (as depicted by the injured man in the parable of the Good Samaritan). This description of the stranger may have resonance for those seeking to support homeless people as a requirement to act out their love for God. The faithful then are instructed to love God, but they are also told that God loves them and the world. The creation story presents another aspect of God’s love where humans are created in the ‘image of God. He created him, male and female he created them.’ (Genesis 1:26). This form of love may be presented as self-sacrificing, as seen in ‘For this is how God loved the world: he gave his only son,’ (John 3:16). These descriptions indicate the depth of this concept for believers, that they are as much a part of God as God is of them.

Some believers view love as value rooted in a dynamic source for action in the world or as Lewis (1960) asserts ‘We begin at the real beginning, with love as the Divine energy’ (1960, p153).
Charity


In an examination into the philosophical roots of Social Work, Bowpitt (1998) reflects on early notions of practical charity which ‘was seen as a way of showing the love of Christ to those who were not only poor but alienated from traditional sources of social support’ (1998, p680). One of the national informants spoke about their perception of the notion of charity found in FBOs known to them:

*It’s almost a sense, I don’t know whether it is true or not, but a sense that their motivation is duty, so it’s a charitable duty. It has nothing to do with the statutory duty that motivates people with a FB with regards to poor people, it is a duty to help them.* (National stakeholder, homelessness membership organisation)

One of the primary actions associated with charity is giving. Ten Veen (2009) indicates there is evidence of giving found across ‘all cultures and religious faiths’ and it is ‘is an important means of establishing a social safety net for the poor’ (2009, p3). An example of this may be through indirect giving where congregations collect money for a particular cause or food to distribute to people in need within their parish. Lancione (2014) speaks about alms giving to the homeless in which the homeless person received ‘alms or other goods as a form of first-aid help’ (2014, p 10).

Giving can also be a sustained activity as part of religious adherence. Zakah (Zakat), the third pillar of Islam, places a requirement on Muslims in positions of wealth to give to those in need. Ten Veen (2009) outlines ‘Zakat’ as a mechanism for the purification of the giver as ‘a consequence of which is aiding those who are less fortunate’ (2009, p5). Zakah is therefore referred to in the Qur’an: ‘Zakah expenditures are only for the poor and for the needy’ (Qur’an 9:60). In another chapter of the Qur’an, a distinction is drawn between giving that is self-seeking and aims to increase wealth and ‘what you give in zakah,
desiring the countenance of Allah - those are the multipliers’ (Qur’an 30:39). Gravell (2013) also speaks about the ethical requirement on Christians because ‘charity and the duty to help others is central to the teachings of Christianity’ (2013, p 15). In the New Testament, James affirms charity as active support for people who are in need of clothes and food. The action required of believers in this situation is giving people ‘these bare necessities of life’ (James (2:14 – 17)).

**Hospitality**

People offer hospitality to one another as part of social interactions. This includes providing friends/families/neighbours with food and drink. Hospitality, in religious terms, is still about the practical aspects of giving food and shelter (again infused with the ‘stranger’ motif) but includes elements of mystery and a potential place for revealing the divine, in the form of the aforementioned ‘stranger’. The gospel writer, Matthew has Jesus say ‘For I was hungry and you gave me food, I was thirsty and you gave me drink, I was a stranger and you made me welcome,’ (Matthew 25:35). In the third book of John, the author picks up the stranger motif in commending his friend Gaius for ‘doing loyal work in helping these brothers, even though they were strangers to you.’ (3 John 1:5). When describing the characteristics of a widow, Paul notes that she had ‘been hospitable to strangers and washed the feet of God’s holy people,’ (1 Timothy 5:10). Paul also references ‘angels’ as part of the ‘stranger’ motif and its connection to hospitality: ‘remember always to welcome strangers, for by doing this, some people have entertained angels without knowing it’ (Hebrews 13:2).


Within the context of hospitality, believers may take acts of hospitality onto the streets through soup kitchens, in day-centres and drop-ins and in shelters. FBOs may also operate from religious buildings such as church halls or other church spaces where worship takes place. When they do the latter, this may be based on a belief in the theological notion of
sanctuary in which they seek to provide safe space for homeless people, as reflected in the words of one of the national informants who worked with an FBO:

*To provide a safe and secure nurturing environment, we do have a mission statement which is currently being looked at and rehashed but essentially we want to make a difference, that nurturing environment, we are contracted just to provide minimal support and a roof over someone’s head.* (National stakeholder, manager 2, voluntary sector homelessness provider)

However, some commentators have noted the fraught nature of sanctuary in practice (Jamoul and Wills, 2008; Leavey et al, 2007; Johnsen et al 2005). Opening up religious spaces in which to provide hospitality may also challenge the people who feel they are the custodians of the ‘sanctuary’. Clergy in a study by Leavey et al (2007) indicated they were left feeling ‘unprepared, vulnerable and intimidated’ (2007, p 557) after providing services in their churches.

**Solidarity**

Solidarity can be explained in religious and socio/political terms. In both senses, the base of solidarity is human relationality, interdependence and identification with the other. The religious notion of solidarity may also signify being at one with God or receiving God’s blessing. The writer of Deuteronomy indicates to followers that they are to ‘*Always be open handed with your brother, and with anyone in your country who is in need and poor*’ (Deuteronomy 15:11). The gospel writers provide examples of what they see as Jesus’s solidarity with people. In Matthew, the writer focuses on the way Jesus responds to the disciples for chasing the children away: ‘*for it is to such as these [children] that the kingdom of heaven belongs*’ (Matthew 19:14). Gelder (undated) notes solidarity as a Christian virtue which ‘*must be permeated by love (caritas)*’.

This notion of ‘responsibility to their own citizens’ may resonate in faith bases at national and local level. Gelder (undated) speaks of a non-individualistic form of solidarity existing ‘*within and between social institutions*’. Dinham and Lowndes (2008) expand on this notion of solidarity as being delivered by:

*Christian ideas of community and love of neighbour, the Jewish practice of mizvah, the Muslim duty of zakat, and the Hindu concept of seva* (2008 pp5/6).
Robinson (2010) also reflects on the ways in which local churches and communities work together ‘in overcoming injustice and witnessing to a fairer and more equitable society’ (2010, p61).

**Fighting injustice**

This is the idea that religious people are motivated by their faith to support others who are socially disadvantaged. Injustice may be considered as emerging from unequal power structures where some have power and some are powerless. This calls for solutions addressing root causes. There are scriptural foundations calling for an end to injustices. The Qur’an states ‘*These are the verses of Allah. We recite them to you, [O Muámmad], in truth; and Allah wants no injustice to the world [i.e., His creatures].*’ (Qur’an 3:108).

Solomon, in the Proverbs, writes about two forms of injustice. First of all he speaks directly about the impact on the poor in, ‘*Though the farms of the poor yield much food, some perish for lack of justice.*’ (Proverbs 13:23).

In a parliamentary report ‘Faith in the Community’ (2013), Wilson notes the views held about injustices which ‘*disproportionately affect the poor more than the affluent*’ (2013, p44). A form of social justice found in the Islamic principle of Zakat is explored by Ten Veen (2009) who notes that Zakat is also ‘*a right of the poor*’ (2009, p3).

Cloke et al (2000) argue that homelessness is ‘*a pernicious injustice requiring urgent policy redress*’ (2000, p 134). This brings the place of Christians for challenging injustices relating to homelessness into view. Murray (2009) asserts that ‘*it’s completely inseparable from politics and everyday life*’ (2009, p35). Jamoul and Wills (2008) also recognise the place of actions to combat injustice through ‘*politicisation that can be developed in faith organisations*’ (2008, p2036). Fighting injustices such as homelessness is also personal as Cloke (2002) reflects on when he states that ‘*the politics and ethics of resisting injustice*’ provided part of the motivation for his ‘*undertaking regular voluntary work in a local night shelter*’ (2002, p588).

The five themes of ‘love’, ‘charity’, ‘hospitality’, ‘solidarity’ and ‘fighting injustice’ are understood as values which organisations/staff might use as a base for actions within the context of homelessness. Commentaries also sought ways to qualify other characteristics of ‘faith’ found in FBOs. Section 6.4 below, first of all outlines how previous studies have
tackled this theme before introducing and justifying the concept of ‘faithness’ as an alternative means for examining and qualifying organisational faith.

6.4 Conceptualising organisational faith: from organisational typologies to ‘Faithness’

What is the ‘faith’ in faith based organisations?
An extensive literature review of international and UK perspectives highlighted different thoughts about how faith might be present in the operational structures of FBOs. A common justification for being explicit about the faith content of FBOs was the understanding that the umbrella term ‘faith-based organisation’ was over-simplified (Sider and Unruh, 2002; Jeavons, 2004; Johnsen, 2014).

Studies covered a range of organisations (from congregations to large organisations) operating in different contexts (from the field of education to international development). Smith and Sosin (2001) describe a ‘Faith-Related Agency’ as one in which there is:

*a formal funding or administrative arrangement with a religious authority or authorities; a historical tie of this kind; a specific commitment to act within the dictates of a particular established faith; or a commitment to work together that stems from a common religion.* (2001, p652)

Ebaugh et al (2003) contrast the difference in organisations delivering social services:

*Although not totally absent from secular agencies, religion is what makes faith-based agencies religious. Where’s the religion? Everywhere. Religion infuses agency self-presentation, personnel, resources, decision-making processes, and interactions with clients and among staff in faith-based agencies.* (2003, p423)

Clarke (2008), describing the place of FBOs in international development, notes:

*The faith element of the FBO is not an add-on to its development activity. It is an essential part of that activity, informing it completely. This makes the FBO both distinct (to the extent that faith values imbue its very identity) and yet also reflecting*
a broader non-governmental response to poverty and development, sharing many of the same values. (2008, p15)

Clarke (2008) above, interestingly highlights the interplay of faith and secular influences in the context on which he writes. This is the same as Wright (2009) in his consideration of organisations operating within the ‘Charitable Choice’ welfare programme, which he describes as:

....affiliated with a religious denomination, and religious principles often inspire their work, even when the organizations are providing services of a secular nature. (2009, p9)

The ways in which a FBO was affiliated with other religious bodies formed other strands of research. Smith and Sosin (2001), mentioned above, focused on the notion of ‘religious coupling’ in their study of ‘Faith Related Agencies’. Their work analysed the ties between organisations and their religiosity (the feelings or beliefs derived from religion) and the differences these made to an organisation’s operation.

Monsma and Mounts (2002) examined agencies which were delivering welfare-to-work programmes. They described two types of organisations where the first ‘integrate religious elements into the welfare-related services they provide’ (2002, p7) and the second where ‘religious activities are largely separate from the welfare related services that they provide’ (2002, ibid).

In their study about North American housing programmes for homeless people, Goggin and Orth (2002) elaborate on a ‘faith-integration scale’ (FIS) to measure ‘the extent to which they [FBOs] incorporate religious values and practices into their policies and programs‘ (2002, p2).

Sider and Unruh (2004 and 2005) perhaps went the furthest in tying the notion of organisational faith to a complex classification of FBOs. They provided six different categories of organisations ranging from ‘Faith-Permeated’ to ‘Secular’ in which they considered the ways in which faith influenced twelve different organisational and programmatic characteristics.
**Conceptualising organisational ‘faith’ through ‘faithness’**

This section turns to consider the concept of ‘faithness’, this research’s approach to explaining the nature and operationalisation of faith found in organisational settings. ‘Faithness’ was introduced as a term because firstly, the research was interested in understanding the essence of faith (as applied in the context of organisations) and secondly, the suffix ‘ness’ implied a qualification of the level of faith present. Conceptualising faith through ‘faithness’ therefore stood alone as a lens for investigating the Scottish homelessness sector. It was also applied retrospectively to findings from other research to enable the comparison of Scottish FBOs with organisations operating in other contexts. There were two significant benefits of using ‘faithness’ over the application of other typologies. The first was that it understood faith as a spectrum which overcame the limitations that Unruh and Sider (2005) themselves identified:

> Finally, this typology, like any typology, is inherently limited. Life is more complex than can be depicted on a chart. A typology is meant to capture general trends, while the reality is that many organizations and programs will fall in the gray area between the types or will combine elements of different categories. (2005, p109)

Secondly, ‘faithness’ acknowledges that FBOs were indeed heterogeneous (as suggested by other studies) without the need to sub-categorise organisations or append descriptions which themselves need to be explained. As well as introducing the concept of ‘faithness’, this section seeks to show how it can compare with analyses from other studies.

Table 6.1 below briefly introduces the concept of ‘faithness’ and the similarities and differences in the characteristics of organisations which have faith and those which do not. It indicates that aspects of ‘faithness’ may be manifest (or not) within a range of organisational characteristics, such as: identity, staff (including volunteer) recruitment, and resourcing.
Table 6.1: operational characteristics of ‘faithness’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Operational characteristic</th>
<th>Overt faith-base</th>
<th>‘Faithness’</th>
<th>Secular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Religious name.</td>
<td>Name may be religious.</td>
<td>Name is not religious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current faith affiliation.</td>
<td>Historical faith affiliation.</td>
<td>No faith affiliation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity</strong></td>
<td>Mission statement and objectives infused with religious language which may be evangelistic in nature.</td>
<td>Mission statement and objectives predominantly secular with no evangelistic overtones.</td>
<td>Secular mission statement and objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recruitment</strong></td>
<td>Staff are expected to hold a faith position as well as requisite experience and skills.</td>
<td>Recruitment based on staff having requisite experience and skills.</td>
<td>Recruitment based on staff having requisite experience and skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff may or may not have faith positions.</td>
<td>Staff may or may not have faith positions.</td>
<td>Staff may or may not have faith positions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resourcing</strong></td>
<td>Donations and legacies as single largest/only sources of funding.</td>
<td>Donations and legacies not main source of funding, derived from religious and secular sources.</td>
<td>Donations and legacies not main source of funding, derived from secular sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteers largely drawn from congregations and other religious bodies.</td>
<td>Volunteers drawn from any community.</td>
<td>Volunteers drawn from any community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The examples of ‘faithness’ noted in table 6.1 are merely illustrative of potential points along the spectrum. There may indeed be variations within these points, for example the identity of a secular organisation may indicate a historical link to faith (their name or founding) because faith was a common base for voluntary sector organisations in Scotland (as noted in chapter four above). This example underlines another benefit of the ‘faithness’ concept in that it identifies nuances without confining these organisations to a distinct category because of the presence of a historical remnant of faith.
The place of ‘faithness’ in illustrating the characteristics of organisational identity, recruitment and resourcing are now considered in more detail with reference to the principles identified from other research.

**Organisational identity**

Identity is about an organisation characterising who they are and ‘faithness’ can explain the differing degrees to which faith/secular influences infuse this characteristic. Identity includes the name, mission statement and objectives. Jeavons (1997) asks whether the organisational name ‘ties it explicitly to a particular religious purpose or a specific religious tradition.” (1997, p 82), a ‘Yes’ response to this question does not mean an organisation is high up the ‘faithness’ spectrum as this may be a remnant of the organisation’s history. Sider and Unruh (2004) explain changes in religious influence in their concept of ‘Faith-background’ in which they observe organisations which ‘may have been founded by a religious group, but the link has since been dissolved” (2004, p121). On the other hand the identity of FBOs that Cloke et al (2005) describe as ‘undergirded by strong and deliberate statements of `mission’ or `values’. (2005, p385) represents organisations which would be considered as showing high levels of ‘faithness’. One of the national informants interviewed exemplified the difficulties there were in identifying FBOs:

> It depends on what you really mean by FB, there are some whose origins are FB but who really have very little... or bearing on how they operate or what they do at the moment and you would be hard pressed to tell with a number of them whether they were FB or not! (National stakeholder, homelessness membership organisation)

This point provides an oversight of the reason for introducing the concept of ‘faithness’ as a means for setting out and understanding the nuanced position of faith in organisations.

**Recruitment**

As noted in table 6.1 above, the way that an FBO recruits its employees can demonstrate different degrees of ‘faithness’. Examining how religious influences inform personnel selection processes is therefore important. Johnsen (2014) discusses recruitment policies and notes that some FBOs require senior staff to be ‘adherents of the faith to which the project was affiliated’ (2014, P9). This practice, known as a ‘Occupational Requirement’ (OR), may be an overt sign of ‘faithness’. Three informants provided perspectives about the operation
of an OR. The first informant, working with an FBO, indicated how the practice had changed in their organisation:

_There’s no longer a general occupational requirement apart from CEO and board level, they have to have a live faith membership if you like, but from myself down, we don’t need to have that._ (National stakeholder, manager 2, voluntary sector homelessness provider)

The second informant spoke how their organisation gradually removed the OR as they moved from operating as an FBO to a non-faith based service provider:

_What we needed them to do was to set the values of the organisation and make sure that board members met your values and that values might reflect faith or what have you but it is the values that are important not saying that somebody has to have a faith to work here._ (National stakeholder, manager, national homelessness project)

The third informant provided an insight into the practice of an OR from the commissioning perspective:

_So it is not an issue that ever entered my head unless someone made it an issue like a FBO said we will only employ people with a certain belief, which would be quite difficult to do that now._ (National stakeholder, local government body)

Jeavons (1997) highlights a position where employment conditions may not specify this but nevertheless ‘faithness’ is a factor because ‘employees may self-select on religious grounds’ (1997, p83). Neff et al (2006) indicate FBOs ‘may be more likely to hire unlicensed nonprofessional staff’ (2006, p 51), again a point which is in keeping with the statement made in table 6.1 above.

**Resourcing**

‘Faithness’ can also explain the different positions that FBOs adopt in respect of resourcing. Sider and Unruh (2004) give an example of ‘Faith-permeated’ organisations, (the organisational type they determine as the most influenced by faith) which ‘intentionally target appeals for support to the faith community’ (2004, p122). Some
FBOs are in receipt of government funding or deliver services as part of a local strategic agenda which means they balance their faith provenance along with the secular positions of their public sector funders. Monsma (2002) probed why faith-based/integrated programmes often operated without government funding. He found a number of reasons including:

*feared for their religious freedom, a more general fear of cumbersome, time-consuming government regulations, or not being able to pursue the programs they feel called to pursue, or all three.* (2002, p15).

As well as using ‘faithness’ to explain faith elements of individual characteristics, the notion of ‘faithness’ can accommodate the overarching principles found in other research. Firstly, in relation to ‘religious coupling’ (Smith and Sosin, 2001), which are the ties between organisations and their religiosity (the feelings or beliefs derived from religion) and the differences these made to an organisation’s operation. An organisation high on the ‘faithness’ scale would be expected to have evidence of strong religious coupling. The notions of ‘religious integration’ (Goggin and Orth, 2002; Monsma and Mounts, 2002) can also be explained by ‘faithness’ in that organisations demonstrating high levels of religious integration would be placed at the higher end of the ‘faithness’ spectrum. Finally, in relation to the organisational typologies of Unruh and Sider (2005), their ‘faith permeated’ organisations, that is, evidence of the highest level of faith components in their classification, again would sit high up on the ‘faithness’ scale. The above instances show how ‘faithness’ is both simple and robust in that it offers one scale along which many approaches to defining the faith component of organisations can be measured or accommodated.

### 6.5 Conclusion

This chapter has: established a working definition of FBOs for the purpose of this study, briefly explored a range of values which organisations (and staff) may interpret as motivations for their working with homeless people, introduced the concept of ‘faithness’ and used it to reflect on how ‘faith’ itself may be constituted. Three key aspects of the discussion are particularly noteworthy.

Firstly, a specific definition of the term ‘FBO’ has been provided in this chapter, this being an independent charitable organisation providing services to homeless people and which
has a live faith affiliation. A short and precise definition was considered to be the best platform to examine the differences between FBOs and secular organisations. The assumption being that FBOs as voluntary sector organisations and their secular counterparts were similar organisational entities, apart from the way in which faith influenced them. And this comparison formed the key line of enquiry to answer the research questions around the conceptual scale of ‘faithness’.

Secondly, this chapter examined the basic theology behind the values of ‘salvation’, ‘love, ‘charity’, ‘hospitality’, ‘solidarity’ and ‘fighting injustice’. Attention was devoted to these notions because they were thought to have particular resonance for adherents/FBOs working with homeless people. Understanding factors that might motivate action or underpin ‘faith in action’ is important when examining models of support that FBOs adopt.

Thirdly, the concept of ‘faithness’ was introduced and brief examples given of its application in differentiating between faith and secular influences in organisations. The concept of ‘faithness’ recognises that a definition of what constitutes an ‘FBO’ is not sufficient, on its own, to explain what ‘faith’ might mean in relation to organisational ethos and practice. The concept was then compared with notions of organisational faith put forward in other studies. This showed that ‘faithness’ offered an adequate theoretical base from which to empirically investigate the faith component in organisations operating in the Scottish homelessness sector.

In setting out the concept of ‘faithness’, this chapter has created the investigative lens for the rest of the thesis, which now turns to the organisations identified and analysed through the service profiling.
PART 3: RESEARCHING THE SUBJECT
Chapter seven: Profiling the current contribution of faith-based organisations to homelessness services in Scotland

7.1 Introduction

Chapter four above examined the evolution of FBOs and their contributions to homelessness services across the UK. This chapter details FBOs operating in Scotland, identified through the service profiling (explained fully in chapter two above) and illustrates the current contributions they make to homelessness and allied services.

The purpose of the chapter is to present the results of the service profiling exercise and begin to respond to the research questions about the contributions FBOs make and levels of organisational ‘faithness’.

Section 7.2 outlines the types of organisations identified through the service profiling. Section 7.3 examines their ‘faithness’. The type of contributions made by organisations and the areas in which they operate are detailed in section 7.4. Section 7.5, the conclusion, draws together the chapter’s key points showing how the profiling has helped answer the research questions.

7.2 Organisations

The service profiling comprised of reviewing a range of national data sources/research reports (HouseKey, Homeless Link, Johnsen et al, 2002 a, b, c; Sosenko et al, 2013 SG) to find out different details about homelessness organisations operating in Scotland and, where applicable, their faith affiliations.

76 organisations were identified through this examination because they had some form of faith affiliation and they were providing services to homeless (and other vulnerable) people. 38 organisations, in total, were considered to be FBOs because they reflected the definition in chapter six above, that is they were registered as independent charitable organisations and their operations (in delivering homelessness and allied services) were influenced by faith. The other 38 entities were profiled to provide comparisons and study the development trajectories of organisations with a faith affiliation in keeping with the research objective.
Profiling 76 organisations was considered sufficient for the purpose of the analysis in gathering information about organisations to explore the spectrum of ‘faithness’. The main purpose of this chapter is to report on the 38 FBOs.

FBOs had a presence in 15 local authority areas. Four FBOs, ‘Bethany Christian Trust’, ‘The Salvation Army’, ‘CrossReach’ (the independent social care organisation of the Church of Scotland) and ‘Scottish Christian Alliance’ operated in more than one area. As they also delivered accommodation services, they were considered as examples of large FBOs, whereas ‘Loaves and Fishes’ and ‘The Eagles Wing Trust’ were small FBOs because they operated in one area and their hours of operations were limited. The oldest examples of FBOs were established in the nineteenth century and the newest, in the twenty-first century such as foodbanks which were set up during the course of this study. Nine FBOs had taken on a new legal status during the course of the research.

With regard to targeted clientele, the FBOs supported statutory (and non-statutory) homeless households, rough sleepers, rehoused homeless people and other vulnerable people including those with drug and alcohol addictions, and those leaving institutions. These client groups were similar to some of those identified in the ETHOS definition of ‘homelessness and housing exclusion’ (FEANTSA, 2006)

7.3 ‘Faithness’

The profiling was conducted, in part, to examine the ways in which faith was represented in FBOs with a focus on organisational name, history, objectives, constitutional form and income sources (as data covering those characteristics were easily accessed). This section uses the conceptual scale of ‘faithness’ to gauge if FBOs are similar or different to each other and whether there are certain characteristics that make more explicit reference to faith than others.

In summary, 16 FBOs were at the top end of the ‘faithness’ scale because all their characteristics referenced faith, that is, their name had religious overtones, they had current faith affiliations, they had unincorporated constitutional forms, their objectives were infused with religious language, and they were self-funding (and largely through religious sources). 13 organisations were placed towards the middle of the spectrum because their objectives were more secular in tone and they were in receipt of government funding, for example. The nine organisations at the lower end of the scale had current affiliations to
faith but no other characteristics referencing faith. The next paragraphs consider the nature of ‘faithness’ present in the characteristics in turn.

**Organisational names and ‘faithness’**

Seven organisations would be placed high up on the scale of ‘faithness’ with regard to their name because they were strongly related to religion, containing for example the words ‘Christ’, ‘Christian’, ‘Saint’, or ‘Salvation’. The next grade on the scale would be linked to having names which are immediately recognisable as pertaining to faith, for example ‘Church’, ‘Mission’. 14 organisations would be found in this group. Ten organisations could be classified as being the lower end of the scale because their names had only subtle links to religion, for example making reference to a religious text or pertaining to a person of faith. Seven organisations would be placed at the lowest end of the scale because their names included no reference to faith.

**Organisational affiliations and ‘faithness’**

The highest end of the conceptual scale of ‘faithness’, with regard to organisational affiliations, was to have an overt faith-base with many connections to religion/faith, high degrees of religious coupling (Smith and Sosin, 2001) or religious integration (Goggin and Orth, 2002; Monsma and Mounts, 2002) the middle range is where there are some links to churches or religious organisations whilst at the lower end of the scale, a current connection is derived from a faith history or through partnering with religious organisations (along with others). Using this guide, 20 organisations would be placed at the top end of the scale, nine in the mid-range and nine towards the lower end.

**Constitutional forms and ‘faithness’**

Although Johnsen et al (2002 a, b and c) briefly highlighted whether organisations were constituted as charitable bodies, other writers did not seek to elaborate on this characteristic. However, within the context of Scotland where voluntary sector organisations had founding links to religious/faith groups, this element was considered as cogent for providing insights into whether organisations had moved towards recognisable business footings (being legally constituted). There is less of a scale in this aspect because organisations can either hold a legal identity for example ‘Company’ or Scottish Charitable Incorporated Organisation (SCIO) or not (such as ‘Unincorporated Association’, ‘Trust’), the latter two being the form traditionally favoured by religious organisations. However, a scale could be introduced for those organisations which had acquired a legal identity.
FBOs which did not have a legal personality would be at the top of the scale with those incorporated as ‘SCIOs’ in the middle whilst FBOs, operating as companies would be the lowest end because they had assumed business identities. Under these conditions, 17 organisations would be placed at the highest end of the scale because they were unincorporated, the 13 SCIOs would be found mid-range and eight FBOs would be at the lowest end because they were companies.

**Organisational objectives and ‘faithness’**
Organisational objectives set out an organisation’s identity (Chew 2006). ‘Faithness’ may be present in these statements in the form of religious language and tone, a theme covered in other literature (Jeavons, 2002; Unruh and Sider, 2005; Cloke et al, 2006). Objectives laden with religious influences and overtones of evangelism or religious notions (such as salvation) would be at the top end of the scale, whereas religious references modified by humanist principles might be classified in the middle. Occupying the lower end would be objectives which were in keeping with those of the homelessness sector. There were 21 organisations that were far up the scale, these included large and small FBOs which were not in receipt of government funding, nine organisations had objectives which would be placed in the middle of the range, and eight organisations made no reference to faith in their organisational objectives.

**Income generation and ‘faithness’**
The scale in relation to resourcing comprises self-funding at the top end of the scale, mixed funding (donations and grant making trusts and donations and low government funding towards the middle and those whose funding consisted predominantly of government funding at the lower end. Although larger FBOs tended to be in the middle range, relying on some form of government or grant making trust, there were some that were completely self-funding. It was difficult to derive information about this characteristic because of changes in charitable accounting requirements or because the income generated was so limited or part of a larger organisation’s accounting processes.

During the interviews with national informants (which were conducted at the same time as the profiling), the ability of FBOs to generate resources from a range of sources was discussed. In the first instance, one informant detailed a service delivered by an FBO, who worked with congregations to offset service costs:
They don’t get any LA grant, it is purely churches that run that, because the Council don’t deem them necessary. (National stakeholder, manager, national homelessness project)

A second informant, from an FBO touching on a similar point, spoke about other FBOs that they knew thrived because of the level of volunteers:

You are kind of knocking at an open door because they have the faith content of helping people less fortunate than ourselves. (National stakeholder, faith based voluntary sector organisation)

One informant spoke about a small service which had lost council funding but they saw its potential to continue because it was run by:

A wee band of ladies willing to keep the work going whereas some of them are bigger and need to look for outside funding and more people to manage it, it sometimes becomes more complicated more difficult. (National stakeholder, manager, national homelessness initiative)

The examples from these informants would suggest these organisations being placed high on the ‘faithness’ scale being self-resourcing when it came to income generation.

This short exploration of FBO characteristics, using the conceptual scale of ‘faithfulness’, provides some insight into the differences in organisations, even where they are all defined as FBOs, thus underlining the argument of the heterogenous nature of these entities (Jeavons, 1997, Sider and Unruh, 2004, Johnsen, 2014). The next section considers the contributions the profiled FBOs make to homelessness services.

7.4 The contributions made by FBOs

In chapter four above, consideration was given to the contributions FBOs made to homelessness and allied services in the UK. This section focuses on setting out the contributions that FBOs make to homelessness services in Scotland. Table 7.1 identifies the number of services provided in each local authority area, first of all by the FBOs profiled, followed by the total number of services delivered from all profiling results.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Authority Area</th>
<th>Number of services in each area delivered by FBOs</th>
<th>Total number of services in each area delivered by FBOs and other profiled organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen City</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeenshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyll and Bute</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Edinburgh</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comhairle nan Eilean Siar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee City</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ayrshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Dunbartonshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow City</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverclyde</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moray</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orkney</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth and Kinross</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renfrewshire</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ayrshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lanarkshire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lothian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n = 50) (n = 87)

As might be expected, the greatest concentration of services was found in Glasgow and Edinburgh, a finding which was similar to Johnsen et al, (2002 a, b, c), as the main population centres, with the highest number of homeless people in Scotland (Fitzpatrick et al, 2013 and 2015) and a higher proportion of services delivered by FBOs also located in these cities.

The services were grouped under the same headings as chapter six above (that is street based, building based and accommodation services), with Table 7.2 providing a breakdown of the number of services delivered by FBOs and the total number of services to compare against.
Table 7.2: types of service delivered by FBOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of service</th>
<th>Number of services delivered by FBOs</th>
<th>Total number of services delivered by FBOs and other profiled organisations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street based</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings based</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n = 50) (n = 87)

Street based services included soup runs and street ministries, whilst building based contributions were made within day centres, drop-ins, through food services, starter packs and foodbanks. Accommodation services comprised hostel and resettlement accommodation. Table 7.3 below shows the number of services in each local authority area, profiled by type.

Table 7.3: number of services delivered by FBOs by type and location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of services</th>
<th>Types of services delivered by FBOs in each area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street based (n =13)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile soup (n =7)</td>
<td>City of Edinburgh (1), Dundee City (2), Glasgow City (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street ministries (n =6)</td>
<td>Fife (2), Glasgow City (1), Highland (1), Perth and Kinross (1), Stirling (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building based (n =21)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Centres (n =6)</td>
<td>City of Edinburgh (1), Glasgow City (4) and Perth and Kinross (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop ins (n =2)</td>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway (1), South Lanarkshire (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food (n =2)</td>
<td>City of Edinburgh (1), Glasgow City (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foodbanks (n =4)</td>
<td>Aberdeenshire (1), Glasgow City (2), South Ayrshire (1),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starter packs (n =7)</td>
<td>Argyll and Bute (1), East Ayrshire (1), East Dunbartonshire (1), Glasgow City (1), Moray (1), Stirling (1) and West Lothian (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accommodation (n =16)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostels (n =10)</td>
<td>City of Edinburgh (2), Dundee City (1), Fife (1), Glasgow City (4) and Perth and Kinross (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resettlement (n =6)</td>
<td>City of Edinburgh (3), Glasgow City (3),</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Street based services
Street based services included soup runs and street pastor projects. Seven of the FBOs profiled in this study delivered a total of 13 street based services in seven areas as shown in table 7.4 below, with a comparison again drawn against all services.
Table 7.4: location of street based service delivered by FBOs by type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number of soup services</th>
<th>Number of street ministries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FBOs</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen City</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeenshire</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angus</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Edinburgh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comhairle nan Eilean Siar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee City</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow City</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth and Kinross</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n = 7) (n = 10) (n = 6) (n = 12)

Soup runs are a traditional model of support to which FBOs have long made contributions (Lane and Power; 2009. Johnsen et al, 2002 a) where soup (and sandwiches) are served to people out on the street. The number of Scottish soup runs identified in the profiling was an increase on those highlighted by Johnsen et al (2002, a) suggesting that FBOs continue to see these services as being of value to homeless people. Soup run services were operated mainly by volunteer staff (drawn from congregations/faith groups). In Edinburgh and Glasgow, soup runs operated on a nightly basis and visited different sites with one of the Edinburgh soup runs starting a lunchtime service during the course of the study. In Edinburgh, The Care Van soup run included volunteers from churches across the Lothians whilst in Glasgow, the Rokpa Trust worked with faith and non-faith based organisations. In Dundee, the two services alternated the evenings they operated and each stopped in a different location. The Eagles Wing Trust in Dundee also worked in partnership with local churches. In some instances, schedules provided a structure for organisations operating in the same area (Warnes et al, 2003; Lane and Power, 2009). Some of these timetables, along with soup run routes, were made available on Council websites.

Street ministries are a relatively new type of service, established in Scotland in the 2000s through the Ascension Trust which seeded them. Street Pastors go out on the streets during the late evening and early morning and offer basic support to people, including people who are sleeping rough. All the street pastor services profiled drew on volunteers from churches and other religious organisations. Some services had links to their local authority including
homelessness and community justice departments (as part of Council community safety programmes).

The FBOs that delivered street services were in similar positions to each other on the ‘faithfulness scale’ and located towards the upper end of the scale. They featured biblical references in their names, faith-based histories and had objectives infused with religious language. The operational style of these organisations in using religious resources (assets, donations and volunteers), similar to those noted by other authors (Johnsen et al, 2002 a; Sager and Stephens, 2005; Lane and Power, 2009) also placed them high up the scale of ‘faithfulness’. However, half of them had legal identities, a somewhat surprising factor in smaller organisations.

The FBOs delivering street ministries were also in comparable positions with each other on the scale of ‘faithfulness’ and, overall, slightly higher up the scale than soup runs because faith was referenced across the range of their characteristics and they had closer associations with other religious organisations than those of soup runs.

Building based services
A total of 21 buildings based services were delivered by the same number of FBOs operating in 20 areas as shown in table 7.5 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Day-centres</th>
<th>Drop-ins</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Food banks</th>
<th>Starter packs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FBOs All</td>
<td>FBOs All</td>
<td>FBOs All</td>
<td>FBOs All</td>
<td>FBOs All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeenshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyll and Bute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Edinburgh</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumfries and Galloway</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee City</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Ayrshire</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Dunbartonshire</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow City</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inverclyde</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moray</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth and Kinross</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renfrewshire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Borders</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Ayrshire</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lanarkshire</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lothian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(n=6) (n=6) (n=1) (n=5) (n=2) (n=6) (n=4) (n=20) (n=6) (n=12)
There were five different types of contributions that FBOs made as part of building based services, including: day-centres (6), drop in access points (1), food services (2), foodbanks (4) and starter packs (6). Glasgow had the greatest prevalence of buildings based services including four day-centres.

Day-centres and drop-in points are again types of contributions in which FBOs have longstanding connections. The profiled day centres were generally open during daytime hours, five days a week and provided basic services such as meals and spaces to socialise, specialised support (or access to support agencies) and classes (educational and life skills) an operational style similar to those identified in other research (Johnsen et al, 2002 b; Glasgow Homelessness Network, 2005; Bowpitt et al, 2013. The drop-in service profiles showed that these services offered limited access hours either during the day and/or evening. Their services ranged from signposting to other organisation to providing basic sustenance and refreshments.

FBOs ran all the day-centres profiled in this study, but were in different positions on the scale of ‘faithness’. The reasons for that were that three were self-resourcing through donations and legacies, whilst three had mixed sources of income which included government funding, and two organisations had objectives with no references to faith or which used religious language, whilst four of them had a legal identity. The one organisation, considered an FBO within the definition of this study, that delivered drop-in services had similar levels of faith as the other profiled organisations and was in the highest position on the scale of ‘faithness’, because they had historical and live faith affiliations, their name reflected a faith provenance, and their objectives were infused with religious language.

The two food services in which profiled FBOs were involved were traditional in form, in that they provided space for homeless people to access basic food provisions. The FBOs and the other profiled organisations that provided food services were in a similarly high position on the scale of ‘faithness’ to each other.

Foodbanks are another form of food distribution, which have increased in number since the onset of the UK Government’s welfare reforms (Sosenko et al, 2013; Trussell Trust, 2017). Foodbanks provide people in need (including homeless people) with access to grocery supplies (and sometimes small household items). Referral structures were identified in
which statutory agencies (including social workers, health professionals, housing support officers) referred recipients and gave them vouchers to use. The foodbanks identified in the profiling operated through collaborations between church based and non-faith based organisations. Resources were also drawn from secular organisations (supermarket food collections) and churches/congregations.

The FBOs that ran foodbanks were markedly different from each other providing further evidence that the definitions of FBOs cannot be over-simplified (Jeavons, 2002; Ebaugh et al, 2003, Sider and Unruh, 2004, Johnsen, 2014). Although linked to religious organisations, their stated objectives and purpose were rarely reflective of a faith position. However, two examples show noticeable differences in these positions. Both were self-funding FBOs (donations etc) and both had a legal status and religious motivations. The first, with an overt faith reference in their name, was distinctly evangelistic in tone: ‘*distributing Christian religious tracts and information about local churches to those receiving help*’. The objectives of the latter, again based on a Christian ethos, saw their focus as one of ‘*supporting values and principles which promote social inclusion and anti-discriminatory practices*’.

The starter packs profiled were set up in the 1990s by Scottish Churches Housing Action (SCHA), a national FBO that operates, in part, a community development model. Starter packs contain basic household items (donated by individuals and sometimes supermarkets) to support homeless people when they are rehoused through the discharge of a statutory duty, or as part of tenancy sustainment services. Some starter pack schemes worked within Local Authority referral arrangements.

Starter Pack schemes began as inter-congregational collaborations which used church buildings and relied on volunteers from participating congregations in distributing packs a couple of times a week. Organisational websites analysed as part of the profiling showed that larger operations, for example ‘New Start Highland’, were open five days a week and had diversified into the provision of furniture as well as offering housing support and employment training.

The FBOs that provided starter packs were similar to each other and the organisations profiled and were typically classified at the lowest positions on the scale of ‘faithness’. Although they all had historical connections to a larger FBO, they had no references to
faith in their objects and almost half of them had legal identities. Two of the FBOs alluded to their religious affiliation in their names.

The notion of religious ‘coupling’ (Smith and Sosin, 2001) was a useful one to explain the development trajectories of the more recently established FBOs identified above (those delivering food banks and starter packs) because they had initial couplings with FBOs that supported them through their early development and after disengaging from the ‘parent’ body, new couplings had been formed with other agencies (faith and non-faith based organisations).

**Accommodation services**

Five organisations delivered 16 accommodation services in five areas with The Salvation Army making contributions to eight of these. Table 7.6 below highlights the locations in which the FBOs delivered accommodation services.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number of hostel services</th>
<th>Number of resettlement services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FBOs</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Edinburgh</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundee City</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fife</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow City</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth and Kinross</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 10)</td>
<td>(n = 10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Salvation Army hostel services were direct-access, meaning that service users could approach them without going through the Council. The majority of accommodation services noted in the research of Johnsen et al (2002 c) were themselves direct access. The hostel services delivered by other organisations had referral systems in place with local authorities.

The resettlement services provided residents with opportunities to undertake ‘meaningful activities’ such as job clubs, IT/education classes and some drug and alcohol rehabilitation.

The profiles of the FBOs delivering accommodation services showed they were ranged across the scale of ‘faithness’. All of them were in similar positions high up the ‘faithness’ scale with regards to name, history and objectives. However, four of the FBOs had
assumed legal status and all were in receipt of government funding, which took them slightly down the ‘faithness’ scale. Overall, The Salvation Army and CrossReach were higher up the scale than the others because they had retained an unincorporated constitutional form.

7.5 Conclusion

The profiling was undertaken to identify FBOs fitting the definition set out in chapter six above, which were delivering services to homeless people in Scotland and to examine their characteristics regarding degree of ‘faithness’. This was done to answer the research questions about who organisations were and what they did and whether the concept of ‘faithness’ could explain differences between them. This chapter has therefore built on the definition set out in chapter six about what constitutes a faith-based organisation because it has considered what it was (faith-wise) that made an organisation different to others (along the spectrum of ‘faithness’).

76 organisations with differing faith affiliations were identified and profiled and their organisational attributes analysed. 38 organisations identified were defined as faith-based organisations because they were independent charitable organisations operating in the Scottish homelessness system, they delivered services to homeless (and vulnerable) people and their operations were influenced by faith. Although the main focus of the chapter was on the FBOs, comparisons were made between them and other organisations.

Some organisations were identified as having long histories whilst others were established more recently (including in 2015). There was evidence of change and development within organisations, for example Churches Action for the Homeless (CATH) services (day-centre, accommodation, outreach, starter packs) had gradually expanded from their original soup kitchen in 1993. There was also evidence of services closing but so too continuity in service types, for example foodbanks as newer forms of the distributive hospitality of food and soup runs. This could indicate that a self-funding/resourcing service model designed to lessen the impact of homelessness or social need, will continue to be sustainable especially where there are constraints on public services. Another way in which development was noted was in the way organisations updated constitutional forms to acquire a legal identity.

The second aspect of this chapter was about identifying the types of services that organisations provided. 87 services in total were identified in 22 local authority areas, with
50 of those being delivered by FBOs in 15 local authority areas. The chapter also confirmed that the contributions Scottish faith-based organisations made to the homelessness sector were similar to those identified through literature reviews, in that they delivered accommodation, day-centre, drop-in, food distribution and soup run services (Warnes et al, 2005; Johnsen et al, 2002 a, b and c; Johnsen with Fitzpatrick, 2009; Lane and Power, 2009). In addition, new types of services, namely, starter pack schemes, foodbank and street ministries were also profiled. The reason for including these services was they were considered to fit a definition of ‘allied’ services. They supported homeless people (although not exclusively) going through transitions or integrating into new communities through the provision of low level support, advice, advocacy and signposting.

The ‘faithness’ of organisations was also considered. Evidence was presented showing how the concept of ‘faithness’ was sufficiently nuanced to identify differences between FBOs as well as between FBOs and other providers. This included identifying secularising influences (acquiring a legal status, generating income through government funding, changed objectives) considered as desirable for organisations operating in statutory homelessness systems. These findings suggest that the concept of ‘faithness’ is suitably sophisticated as an analytical lens for identifying the complex nature of organisational faith which other authors also highlighted as integral to research in this area (Jeavons, 2002; Sager and Stephens, 2005; Unruh and Sider, 2005; Johnsen, 2014). The assumption that faith references would be more apparent in organisations whose income was independent of government, or who were delivering smaller allied services, was confirmed. Moreover, the conceptual scale of ‘faithness’ indicated where organisations might have a pre-disposition to overt displays of faith (infused with religious overtones) in their service environment; including religious practices (prayers, sermons, devotions) or programmes (e.g. faith-based drugs and alcohol recovery and rehabilitation approaches). These practical characteristics will be explored through the case studies and compared against the findings of other research (Goggin and Orth, 2002; Jeavons, 2002; Sider and Unruh, 2004).

The service profiling therefore formed an important step in this research because it provided a platform from which to build the main research focus. That is, using three case studies to elaborate on the concept of ‘faithness’ to determine how faith influences (if at all) the operations of organisations in the Scottish homelessness system.
Chapter eight: An introduction to the case study organisations

8.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to describe each of the three case study organisations by detailing key characteristics for each. It is based on data gathered through organisational materials and fieldwork interviews. Data from the latter is used to reflect on the realities of service provision from stakeholders’ perspectives, to draw on how they see their organisations and their work. The methods for choosing the case study organisations were described in chapter two above.

Section 8.2 provides an overview of all the case studies. Section 8.3 describes service one, ‘Trinity 3’ an accommodation unit managed by a FBO. Section 8.4 details a day-centre service, ‘Joseph’s Place’ provided by a secularised organisation with historical links to a faith base. Section 8.5 highlights the operation of a recovery drop-in service of a secular organisation, referred to as ‘Kana’. Each section provides details on the service type, operational structures (staff and management, client group and referrals, conditions of use) and faith characteristics. The term ‘characteristic’ is used because it is descriptive rather than evaluative. Section 8.6 forms the conclusion.

8.2 Comparative outline of the case studies

The case studies and their respective identifying details are listed in table 8.1 below. This provides detail regarding the organisational number and pseudonym used to refer to each through the chapter, as well as giving an indication as to their positions in terms of overall ‘faithness’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisational number</th>
<th>Alias</th>
<th>Referenced as</th>
<th>Study focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>‘Trinity 3’</td>
<td>‘Faith-based’ because its organisational ethos is overtly faith-based</td>
<td>Resettlement unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>‘Joseph’s Place’</td>
<td>‘Secularised’ because it had connections to a faith-base but was now operating on secular principles</td>
<td>Day centre project team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>‘Kana’</td>
<td>‘Secular’ because it was set up by a person of faith but always operated on secular principles</td>
<td>Recovery drop in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All services that participated in the fieldwork were buildings based, although all three organisations delivered outreach services as well. The three organisations chosen were large enough to allow consideration of organisational and service (accommodation, day-centre and drop-in service) characteristics.

All the organisations were independent charities based in Scotland and had legal personalities. All three management boards were operated by ‘Trustees’ indicating that the organisations had previous constitutional forms although they had since assumed legal personalities. All organisations had changed since their foundation by expanding the range of services they delivered. One had set up as an independent organisation following separation from its founding organisation.

All organisations operated in the voluntary (third) sector. One of the main reasons for considering voluntary sector services was the assumption that the services they provided were different to those of public bodies (Prochaska, 1988; Anderson, 1993; Knapp and Kendall, 1993). In the case of homelessness, day-centres (operated by organisation two) are unique to the voluntary sector. Although organisation one provided an accommodation service, it and organisation three could be distinguished from statutory services because they operated in more than one area.

There were religious influences present in the founding of all three organisations. However, within the current context, organisation one operated on Christian principles whilst organisations two and three emphasised their humanist principles and practice. Participants from all organisations identified holding a position of personal faith, a finding that was similar to other research (Ebaugh, 2003; Cloke et al, 2007; Johnsen, 2014)

Before turning to the specific services focused on through the fieldwork, table 8.2 below summarises additional key historical and structural characteristics of all three organisations.
### Table 8.2: Key characteristics of case study organisations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>‘Trinity 3’</th>
<th>‘Joseph’s Place’</th>
<th>‘Kana’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Decade of foundation</td>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>1960s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of staff</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of volunteers</td>
<td>Over 3000</td>
<td>Over 50</td>
<td>Over 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Number of services</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Location of services</td>
<td>Various geographical areas</td>
<td>One geographical area</td>
<td>Various geographical areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Number of clients (using all service)</td>
<td>Over 7000</td>
<td>Over 3000</td>
<td>Over 4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Legal status</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Company</td>
<td>SCIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Income sources</td>
<td>Grants, Donations, LA grants, Fundraising</td>
<td>Grants, Donations, LA grants, Fundraising</td>
<td>Grants, Donations, LA grants, Fundraising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Level of income</td>
<td>Over £1,000,000</td>
<td>Over £500,000</td>
<td>Over £1,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This introductory section has provided the key details about the organisations at structural levels. The key characteristics of these organisations shared commonalities with other voluntary sector service providers identified through other studies (Johnsen et al, 2002 a, b, c; Warnes et al, 2003; Jones and Pleace, 2005). The characteristics of each service are now described in turn.

### 8.3 Organisation one, ‘Trinity 3’ (faith based)

**Service type**

The first service is an emergency resettlement accommodation unit. The accommodation comprised six shared flats which provided 28 bed spaces with a maximum capacity of 24 men and 4 women. Each resident had a single room (with key), a shared lounge, bathroom and a ‘kitchenette, so they've got a microwave, toaster, and a little fridge.’ (Project worker, Trinity 3).
The resettlement unit was set in an old building (c1900) and was spread over several floors. The kitchen, dining room and interview spaces, along with the main entrance and duty room, were on the first floor. Offices and residents’ lounges were in the basement (although windows did supply some natural light). The residents’ cluster flats were on the higher floors.

All the staff interviewed used the term ‘homeless hostel’ to describe the unit. Individual staff reflected on elements of the service that they saw as different to other hostels:

*We’re not a pure homelessness hostel; it's more a rehabilitation hostel so it's more we're trying to get people ready to move into long-term accommodation.*

(Deputy manager ‘a’, Trinity 3)

*I think that transforming lives really has a sustaining idea that it's not just a hostel but a resettlement centre. So I think that's what I think of it, I guess.*

(Volunteer ‘b’, Trinity 3)

As a form of supported accommodation, support needs were identified at the referral stage, with formal support planning beginning a couple of days into the occupancy. The assessment of need was achieved using a standardised matrix to measure whether support needs were ‘high’, ‘medium’ or ‘low’. The types of practical support on offer therefore ranged from basic advice and advocacy, life skills learning, access to employment and education to specialist support for people with addictions. There was a named worker system in operation which meant that staff were responsible for a caseload of three or four residents. A second named worker was also in place so that if residents had an issue outwith planned support times, or when their support worker was unavailable, they still had the option of speaking to another worker. One of the support workers explained the system:

*We are kind of the second worker for when their worker either isn't on shift or is on annual leave or something, as the back-up. We maybe don’t know their case quite so well, but we should be the go-to person for anything that needs handing over, or any actual work that needs doing when their support worker's not around.*

(Volunteer ‘b’, Trinity 3)
The basic structures of the resettlement unit were therefore similar to resettlement units described in other research (Foord et al, 1998; Johnsen et al, 2002 c; May et al, 2003; Warnes et al, 2003).

**Operational Structures**

**Staffing and management**

In total there were 20 staff working in the unit with separate day and night staff. There were two day-time teams who worked different shifts. During the day there would be three operational staff (two on night shift) in the unit, along with the manager or deputy managers. The general staff routine each day included meal time duties (part time cook and other staff), flat checks, kitchen duties with residents, carrying out admission interviews, support meetings, office duties, external meetings and organising social activities for residents.

The service manager had overall responsibility for the operation of the unit ensuring, ‘the safety and wellbeing of staff and residents here’ and ‘making sure that this unit complies with the standards set out for the Care Inspectorate, for the council, who do all of our referrals and fund us.’ (Service Manager, Trinity 3). This interviewee also liaised with the organisation’s executive team and head office, and attended various external meetings including one with other managers, as they explained:

*There are managers from lots of other hostels in the city, at least ten other managers at any one meeting. They could be anything from [named FBO] through to non-council ones and also non-Christian hostels that are maybe inside the city.*

(Service Manager, Trinity 3).

As well as ‘dealing with whatever comes up operationally in that week’, one of the deputy managers had responsibility for supervising staff (day and night) and preparing the work schedules:

*I do rotas for each day making sure there's enough staff. Doing that for the future weeks and months, and then a rota basis with the other managers, the duty manager.*

(Deputy Manager ‘b’, Trinity 3)
The other deputy manager detailed part of their daily workload which included:

We're trying to cover the work. Things like the health and safety stuff, like the window checks, the social stuff, such as tea break, and then people could be having meetings, people could be out, so realistically you can only cover one interview in the afternoon. (Deputy Manager ‘a’, Trinity 3)

One of the support workers stated in depth what their role entailed:

I would quite frequently have a support meeting, at least one in a day, at a time convenient to my residents as much as I can, and with them I'm creating a support plan, and then after that we're making moves to bring that plan to fruition. So that might also mean that in my days I'm making phone calls, I'm referring them places, I'm taking them to appointments, or activity groups, local community things, sending emails, writing letters on their behalf, all that kind of admin stuff you slot in throughout the day. (Project worker, Trinity 3)

Support workers also liaised with workers from other organisations (housing, health and homelessness departments) either to advocate on a resident’s behalf or to ensure they were gaining access to appropriate agencies or support.

These staffing levels were complemented by four volunteers. I spoke to two people who were on a years’ volunteering placement arranged through an international Christian based programme. They were known as ‘full-time volunteers’ and were assigned to support workers and as one of the deputy managers noted:

They do most things. They don't do direct support work, they don't do sitting down one-on-one with the rest of them, but pretty much every other task they do. (Deputy manager ‘a’, Trinity 3)

The service would also encourage their residents to think about volunteering opportunities as part of building skills for moving into (or back into) paid work or where a person had indicated they wanted to give something back to the organisation. Volunteers could be involved in a range of activities including fundraising, office admin, marketing and outreach work.
The manager and deputy managers were responsible for overseeing the operation of the unit and reporting to the larger organisation. Staff support and development was implemented through training and learning opportunities and personal supervision for all staff. There was an additional handbook for volunteers outlining the areas that they would work in and support structures, which one volunteer reflected on:

*Yes, so I have a, I guess, supervisor, which is one of the project workers, and then also the management too.* (Volunteer ‘a’, Trinity 3)

Staff indicated how daily operations were managed through team/shift hand overs where there was a ‘*thorough explanation of what's happened over their couple of shifts.*’ (Project worker, Trinity 3) which was used to plan the work for that shift. The team also met at other times of the day to provide updates to each other.

**Client groups and referrals**

The client groups supported in the resettlement unit included people who had slept rough, ex-offenders, people with addictions, and refugees and were therefore client groups identified within the ETHOS definition (FEANTSA, 2006; Fitzpatrick et al, 2013)

Self-referrals and referrals from other agencies were not accepted because of the council having 100% referral rights. The accommodation units identified in Johnsen et al, (2002 c) were largely direct-access perhaps indicating that since that research, local authorities have formed different relationships with voluntary agencies when funding their services (to facilitate the provision of services for statutory homeless people). Vacancies were allocated using the organisation’s support matrix to determine whether the person had high, medium or low needs (bed spaces were allocated on this measure). Prior to referring the person, the Council assessed needs in the same way. They would telephone the service to check out vacancies, then email providing details about the prospective resident, including the assessment of support needs. The organisation would phone the council to confirm the offer of an interview. Referrals were accepted throughout the day with staff also able to carry out short evening interviews ‘*just to get somebody in*’. (Deputy manager ‘a’, Trinity 3)

**Conditions of use**

Residents were given an occupancy agreement for an initial stay of twelve weeks. This laid out the amount of rent (generally paid for through housing benefit), service charges
and the responsibilities of residents and staff. House rules were laid out in the occupancy agreement. The focus of these varied, some being about safety aspects connected to shared living and respecting the wellbeing of each other and staff, for example ‘no weapons, no violence or aggression or abuse’ (Project worker, Trinity 3). Some rules doubled up as life skills training where residents were expected to take care of their own space and participate in communal tasks such as weekly kitchen duty. Residents were encouraged to have their meals in the dining room although it was not compulsory. As the accommodation unit was a dry-house, residents were expected to refrain from drug or alcohol consumption on the premises.

There was a curfew in place so residents had to be in at a specific time unless arranged otherwise. The impact of rules (Foord et al, 1998; Warnes et al, 2003) is discussed further in chapter 11 below. Residents were able to stay in the building all day if they wanted and could have guests. If they were leaving the building, they would hand in their keys to the office, as the manager explained:

It is a good fire board, so if there was a fire we would know is that person in or out. Sometimes people will say as they are leaving, 'I'm really sorry, I've left my key in my room', and we'll put a tag on that says key left in room, but yes, that's why we do it. We don't do it, I don't know, to take away that person's humanity. It's just a security thing. (Service Manager, Trinity 3)

Residents had responsibilities to attend support meetings and work towards achieving the goals set at the beginning of their stay.

The service and its faith characteristics
Case study one’s organisational name contains faith references and the agency was established by a minister of religion. It has maintained an overt faith base throughout its history:

We are openly Christian. People will know that at interview, or should know that at interview. (Service Manager, Trinity 3)

As expected for such an organisation, all staff interviewees spoke about faith. People used terms such as Christ, God or Spirit, as well as describing practical applications of faith. Staff spoke about team time for prayer and reflections and daily devotions
(voluntary for residents) where a biblical passage would be chosen to discuss. Prayer was used by staff at different times of the day:

Yes, in the mornings in our initial staff meeting we actually do a prayer with night shift as those staff are leaving, just in the office and then again after we discuss the schedule for the day. (Volunteer ‘b’, Trinity 3)

Prayer was also identified as a practical support for staff in different work situations:

It's really nice when like a difficult situation arises, or when you know you're about to have to face a difficult situation, a difficult conversation, or an incident, that you can turn to your colleague and, ‘Can we pray about this before we go and deal with it?’ (Project worker, Trinity 3)

There were one or two posters with faith references in different spaces in the unit set amongst other pieces of information. The physical presence of Bibles in the unit was noted by another interviewee:

They'll find a Bible in their room, but other than that there's no obligation to be involved in anything. (Deputy manager ‘a’, Trinity 3)

Another interviewee spoke about Biblical passages that they reflected on when thinking about the impact of their faith on their approach and work:

The verses from Matthew that talk about visiting the prisoner, yes visiting the prisoner and clothing the naked and feeding the hungry and how each one of those people to be thought of as Jesus. (Service Manager, Trinity 3)

Staff also talked about supporting people from different religions and the contacts they would make with other religious organisations on that resident’s behalf.

By way of summary, Table 8.3 below lists ten service characteristics for ‘Trinity 3’ and the faith references visible within each.
Table 8.3: faith references identified in ‘Trinity 3’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service characteristic</th>
<th>Faith reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Name</td>
<td>Biblical link</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mission Statement</td>
<td>Religious language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. History</td>
<td>Founded by person of faith as an FBO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Source of income</td>
<td>Mixed including government (mixed faith reference)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Legal status</td>
<td>Company (not a faith reference)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Staff/board selection</td>
<td>Some levels of staff (self-selection, staff/volunteers who choose to work with organisation because of its faith base)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Environment</td>
<td>Limited faith imagery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Religious observance</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Religious language</td>
<td>Overt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Personal subscription (staff)</td>
<td>All interviewed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although table 8.3 indicates that ‘Trinity 3’ is towards the top end of the ‘faithness’ scale, they have two secular characteristics, that is holding a legal personality (their company status) and being in receipt of government funding. When examined within the religious classification systems of Unruh and Sider (2005), ‘Trinity 3’ best fits the ‘faith-permeated’ organisation, although their income source could take them to the lower category of ‘faith affiliated’, it would have high levels of ‘religious coupling’ (Smith and Sosin, 2001) and demonstrate many areas of ‘religious integration’ (Goggin and Orth, 2002)

8.4 Organisation two, ‘Joseph’s Place’ (secularised with a historical connection to a faith base)

**Service type**

The second organisation operated a day-centre. It was open throughout the year, five days a week. The opening hours and service arrangements were explained by one of the project workers:

*We open for breakfast from 10:00 to half eleven and then we close again for an hour.*

*We open again at half twelve, the café opens to serve lunches from half twelve to half*
two and you will find the majority of service users leave at half two when the café closes. However, the building is still open for classes upstairs. (Project worker ‘c’, Joseph’s Place)

The term ‘day-centre’ was constantly used by most (but not all) staff interviewees to describe their place of work. One member of staff explained the purpose of day-centres:

Day centres are a good safety net especially in the city centres. A good safety net, if the system's not working, the safety net's here and we can pick up the pieces and hopefully we’ll be that connecting link that gets people back into the support they're missing out on. (Team leader, Joseph’s Place)

As a building based service in a single location, there were general provisions available for service users, namely: food, showers and a place for social activities. One worker summarised the services:

We provide advocacy, we help people fill in forms which can be scary, practical issues – clothing, food, showers and shaves and degrees of emotional support where people want someone to talk to. It’s quite a wide spectrum we provide, court letters, we go along to court, we visit people in prison, in hospitals. (Project worker b, Joseph’s Place)

Over 3000 people used the day centre in 2014/15. About a third of clients approaching the organisation were supported by the duty service and about one hundred used the café per day.

The organisation also offered tenancy sustainment support, advocacy, signposting, prison outreach and access to medical services. Classes were provided to service users which were either delivered through an in-house support team or through partnering arrangements with colleges. One project worker indicated they ran ‘a drop-in computer class on a Wednesday and I help people looking for work in that.’ (Project worker ‘d’, Joseph’s Place).

The building in which the day-centre was located was owned by another organisation and contained private interview rooms, staff offices, kitchen and café facilities and spaces for classes was on the second floor.
The basic findings above were similar to those identified in literature about day-centres (Johnsen, 2002 b and 2005; Warnes et al, 2005; Glasgow Homelessness Network, 2005; Randall and Brown, 2006).

The case study was largely built around the work of the team that facilitated the day to day operation of a day-centre. A newer element of service provision that the team was delivering was operated by the local homelessness department along with the health board and social work. Focused on people with longstanding histories of homelessness and other vulnerabilities, the team was tasked with assigning a key worker to service users referred through this scheme.

**Operational structures**

**Staffing and management**

The organisation employed 23 staff (full and part-time) with the operational activities managed by a director and three team leaders. Seventeen project workers were spread over four service teams. There were nine staff in the project team taking part in the fieldwork.

Paid staff worked from nine in the morning to five in the evening each day. A team meeting was held first thing to discuss the previous day’s work, who had presented and the support or services needed.

Project staff had three main tasks. There was door duty management during centre opening times (this person would keep a log of people coming through the door and ensure that they were not under the influence). As such, the person on door duty was a point of welcome (and sometimes the first ‘official’ person a client might meet).

Another staff member would be on ‘duty’. The duty service was the most intensive element of work at the centre. It included carrying out an assessment of peoples’ needs (health, money, social) or supporting people who had an issue or urgent matters that needed dealt with. Joseph’s team leader spoke about the way that duty role worked:

> There could be a waiting list to see that person, of course. We open up at the opening time, you’re probably aware of it, those times now. So it’s a limited resource and there could be X number of people wanting to avail themselves of that service.

(Team leader, Joseph’s Place)
The project worker who was assigned café duty would oversee the meal services, to check that clients were okay, whether they wanted to discuss any issues and support volunteers. They had responsibility for deciding whether clients were entitled to get free food (on grounds that they were known to be destitute).

The organisation utilised the services of over 50 volunteers with a range of experiences. There were people that had worked in the public sector or social care policy work previously and those who had direct experience of homelessness. The two volunteers I spoke to became interested in homelessness after encountering homeless people in their previous employment experience. ‘Supported Volunteering’ opportunities were available to people who had been homeless, to help build up their skills-set and increase their self-belief.

Volunteers could be involved in a range of tasks linked to the kitchen, café, furniture and allotment projects. There were formal training opportunities for volunteers to gain requisite skills as noted by the volunteers interviewed:

"We have attended trainings on Health and Safety, Food Hygiene, Customer Care ... safe talk training which is not suicide intervention but the prevention of suicide."
(Volunteer ‘a’ and ‘b’ Joseph’s Place)

The Director led on the strategic management of the organisation, including working with the Board to deliver the organisational objectives. The Director also supported the management ambitions of the organisation through their connections to external bodies, taking a lead role in a local strategy group feeding into council homelessness structures. At a strategic level, the team leader met with other managers from voluntary sector organisations and service managers from the Council. The team leader was responsible for day to day management of the work and would allocate duties for the day at the daily team meeting. They also had responsibility for managing volunteer programmes.

**Client group and referrals**

The people who used the day centre had a range of homeless experiences, some had been through the system and were rehoused, whilst others were having difficulty in accessing the system. The client group included ex-offenders, people with addiction issues, refugees, and people who had slept rough. As with ‘Trinity 3’ parts of the ETHOS definition (FEANTSA, 2006) was relevant for the client groups supported by ‘Joseph’s Place. One
of the project workers spoke about the length of time some service users had engaged with the organisation:

_The older ones, normally males, have been using the service for a good number of years and many of them may have been homeless back in the day and back in the day could have been thirty years ago. It could also be last week but this is maybe just a place to come to socialise and get a meal, proper food to engage with their peer group._ (Project worker ‘a’, Joseph’s Place)

Another interviewee picked up on the social aspect of the day-centre being used by clients that had been through the system and had been rehoused:

_Fifty-five to sixty per cent of the volume of people coming through each day with actually have tenancies. That sometimes surprises people when you’re a drop-in centre for people affected by homelessness._ (Team leader, Joseph’s Place)

Although a direct access facility, homeless people were signposted to the centre by other agencies, namely the local authority homelessness department, local law centres and CABx. Service users also sometimes self-referred.

**Conditions of use**

Other research indicates day-centres often operate basic rules (Glasgow Homelessness Network, 2005; Johnsen et al, 2005; Jones and Pleace, 2005). The rules set out by ‘Joseph’s Place’ included respecting staff and other people using the centre, no drinking and no violence. If people approached the centre under the influence, they were told to come back, in case they were at increased risk to themselves falling whilst negotiating stairs to facilities on the first and second floors. People were also signed in when accessing the day-centre. People were expected to pay (a nominal sum) for their meals if they could afford to.

**The service and its faith characteristics**

The day-centre had historical links to a FBO and operated from premises used by another FBO. One of its founders explained the reason for the creation of the FBO to which they had a previous connection:
They were a group of [religious] people who I suppose committed themselves to do something caring. It's caring work; but backed up by the spirituality of it.

(Volunteer ‘c’, Joseph’s Place)

Any references made to faith tended to be in relation to the organisation’s history, with one interviewee noting that, at their induction training, they learned that ‘the organisation had links to faith before it became a day-centre’ (Volunteer ‘a’ Joseph’s Place).

However, from the outset, the new organisation operated on secular principles, becoming a charitable body and registered company. The language used in organisational publicity material about classes and other provisions was secular. The staff interviewed referred to other organisations as being faith based but not their own. There was an emphasis on the operation of the organisation being driven by secular (humanist) principles:

That's the important distinction, it's secular. We adopt, as I said human values, we accept all faiths or no faiths. (Director, Joseph’s Place)

Staff also indicated that in their encounters with service users ‘faith is not spoken about overtly.’ (Project worker ‘a’, Joseph’s Place). Another interviewee was more explicit in asserting:

Never heard it mentioned once. No-one has approached me to say they wanted to speak about faith. (Volunteer ‘b’ Joseph’s Place)

There was limited faith imagery present in the building (and therefore in the spaces that clients used), because of the landlord’s faith affiliation. A small cross and notice of religious services was visible in one of the doorways. In the dining/kitchen area there was a small cross on the wall and a notice on a board highlighting a bible meeting which day centre service users could attend. Two or three interviewees raised points about service users’ being supported in their personal affiliation because ‘they don't feel comfortable going to a church but would like to come here.’ (Volunteer ‘c’, Joseph’s Place).

There were voluntary faith observances available for day-centre service users. This included a space which ‘people can use for a quiet time of reflection and prayer.’ (Team leader, Joseph’s Place). Another interviewee spoke about the demand for that space:
We get quite a lot in who ask, what times the services are held, that’s fine, some people just want to talk [ ] and chat about whatever. They know they can still access that. A lot of them have got their own churches and they will go there and practice their faith. (Project worker ‘d’, Joseph’s Place)

There were some connections to churches because homeless people using the day-centre sometimes also availed themselves of shelter programmes operated by different churches. Another interviewee elaborated on how the organisation supported people using churches:

If they are sleeping rough or sleeping in churches, we would certainly link them to other organisations. (Project worker b, Joseph’s Place)

In summary, Table 8.4 below lists ten service characteristics for service two and the faith references visible within each.

Table 8.4: faith references identified in ‘Joseph’s Place’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service characteristic</th>
<th>Faith reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Name</td>
<td>Linked to person of faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mission Statement</td>
<td>No religious language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. History</td>
<td>Founded by people of faith on religious principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Source of income</td>
<td>Mixed including government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Legal status</td>
<td>Company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Staff/board selection</td>
<td>No faith requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Environment</td>
<td>Limited faith imagery (belonging to premises landlord)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Religious observance</td>
<td>Voluntary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Religious language</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Personal subscription (staff)</td>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Joseph’s Place was described as ‘secularised’ and table 8.4 shows why that is the case. The organisation displays some elements of faith which are remnants from their history and their current coupling to their landlord, a religious organisation. This would place ‘Joseph’s Place’ towards the lower end of the ‘faithness’ scale – perhaps a more accurate position than that of Unruh and Sider (2005) where they could fall into the mid-range ‘faith-affiliated’ category. The limited presence of ‘religious coupling’ (Smith and Sosin,
2001) and ‘religious integration’ (Goggin and Orth, 2002) again are due to their association with their landlord and are therefore accommodated in the ‘secularised’ definition and position on the ‘faithness’ scale.

8.5 Organisation three, ‘Kana’ (secular)

Service type

A recovery service and drop-in centre was the focus of the third case study. The service had two bases of operation, office space which the recovery team worked from and the drop-in centre. The drop-in was located in a single level, fully accessible building in a town centre. There was an informal seating area for service users to sit and chat, basic kitchen facilities for making drinks and snacks, a table and chairs for working at, and two computer desks where users could access the internet or prepare letters etc. There was a large room for activities and a small office which afforded privacy for one-to-one support if requested. It was open five days a week between the hours of nine to five.

Through the drop-in, clients could access: mutual aid meetings (offering different models for example, 12-step programmes, SMART), alternative therapies and social activities (for example, guitar group). Group work and peer support methods sat along with key-worker and 1- to-1 support. As there was a multi-agency approach to recovery work, clients using the recovery service and drop-in also had access to other forms of specialist support. This set up was fairly typical of drop-in services with more specialised functions such as supporting people with addictions (Warnes et al, 2003; Johnsen et al, 2005; Jones and Pleace, 2005; FEANTSA, 2010) and different to FBO operated drop-ins providing basic food and hot beverages (Conradson, 2003, Johnsen with Fitzpatrick, 2009). In 2014/15, over 650 people used the recovery service, with almost half of these accessing the drop-in.

Operational structures

Staffing and management

There were 86 (FTE) members of staff employed by the whole organisation, led by the Chief Executive, four group leaders and 14 managers.

Over 600 volunteers worked across the whole organisation with the number of hours given being equivalent to over 45 full time staff. Volunteers could get involved in roles across the organisation (in direct provision areas and administration). A coordinator’s post was set up in 2015 to support the organisation to maintain this workforce. With this aim, they
had developed volunteer handbooks, training programmes and support frameworks. The coordinator, during their interview, noted the range of experiences volunteers had:

*An awful lot of those volunteers are guys and women who have come from a background of homelessness, come out of jail, have had mental health problems, had substance abuse issues and that.* (Service manager ‘a’, Kana)

In the recovery service, there was a manager and 4 project workers and a community development worker who was based at the drop-in. All levels of staff worked with staff from other organisations (voluntary and statutory) to ensure clients had the widest access to support.

The service manager was responsible for managing the recovery team and drop-in, setting up arrangements for funding and liaising with different organisations in the recovery partnership. They also worked with national organisations and government to ensure the service’s knowledge, skills base and operating frameworks met current standards.

Support workers provided advice to people about various issues including housing benefits, health and relationships. They also developed recovery plans with the client to identify their needs and plan the forms of support (social, emotional and practical support, medical treatment) that would meet these. The planning process looked at how people could link into external resources that supported their recovery.

The community development worker based at the drop-in provided direct support to clients as well as being responsible for planning and coordinating the programme of activities. They liaised with the local community and organised events to raise awareness about the work of the drop-in. They supported the work of the steering group, (which included people with lived experience) who met on a monthly basis.

There were two types of voluntary work available at the drop-in: ‘volunteers’ and ‘peer-supporters’. The latter had a formal role which included attendance at steering group meetings and committing to working one day per week. Volunteering at the drop-in was seen as supporting a person’s recovery and increasing their skill set for future employability or other volunteering roles. Volunteers were provided with a handbook describing the different roles, responsibilities and support structures. As the volunteers could assume regular and significant responsibilities in the drop-in centre,
they were formally supported by the community development worker through 1 – to = 1 supervision and different forms of training. They would be trained in conflict resolution, in ways for maintaining confidentiality and ‘basically how to talk to somebody, you know, the act of listening and effective communication training.’ (Development worker, Kana)

Client group and referrals
In one way, the client group for the recovery service was the most specific because it was supporting people with addictions. As a result of their addiction, however, clients came to the service with wide ranging experiences. This included people in their own accommodation or who had had periods of homelessness. Some clients had housing issues such as difficulties in sustaining independent living because of the impact of their addiction on financial security, through loss of paid employment, or losing benefits. The client group could also access the recovery drop-in service:

When they are slightly more stable, their situation's better and your decision-making is a wee bit more consistent and confident to deal with what you'll try to offer.

(Service manager ‘b’, Kana)

The recovery service offered a direct access point. As such, people could ‘present at a drop-in clinic: as their first step to making a recovery.’ (Service manager ‘b’, Kana). Referrals were made to and from other agencies in the recovery partnership as well as clients accessing other direct access drop-in facilities, a model of support identified in other literature (White and Kurtz, 2006; Neff et al, 2006; Pleace, 2008).

Conditions of use
People attending the drop-in were required to sign in (name and time of arrival/departure) when they arrived because of fire regulations and for monitoring purposes. The client handbook set out very clearly the rules that were in place and the consequences if these were broken. The system was explained at interview:

There are now bans in place for anybody that comes in under the influence, anybody that is caught using on the premises, anybody caught dealing on the premises, anybody caught shoplifting and trying to sell. (Development worker, Kana)
As well as being used to create positive relationships with the local community ‘because we are front and centre in the centre’ (Development worker, Kana), the rules were also designed to safeguard services users and to provide a safe place for people to meet and help each other with their recovery following addiction.

The service and its faith characteristics

Case study three was chosen because it operated on secular principles and there was no faith referencing in organisational policy documents or marketing materials viewed or religious imagery in any of the buildings visited. Staff interviewees were clear that the organisation was driven by secular (humanist) principles. This included interviewees that had indicated a personal faith affiliation. The organisation’s name was biblically oriented and the founder was noted as a figure of faith:

*I don't actually know what period of time we consciously moved from... we were perhaps never set up as a faith based - it just so happened to be it was that it was a priest who set us up. Certainly, we started off from that position [faith].* (Service coordinator, Kana)

Table 8.5 below lists ten service characteristics for ‘Kana’ and the faith references visible within each.

Table 8.5: faith references identified in ‘Kana’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service characteristic</th>
<th>Faith reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Name</td>
<td>Linked to bible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Mission Statement</td>
<td>No religious language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. History</td>
<td>Founded by person of faith as a secular organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Source of income</td>
<td>Mixed including government (mixed faith reference)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Legal status</td>
<td>SCIO (non-faith reference)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Staff/board selection</td>
<td>No faith requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Environment</td>
<td>No faith imagery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Religious observance</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Religious language</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Personal subscription (staff)</td>
<td>Some</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8.5 confirms that Kana is secular and at the lower end of the ‘faithness’ scale and concurs with the ‘secular’ classification of Unruh and Sider (2005). The case of Kana further underlines the capacity of the concept of ‘faithness’ to encompass different aspects of what it is for an organisation to be secular. That is, Kana had historical elements of faith, which had no bearing on the organisation currently, rather than an absence of faith components altogether.

Interviewees from organisation three also knew about other FBOs because the organisation worked ‘alongside various different organisations, faith based and non-faith based.’ (Service manager ‘a’, Kana). The other service manager from Kana elaborated on those known to them:

... local church fellowships and whether it's a collective of the [] churches or individual denominations, whether it's the Church of Scotland, or the Catholic Church, or the Baptist Church, or whoever, will take on programmes to do something about those who are marginalised in society. (Service manager ‘b’, Kana)

A faith based mutual-aid programme, available in the drop-in, was noted as:

_It is called Celebrate Recovery. Celebrate Recovery is, again, delivered by people with lived experience who have found Christianity. It is primarily Christianity because it's based on the bible._ (Development worker, Kana)

Whilst operating as a secular organisation, Kana facilitated service users’ access to both secular and faith-based recovery programmes to maximise user choice _‘because everybody's journey is different. Everybody gets recovery differently’_ (Development worker, Kana). One of the service managers spoke about how a person’s choice was always considered, in that staff would _‘not promote any fellowship or programme over another.’_ (Service manager ‘b’, Kana). Although this type of perspective might show some evidence of ‘religious integration’ (Smith and Sosin, 2001), the spirit in which it is done (to increase service user choice) keeps ‘Kana’ at the lowest end of the ‘faithness’ scale.
8.6 Conclusion

The focus of this chapter has been to set out the key contextual information of the three case study organisations: ‘Trinity 3’ (an overtly faith-based accommodation unit), ‘Joseph’s Place’ (a secularised day centre with historical faith associations), and ‘Kana’ (a secular recovery drop-in). Specifically, it has provided details regarding service type, operational structures (staff and management, client group and referrals, conditions of use), and assessed the extent to which faith is (or is not) evident in organisational identity, staffing, programmes and premises.

This chapter also successfully applied the concept of ‘faithness’ to examine basic faith characteristics in the case organisations which showed that each one of them incorporated atypical traits. The overtly faith-based Trinity 3 was in receipt of government funding and operated as a company, the day-centre of the secularised Joseph’s Place retained elements of ‘religious coupling’ (Smith and Sosin, 2001) through their landlord being a religious organisation and even Kana, the secular organisation, had a brief faith history in its founding.

This material therefore aids comparisons between the organisations in the following empirical chapters which assess what (if any) difference ‘faithness’ makes to the way in which they operate, their positions in the homelessness sector and how they are perceived by service users. The next chapter considers the first of these themes, that is how the operational structures of the organisations compare with each other and whether ‘faithness’ makes a difference.
Chapter nine: The impact of 'faithness' on the characteristics and practices of three case study organisations

9.1 Introduction

This chapter considers ‘faithness’ in the context of the case study organisations and how faith influenced (or not) their structures and operation. It further develops the concept of ‘faithness’ in analysing the organisational characteristics of the three case studies, introduced in chapter eight above. It also compares the empirical findings of this research with those of previous studies.

Drawing on the fieldwork data, the purpose of this chapter is to systematically compare the key characteristics of the three case study organisations in order to discern whether ‘faithness’ has an impact on what they do and how they do it, thus addressing a core research aim.

Section 9.2 briefly compares organisational names to examine what, if anything, they tell us about the organisational faithness. In section 9.3, organisational aims are analysed. Management structures and individual responsibilities are examined in section 9.4. Section 9.5 focusses on recruitment practices, while Section 9.6 considers what it is organisations do, their daily tasks and how these are ordered. Section 9.7 focuses on considering the physical environments in which services are delivered. Section 9.8 examines the place of faith practices in programmes. Section 9.9 moves from organisational characteristics to briefly analyse staff members’ motivations and the role, if any, that faith plays in these. The conclusion, section 9.10, draws together the findings on the impact of ‘faithness’ on these characteristics and practices.

9.2 Organisational name

All three organisations were similar in that their names had faith references in them, with all three having biblical foundations. This was due to the impact of ‘religious coupling’ (Smith and Sosin, 2001) on religious organisations when they were established. However, the faith element of the name had a different effect (Jeavons, 1997) in each case.

In the example of the faith-based Trinity 3, an overt reference to faith in their name would be expected as their service manager told me ‘It’s in our name. We don’t shorten our name.'
We’re a Christian organisation.’ (Service Manager, Trinity 3). On the other hand, it could be considered anomalous for Joseph’s Place and Kana to retain names because of historical connections to faith through their founders, when informants emphasised they were non-faith based in operation and in philosophy:

That's the important distinction, it's secular. We adopt, as I said, human values, we accept all faiths or no faiths. (Director, Joseph’s Place)

It was quite clearly and distinctly non-religious, so it was interesting, even though the driving force was a Catholic priest and many of the supporters were from religious contexts, they understood that to be genuinely inclusive they had to be secular. (Chief Executive, Kana)

The use of ‘secular’ as a descriptor here appears to show that these organisations avoided having a specific religious affiliation, rather than excluded faith influences altogether. This point was made clear by a project worker at Joseph’s Place who spoke about a room being made available for 'spiritual purposes', while another project worker commented:

I am not clued up on religion, the [name of organisation] is still religious, we are not, we have kind of broken away from that side of things ..... on a day to day basis none of us would be religious but if someone wanted that faith-base, it is there. (Project worker ‘d’, Joseph’s Place).

However, before Joseph’s Place became an independent organisation, they operated under the auspices of a religious organisation but their name was entirely non-religious. The team leader explained that, on setting up as a new organisation, they changed their name which then sounded faith-based. This meant that, ironically, they had a non-religious name when they were affiliated to the founding organisation, but when they became secular, their name sounded more faith-based. One key informant from there highlighted the initial impact that changing the organisation’s name had had on other stakeholders:

I think, initially, for workers as well in other agencies who were colleagues who’d always known us by another name .... but gradually I think it is being recognised more and more as [Joseph’s Place] now but it would take a while and I think that was understandable before the name change started to register.
(Team leader, Joseph’s Place)

Faith had therefore influenced the names of all three case studies with the overt Trinity 3 having the most obvious allusion to religion in their name. Joseph’s Place had changed their name on separating from the religious organisation to which they were previously affiliated but, ironically, their name sounded more faith-based thereafter. Kana, an entirely secular organisation had a name bearing a biblical reference. This all suggests that not too much should necessarily be assumed about the ‘faithness’ of homelessness organisations from their names (Johnsen, 2014).

9.3 Organisational aims

Through their stated aims, organisations may set out what they want to do for service users, their philosophical principles and broader work in homelessness. In turn, it is usually hoped that staff use aims as prompts to inform their actions and daily work routines. This section sets out and compares the aims identified by managers, frontline workers and volunteers from the three case study organisations.

Although the case study organisations delivered different types of services, they all published their stated aims through annual accounts and reports, staff/volunteer handbooks, service user information leaflets and on websites. The main objective of all three organisations was supporting homeless people, a finding which concurred with other research (Randall and Brown, 2006; Johnsen and Fitzpatrick, 2009). However, Trinity 3’s objectives were infused with religious language whilst Joseph’s Place emphasising the rights that homeless people had and notions of social inclusion being at the core of Kana’s objectives.

There were some similarities in the organisational aims identified by the staff from all three organisations, for example they drew on notions from the sector’s 'personalisation' agenda in recognising the individual context of homeless people:

I think it's [being] of the mindset of service of doing what they can do at the right time in people's lives. So I think that they really try to uphold those rights and also remind people of their rights as individuals. (Volunteer ‘b’, Trinity 3)
The main aims are quite simple, to be very much a person-centred approach to those, the most vulnerable people in [ ] who are affected by all aspects of homelessness. (Director, Joseph’s Place)

They are focused on the individual really. It's focused on what their particular situation is; what support needs they have; what they want to achieve; and what they’d like us to help them achieve. (Service manager ‘a’, Kana)

Creating a positive environment for service users was another goal on which informants from all three case study organisations reflected. The service manager from Trinity 3, in the context of operating an accommodation unit, articulated their goal as: ‘I want to give guys happy memories so maybe guys haven't had happy memories at all.’ (Service manager, Trinity 3), while another two informants from Trinity spoke about trying to create space for residents which they hoped would ‘...enable somebody to live their life.’ (Deputy service manager ‘a’, Trinity 3). For a Trinity 3 volunteer, being in a residential unit provided time to:

....build relationships up with residents, just during window checking, just talking to them or at meals or going down and playing pool or table tennis with them for a couple of hours. (Volunteer ‘b’, Trinity 3)

Informants from Joseph’s Place, also saw the importance of having a friendly and supportive tone with one pointing towards providing service users with ‘a quality of life and be treated respectfully by whatever agency they are involved in.’ (Project worker ‘c’, Joseph’s Place). Joseph’s team leader saw that creating a positive environment started at the beginning of each interaction:

We want people to be made welcome, very much so. That friendly greeting at the side door should be a friendly greeting. It should be a welcome. It may be the only welcome that person's going to get that day or even that week. (Team leader, Joseph’s Place)

The notion of welcoming people is important (Johnsen et al, 2005; Murray and Johnsen, 2011; Bowpitt et al, 2013; Gravell, 2013) particularly where service users have found it
difficult to approach services. All key informants articulated aims pertaining to service users’ rights as homeless people and their broader human rights:

So I think that they really try to uphold those rights and also remind people of their rights as individuals. (Volunteer ‘a’, Trinity 3)

So I think an awful lot of things we do are to ensure that service users, basically making sure they are getting what they are entitled to. (Project worker ‘c’, Joseph’s Place).

One of the service managers from Kana highlighted the working relationships they had with other organisations to ensure that service users could access information about their rights:

We interact a lot more with specialist advice agencies who may have specialist knowledge of things like welfare rights or housing law. (Service manager ‘a’ Kana)

However, this rights-based dimension did seem particularly emphasised in Joseph’s Place, with several informants elaborating on their understanding of rights for their service users:

‘I think it is about justice and fairness people getting the service they are entitled to.’ (Project worker ‘a’, Joseph’s Place)

...being non-judgemental. Just to treat people the way you would like to be treated if you found yourself in these circumstances or your mother or father or son treated. If you found yourself in these circumstances. (Project worker b, Joseph’s Place)

An agenda to promote positive lifestyle choices and sustainable routes out of homelessness was evident across all three organisations, and so seemed unaffected by their position on the ‘faithness’ spectrum. Even in the most overtly faith-based organisation, deputy managers from Trinity 3 spoke about their aims in preparing people to move into settled accommodation:
We’re trying to get people ready to move into long-term accommodation and to try and give them some of the life skills that they can maintain that accommodation long term. (Deputy service manager ‘a’, Trinity 3)

It’s to help residents find somewhere suitable to move on, that they can then sustain. Not just getting them what they might think they want when they first come in, or what other people are suggesting to them is the right thing, ....... but to try and identify what would be a suitable move on and then support them to do that. (Deputy service manager ‘b’, Trinity 3)

Likewise, volunteers from Joseph’s Place explained that:

We want to support people to move forward in their situations, move on with, not necessarily into employment, but with their own issues. (Volunteer ‘a’, Joseph’s Place)

Two informants from Kana similarly highlighted how their aims focused on ‘supporting people to do things themselves. We’re trying to support people to achieve things themselves.’ (Manager ‘a’, Kana), and ‘We try and work with everybody who comes our way, from whether their issues are at home, at work, community, wherever, that we try and support them to a better point in life. (Service coordinator, Kana)

Where homeless people have long histories and connections to the homelessness system, they may form a dependency even where the service is not institutional in form. One of Trinity’s deputy service managers spoke about balancing their aims of providing a safe space for residents and striving to encourage their independence:

We want people to be safe here [but]...we don’t want them to think oh, this is a place I don’t want to leave, to get institutionalised and so familiar with the place that it’s difficult to move on. (Deputy service manager ‘b’, Trinity 3)

Staff from Joseph’s Place spoke at length about their aims for safeguarding their service users against any dependence arising from their proximity to the system:

I think it’s wrong that people always come and be dependent. Yes, be dependent on us but we want to set them on a path, in fact get them on a road which makes them
non-dependent on us. Which is quite hard, but that's – we just apply human values to everybody which is quite straightforward. We attempt to see everybody.

(Director, Joseph’s Place)

*I think we try and not get people too dependent on us. Help them take responsibility, get them to do it themselves, learn to cope for themselves. So that is basically the aim, it is not about mollycoddling. They are going to have cope eventually on their own so…. (Project worker ‘d’, Joseph’s Place)*

Although their operational aims did focus largely on creating the means to deliver on practical aspects of moving people on from their homeless experience, and in so doing mostly resembled those of the other two case study organisations, in keeping with its overt faith base, Trinity 3 had additional aims which were quite distinct from those of Joseph’s Place and Kana, and drew on specific aspects of faith. Firstly, Trinity’s service manager detailed a general aim for the staff team:

>[An] aim for me and the staff certainly is to be representatives of Christ, so to be an advert for Christ, to be sort of like inside of this workplace and how that looks like I think is very much in our actions, our approaches to people.

(Service manager, Trinity 3)

One of the deputy service managers highlighted their understanding of what that meant for them:

*I aim to be the absolute best I can because the way I believe it, my boss is Jesus so I'm going to do the best I can because he's in charge. My view is that the 28 people here are his guests so they deserve to be treated well, with dignity, respect and care.*

(Deputy service manager ‘a’, Trinity 3)

Two other informants from Trinity 3 connected their personal positions of faith to aims focused on service users gaining self-respect and a sense of being valued:

*To me, from what I see, it's about hope and the future, and aiming to give people dignity, and showing them that they are valuable to us and to God.*

(Project worker, Trinity 3)
I think we try to look at not just on the outside, what they show us, but go deeper. I think that that faith part is key to that, at least in my opinion it is.

(Volunteer ‘b’, Trinity 3)

As is clear then from this section, all three organisations shared aims around supporting homeless people in a way that reflected on and respected their individuality and the rights to which they were entitled, with the latter theme particularly evident in Joseph’s Place. However, the ‘faithness’ of Trinity 3 was evident in that they also had aims which were distinctive because they reflected on the faith position of the organisation and were infused with faith references and tone.

9.4 Recruitment practices

Recruitment practices in FBOs are covered in other pieces of research pertaining to whether their processes positively seek out adherents (Unruh and Sider, 2005; Smith et al, 2006; Johnsen and Fitzpatrick, 2009). The recruitment practices of Trinity 3 fully embraced such notions and these were a key means by which it upheld its aims of a religious nature just discussed. They were enabled to do so via the application of what is known as an ‘occupational requirement’ (OR), established on religious grounds by ‘The Employment Equality (Religion or Belief) Regulations 2003’ which were consolidated through the Equality Act, 2010. The OR is generally intended to relate to staff leading worship and/or fulfilling professional religious duties (rabbi, minister, priest, imam, etc.). In 2014, however, the Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (ACAS) wrote about the application of a OR in the context of service delivery:

A Christian charity with a religious ethos may be able to demonstrate that it is an occupational requirement for some roles in the organisation to be restricted to Christians.’ (2014, p19) (my emphasis)

The very extensive way in which the OR was implemented in Trinity 3, was noted by one of the deputy managers:

The Trust policy is that everyone who does face-to-face work with the clients has to be a practising Christian. (Deputy manager ‘a’, Trinity 3)
A ruling on the definition of genuineness (Churches Legislation Advisory Service, 2015) appears to offer a rationale for applying a wider OR where staff are upholding the ethos of the organisation through practical observances. In these circumstances, they could ‘legitimately refuse applications from non-Christians because Christianity permeated the organisation: for example, each day started with prayers.’ (2015, p16). In Trinity 3, each day began and ended with team prayers.

Making recruitment conditional on faith for front-line staff could appear at odds with delivering functions which are claimed to be principally secular in nature (see below), and may be considered particularly troubling where posts are supported, at least in part, by public funds. However, staff and volunteers in Trinity 3 appeared to endorse rather than question its applicability in the context of service delivery, because they saw it as a way of building up team unity via a shared understanding and acceptance of faith with other team members:

*It's like singing from the same hymn sheet, using that old expression. We all do. It's something we all focus on.* (Deputy Manager ‘a’, Trinity 3)

*There's no particular denomination or creed, or anything, within the staff team, but in having that same faith means you have broadly the same goals that brings you together.* (Deputy Manager ‘b’, Trinity 3)

*I think it helps in a very cohesive working environment, not just as a volunteer but residents can see how we work together as a team which I think goes back to our core values and ethics as Christians and as a Christian organisation.* (Volunteer ‘a’, Trinity 3)

*We fall back on the faith and remember how to act and how we're supposed to act. I think that's always in the back of our minds, so I think it does help produce the outcome.* (Volunteer ‘b’, Trinity 3)

The profound impact of ‘faithness’ on recruitment practices was also highlighted by the significance of the changes that Joseph’s Place made when they moved to operating from a secularised basis. Common custom and practice, prior to regulations introducing occupational requirements, was that religious organisations often sought to recruit people with a proven faith affiliation (as was evident in job advertisements), including Joseph's
Place. The team leader at Joseph’s Place spoke about the practice of the then parent organisation when they had first started working for them:

_So it was interesting working with that and at that time when I applied for my job, [ ] years ago, it said things in the job advert, 'Must have a live church connection', that sort of thing._ (Team leader, Joseph’s Place)

In removing the requirement of its founding organisation for recruiting people with a faith position, Joseph’s Place underlines its process of secularisation and increasing its capacity for embracing principles of equality.

### 9.5 Organisational management and staff responsibilities

This section focuses on informants’ understanding of their organisation’s management structures and staff responsibilities within them. The data gathered from the fieldwork indicates that, in sharp contrast to recruitment practices, faithness seemed to have little bearing on management, structures and responsibilities.

All three organisations had management boards with the number of people sitting on them varying in proportion to organisational size. All three cases used the term _trustees_ to describe their board members, a remnant from their founding constitution as Trusts. This sat alongside the use of the term 'directors' required for company registration. The ways that informants from all organisations spoke about the functions of their board suggested that they operated along similar business lines, with a focus on planning and delivering strategic functions, which was in keeping with their operating in professionalised environments underpinned by a contract culture.

Although all three organisations operated hierarchies, the distance between the top and bottom tiers were relatively few in number. Further, the organisations were different in size (staff numbers), they arranged different work strands in projects or teams which had their own management structures, that is service manager, team leader.

For the two larger organisations, Trinity 3 and Kana, there were similarities in connection to business planning structures as drawn out by informants from both organisations:
Well, the trust itself does a plan every three years setting general goals, and then we have our own plans that fit to those three years and then each individual member of staff has a yearly appraisal, .... to feed into either the trust-wide goals or ours, or both as far as possible. (Deputy service manager ‘b’, Trinity 3)

I have a five-year strategy document and we have a year-on-year corporate plan and we each have project plans, and then individual work plans. If we get it right there should be a thread, you should be able to connect what some individual has been given as an objective to that strategic plan. (Director, Kana)

Whether it's the corporate plan, it's strategic. So although we're delivering the daily operational stuff, it's definite that we're focused on the long-term strategy: where we're taking the service and how to develop the service and deciding each corporate plan. (Service manager ‘b’, Kana)

Across all three organisations, informants spoke about their individual responsibilities within the context of management structures. Informants’ views from within organisations are grouped here to draw out the movement between each tier, as well as comparison made between organisations. Relating firstly to Trinity 3, where the top level of management was highlighted by the service manager:

I'm in charge of making sure that this unit complies with the standards set out for the Care Inspectorate, for the council who do all of our referrals and fund us and also yes, making sure that we meet all necessary requirements and report back to the exec team as well and head office. (Service manager, Trinity 3)

At the next level, the deputy service manager noted their role in managing several members of staff

I currently supervise two project workers, two night-shift workers, an administrator and then there's a couple of vacancies for another administrator and an assistant project worker, that if they were filled I would be supervising them. (Deputy service manager ‘b’, Trinity 3)
One of Trinity 3’s volunteers noted the points of the chain above them outlining formal and informal arrangements for supporting them:

*I have a, I guess, supervisor, which is one of the project workers, and then also the management too.* (Volunteer ‘b’, Trinity 3)

As with Trinity 3’s manager, the Director of Joseph’s Place outlined their principal management function:

*Right, well basically my role is obviously in charge of the organisation. I devolve responsibilities to three of my staff, in three separate areas.*

(Director, Joseph’s Place)

The next tier of management in Joseph’s Place, was team leaders. The team leader I interviewed spoke about their management responsibilities for ‘a small team, a team, who engage with service users as they present to the centre.’ (Team Leader, Joseph’s Place), indicating a proximity between management interactions and direct work with service users. At the next level, one of the project workers indicated how the team leader was directly responsible for allocating their work to them: ‘So [ ] our team leader would assign our roles.’ (Project worker ‘c’, Joseph’s Place). Another of Joseph’s Place project workers spoke about their responsibilities for volunteers when they were on café duty:

*One of the full time staff oversee …not so much monitoring but support the volunteers. The volunteers run the café and the full time staff support them.*

(Project worker ‘a’, Joseph’s Place)

A similar pattern in management could be seen in Kana, with the Chief Executive noting their management function:

*I lead the leadership team; I ensure that we have in place the operational programme to make sure we can deliver on what we deliver.* (Chief Executive, Kana)
Another staff member from Kana detailed the upward and downward flow of the management structure before noting their role in supporting managers throughout the organisation:

*The structure of us is [CE] heads a leadership team which are the heads of the key services and then the next tier is the management team and that's where I sit in on that level. We meet regularly. The leadership meet every single week. ... I sit down with the service managers to see how my role can help. Technically I work for the department of corporate services.* (Service coordinator, Kana)

The two service managers from Kana gave examples of how their management responsibilities extended beyond the immediate structures of the organisation:

*Our homeless prevention service is the lead partner in that consortium. So, as well as managing my own team, I sort of manage the consortium as well.*

(Service manager ‘a’, Kana)

Similarly, the manager with responsibility for the recovery service spoke about the organisation’s drop-in hub:

*I'm also responsible for the recovery drop-in ..... That is a safe space. It's a designated safe space for people to meet who are, again, seeking positive routes away from active addiction.* (Serve manager ‘b’, Kana)

As the only paid member of staff in the drop-in centre, Kana’s development worker also undertook a supervisory role for people who worked there unpaid:

*All peers and volunteers get supervision probably every couple of months. There is a steering group meeting once a month, which is where we make a lot of decisions.*

(Development worker, Kana)

The same informant spoke about another role they had which was focused on enabling the steering group, a decision-making body that included previous clients:
They are in charge, they oversee the planning of activities and the introduction of new things like focus groups, they make decisions about the operation of the drop-in and practical things like events. (Project worker, Kana)

Thus, for the most part ‘faithfulness’ seemed to have little impact on organisational management and staff responsibilities. However, ‘faithfulness’ had an impact in Trinity 3, in relation to the programming of the daily devotion sessions (prayers and bible reading) which were managed by staff, as noted by one of the volunteers:

A staff member would lead any bible verse they are doing or chapter they want to talk about and just checking in with them or share a prayer and tell them where they’re at with it. (Volunteer ‘b’, Trinity 3)

Furthermore, informants from Joseph’s Place, again spoke about changes to their board when they became an independent (and non-faith based) organisation. Firstly, as the Director noted, ’the board and trustees of the [former host organisation], I've got to say were fairly – I would say very much driven by the religious side.’ (Director, Joseph’s Place). A volunteer with a long-standing involvement in Joseph’s Place, spoke about how the board functions changed following an organisational review in which:

One of the recommendations was that our governing body or the board of directors, whatever you would like to call them, perhaps were not involved as much as they should be with the actual governing of the day centre. (Volunteer ‘c’, Joseph’s Place)

These two quotes show the changes that took place in Joseph’s Place when they became a non-faith based organisation, in which new expectations were placed on the management board to support the business functions of the organisation, rather than focus on spiritual matters as they had done previously.

9.6 Organisational routines.

This section illustrates and compares daily organisational routines within the three case studies. Although staff in the three organisations had administrative tasks to fulfil, their day-to-day workloads were primarily focused on direct engagement with service users. This included advice and information giving, advocacy, support work, running life-skill classes as well as supplying meals and accommodation. While the organisations offered
distinctive services (an accommodation unit, a day-centre and a recovery drop-in), there
were similarities between them in the allocation of tasks.

In the main, my evidence suggests that responsibilities and routines are largely dominated
by organising practical tasks to support service users and ‘faithness’ had a limited role in
these work patterns. However, there was something of a difference with Trinity 3 in that in
addition to their usual work routines, they factored in daily and regular time for staff to
reflect on their faith, as is discussed below.

Types of work
Two informants from Trinity summarised their work as follows:

Support meetings with clients, reviews with clients with managers which we do after
a 12-week stay. Whether or not you're cooking, on kitchen duty ... you're maybe
having to go out with residents that have maybe got interviews or they've got
appointments. (Deputy service manager ‘a’, Trinity 3)

I'm making phone calls, I'm referring them places, I'm taking them to appointments,
or activity groups, local community things, sending emails, writing letters on their
behalf. (Support worker, Trinity 3)

Members of the staff team from Joseph’s Place highlighted similar types of jobs in their
organisation:

We can make calls and advocate on their behalf and maybe arrange for them to go
over to the [local council office]. (Team leader, Joseph’s Place)

The duty service we have can be anything from ‘I received a Scottish Power bill and
I don’t know what it means’ to ‘I think I am going to kill myself’. It’s such a wide
thing so in terms of Advice and Information, on duty being mindful when you are
giving Advice and Information yourself, it is accurate and correct and we get
training on that. (Project worker ‘c’, Joseph’s Place)

So we would be offering advice, helping people sustain their accommodation,
benefits, help to access addiction services or help register with the doctor. We also
provide practical support like giving out food, toiletries and we run a café upstairs [small charge made]. (Project worker ‘d’, Joseph’s Place)

One of Kana’s service managers drew out how the organisation made a distinction in job titles from the other cases, although the actual operational functions of the workers seemed similar:

*Our staff are called personal advisors and we don't like the term support workers, because we're advising people to do the things they want; how they achieve what they want to achieve. We're not their support worker.*

(Service manager ‘a’, Kana)

Volunteers working in the case study organisations had similar functions to other staff, as highlighted by one of Trinity 3’s deputy managers:

*So within the team they [volunteers] do most things. They don't do direct support work, they don't do sitting down one-on-one with the rest of them, but pretty much every other task they do.* (Deputy service manager ‘b’, Trinity 3)

In Joseph’s Place, the volunteers working in the café did similar tasks to full time staff allocated café duty:

*Setting up the café before clients came in, serving the food, checking that everything is on tables, take money and put in cash machine. Usually at half twelve, there is an influx of people so it gets quite hectic at times.* (Volunteer ‘a’, Joseph’s Place)

*If pressures allow, we speak to client coming up to the counter for chats. Some people like to chat for a long time and others are happy just to say hi.*

(Volunteer ‘b’, Joseph’s Place)

Volunteers, as well as paid staff, are therefore at the front end of the service and engage with the service users through the tasks they perform. Organisations also involve volunteers who have personal experiences of homelessness, a practice noted in other pieces of research (Jones and Pleace, 2005; Neff et al, 2006; Boeck et al, 2009). Two staff
members from Kana spoke about how their peer volunteers supported the operation of the drop-in service:

*It's not a member of staff that new person sees. It's somebody with lived experience, somebody who's been through what they've been through. They can give them a bit of information, provide them with what are the major activities that are going on.*

(Service manager ‘b’, Kana)

Kana’s development worker explained how peers were also involved in direct support work with other service users:

*They can sit and talk to them about struggles that they've going through, and the peer and volunteer can say I know how you feel.* (Development worker, Kana)

**Work routines**

Trinity 3 and Joseph’s Place were similar to each other because they provided their residents/service users with meals and food. Trinity’s project worker summarised their organisation’s routine in relation to this:

*Someone's always got to cook lunch, in the morning someone's always going to do the cleaning checks around the flats. Someone always does kitchen duty with the residents after lunch, and also breaks in the early afternoon. We do kind of tea-time, mid afternoon tea and biscuits and cake. Then there's dinner, and kitchen duty after dinner.* (Project worker, Trinity 3)

Two informants from Joseph’s Place also provided their perspectives of routines round their meal times:

*At 10am, after we set up, we open for breakfast from 10:00 to half eleven and then we close again for an hour. We open again at half twelve, the café opens to serve lunches from half twelve to half two and you will find the majority of service users leave at half two when the café closes.* (Project worker ‘c’, Joseph’s Place)
Volunteer-wise, we open from 10:00 to 11:30, we shut for an hour and then from 12:30 till 14:30 the cafe will be open so there busy times …. in the 12:30 to 14:30 slot in the cafe it's quite a busy period so there's three volunteers then.

(Team Leader, Joseph’s Place)

Organisational setting can impact on the way that workloads are ordered. In the example of an accommodation unit like Trinity 3 that covers day and night, tasks may be spread over a longer period of the day, as indicated by two of their informants:

You can do an interview in the evening as long as it's round about 7 o'clock because really you need bare minimum of an hour to get an interview done.

(Deputy service manager ‘a’, Trinity 3).

It's usually when a lot of support meetings happen and interviews for residents, new residents coming in, happen. (Volunteer ‘a’, Trinity 3)

There was also evidence that work routines sought to accommodate the needs of individual clients. An informant from Trinity noted this:

I would quite frequently have a support meeting, at least one in a day, at a time convenient to my residents as much as I can, and with them I'm creating a support plan. (Project worker, Trinity 3)

Outreach services have a different logistic for programming their workloads, which again reflects on the needs of service users in being available in different locations:

Yes, we go out to people. We give clients the option of where we meet .....We meet at a place that's convenient for people, and they can choose that place. Most likely it will be in their homes or where they're staying at the moment; but we often meet people in community facilities, libraries, that sort of thing. It's really up to the service user where we meet. (Service manager ‘a’, Kana)

The development worker from Kana also indicated how their daily routine recognised the regular patterns of their service users:
It’s always the same because most activities are in the afternoon. I think it's to get them here and to keep them here. There is no point in putting anything on at ten o'clock in the morning if I don't have to, because I won't have anybody attend it.

(Development worker, Kana)

It is important for organisations that work directly with service users to have structures for sharing information between staff members, to keep their knowledge about their clients current. This is relevant for keeping support plans up to date, where they have to make ongoing referrals and to reduce situations in which service users are repeatedly having to recount their stories. Informants from Trinity 3 and Joseph’s Place indicated they started their days with staff time or handovers as a means for sharing practical information. One of Trinity’s volunteers spoke in depth about the format of their first meeting of the day:

So, yes, I get here around 8.40. We have a handover from the night before, with the night staff at 8.45. They usually just tell us what happened that night, just a quick summary of each of our residents. Then from there we usually do a staff meeting where we again talk about what's going to be the plan for the day with the shift manager. (Volunteer ‘a’, Trinity 3)

Daily team meetings in Joseph’s Place performed a similar function as highlighted by one of the project workers:

We have a team handover from the previous day, who we saw on duty, through the duty service, what we saw them for and any issues outstanding. We then get allocated our tasks for the day. (Project worker ‘a’, Joseph’s Place)

However, Trinity 3 handovers were distinct to those of Joseph’s Place and the difference was due to ‘faithness’. During their handovers, there was ‘a prayer, a bible reading, to reflect on. So we do that every morning regardless.’ (Deputy service manager ‘a’, Trinity 3). As these were team meetings, these slots did not involve residents. This direct expression of their faith-base was described in more detail by another informant:

Yes, in the mornings in our initial staff meeting, we actually do a prayer with night shift as those staff are leaving, just in the office and then again after we discuss the schedule for the day. (Volunteer ‘b’, Trinity 3)
Trinity’s project worker focused on the personal nature of this time:

*I think that just helps us to refocus and remember why we're here as people who believe in prayer and a loving God.* (Project worker, Trinity 3)

The service manager spoke about how this reflection was integral to their understanding of working based on faith principles:

*Our example comes from, yes, the example set to us by Christ, and I think that's also important .... they have as a team in the morning, and praying when they come on shift and praying when they come off of shift as well, with the new team coming on, just to make sure yes, that we're approaching the work that we do in line with biblical principles.* (Service manager, Trinity 3)

### 9.7 Service environments

In chapter four above, consideration was given to faith influences in service environments (Jeavons, 1997 and 2004, Smith and Sosin, 2001, Goggin and Orth, 2002, Sider and Unruh, 2004). Authors described the presence of religious symbols in spaces that services were delivered from, religious observances such as prayers and bible readings and programmes with explicit religious content. They also examined whether faith practices were compulsory (a condition for receiving the service) or optional.

Within the case study organisations, there was evidence of religious symbols in the service spaces of Trinity 3 and Joseph’s Place, though their focus differed between the two organisations. And, with regard to religious observances (prayers, bible readings), these were again found in both Trinity 3 and Joseph’s Place. This was not the case in the services spaces of Kana, where there was no evidence of religious symbols or observances.

As the discussion below will show via the examples of Trinity 3 and Joseph’s Place in particular, it is perhaps in these matters of service environments that this blending of faith and non-faith aspects is most noticeable, which supports an understanding that the concept of ‘faithfulness’ is a complex and potentially fluid one.
The use of faith-based buildings

The resettlement unit, Trinity 3, was not housed in a building which did not have any observable religious links. When established, some non-faith based organisations used religious resources like buildings because churches had suitable spaces in good locations at reasonable prices. Joseph’s Place continue to do that. This meant at times having to clarify their position with service users ‘a lot of people still think we are a religious base so if anyone mentions it, I will correct them.’ (Project worker ‘d’, Joseph’s Place).

Even in wholly secular Kana, where staff indicated a personal faith affiliation, they appeared willing to use faith-based resources despite the entirely non-faith based nature of their organisation. For example, one informant from Kana, who had a personal faith, spoke about using a community base of a church and its facilities to build up clients’ practical skills:

*I'm trying to build a network of community cook sessions. This is in conjunction with the churches as well because they tend to have halls and kitchens and whatever.* (Service coordinator, Kana)

The same informant went on to give another way in which they saw the place of faith in these encounters, which reflected their own (if not their organisation's) religious orientation:

*We're looking at a far more holistic bit around food with regard to the community element of it, the biblical breaking bread element of it and sharing socially what you're doing.* (Service coordinator, Kana)

Kana staff that did not hold faith positions made no reference to using religious buildings to deliver services.

The presence of religious symbols in service spaces

Faith-based organisations may display religious imagery in spaces where services are delivered, or where activities take place. In Trinity 3 references to Christ were prominently featured in statements about their values contained in staff areas. A more discreet reference, a biblical quote on a sheet of A4 paper, was also placed amongst a range of art posters and service notices in the communal dining room. The service manager drew
attention to the idea behind this:

We do have like a weekly thought for the week really that someone puts up, just on a noticeboard, so crowded among all the other posters. It's just something that one of our volunteers thought of last year and wanted to put on, a type of bible reading and maybe a thought about that underneath. (Service manager, Trinity 3)

Interestingly, there were religious artefacts on the walls in the café space of 'secularised' Joseph’s Place. However, this was entirely due to the fact that the building was owned by a faith-based landlord, rather than being placed there by the Joseph's Place staff. These artefacts included ‘a few crosses and a few Virgin Marys around’ (Project worker ‘d’, Joseph’s Place). This interviewee perceived these icons as not being an issue because the clients were said to be ‘quite used to that, they don’t notice it anymore.’ (Project worker ‘d’, Joseph’s Place), but we return to this issue from the perspective of the service users themselves in Chapter 11. There were no religious symbols in the spaces used by Kana.

**Observing religious practices**

As an overtly Christian organisation, Trinity 3 staff emphasised the place of faith in their work, but insisted that this was not forced on residents:

*I think it's always fair to explain it [the organisation's faith basis] to people. Also it's, 'By the way, we're not going to ram it down your throat and it's your choice if you want to take part or not. No matter who you are, you're going to get the same care.' I always think it's worth actually informing somebody of that at an interview.* (Deputy service manager ‘a’, Trinity 3).

One volunteer explained that faith observances had to be optional in case they impacted on service users’ willingness to use the service:

*We believe in the Christian faith but we're not judging. …… We don't shove it down anyone's throat, we don't just quote scriptures to them. I mean, if we did push faith and stuff I think that the numbers of people who have moved on to better things, I think the number would fall down quite a bit, so...* (Volunteer ‘b’ Trinity 3)
The same volunteer went on to explain that ‘devotions’ time (sessions with prayers and readings), which happened on a daily basis after lunch, was a short time for staff and residents to come together, but again emphasised that this was optional for residents:

A staff member would lead any bible verse they are doing or chapter they want to talk about and just checking in with them or share a prayer and tell them where they're at with it. (Volunteer ‘b’, Trinity 3)

This stance was framed as upholding resident’s 'rights' by another volunteer:

There are some things we just simply can't do, they really try to uphold those rights. .... They don't force people to partake in devotions. (Volunteer ‘a’ Trinity 3)

Similarly, though, despite being a 'secularised' organisation, two members of staff from Joseph’s Place spoke about how one of their volunteers offered time for spiritual matters on an optional basis:

They come in twice a week. They would come into the café on certain days and any service user who wished could speak to them privately. In terms of a daily thing, no. And, it is not compulsory as I said, they make themselves available. It is not mandatory. (Project worker ‘c’, Joseph’s Place).

They are available in a very unobtrusive way for people when they want to seek spiritual assistance and ask questions of that nature. When people want a quiet time of reflection and prayer, and they are also available to ask questions of as well. (Team Leader, Joseph’s Place)

The volunteers who offered this spiritual guidance themselves spoke about the reason for their continued input into the service and the informality of their time with service users:

Basically, I'm here to care for people and if a need is a spiritual one then I will try and help in any way I can. So, I do it just really over the lunch hour, Tuesday and Wednesday. (Volunteer ‘c, Joseph’s Place)

There was no mention of religious observances being part of Kana’s routine.
9.8 Service programmes

Perhaps surprisingly, there was evidence of a degree of ‘faithness’ present in some service programmes across all three case study organisations (Sider and Unruh, 2004).

For example, Kana as well as Trinity 3 offered biblically-based recovery programmes, although in Kana this was one within a range of recovery programme options they extended to their service users. Recovery therapies, based on traditional twelve-step programmes, often incorporate religious elements in them. Passages from the Bible, or religious principles, commonly act as a guide to these processes. Faith-based recovery programmes are used by faith and non-faith based recovery communities (Nealon-Woods, et al, 1995; Neff et al, 2005; White and Kurtz, 2006). One of Trinity 3’s service managers explained the circumstances in which they used a biblically-based residential facility:

The addiction work is done more in places like the [service name]. They have a higher ratio of staff to residents so they can do that in-depth work whereas we’re more focused on getting somebody in long-term sustainable accommodation.

(Deputy service manager ‘a’, Trinity 3)

Although Kana, was a non-faith based organisation, they offered their service users faith-based recovery programmes alongside secular ones, and the recovery service manager explained the organisation’s motivation for this:

The one thing that we will do is we will not promote any fellowship or programme over another because it's that range, that menu of choice’. (Service manager ‘b’, Kana)

The same informant also described the faith-based recovery programme they offered as follows:

You also have a faith-based mutual here which is called celebrate recovery. Celebrate recovery is, again, delivered by people with lived experience who have found Christianity. It is primarily Christianity because it's based on the Bible.

(Service manager ‘b’, Kana)
From Kana’s perspective, then, the choice to offer faith based recovery programmes was not driven by religious motivations but rather by a focus on the needs of their service users, both in offering them the widest choice of services and in encouraging service users to be involved in running activities as part of a personal transition.

However, a very clear example of the potential for faithfulness to restrict rather than extend the choices of service users was provided by Joseph’s Place. As a result of operating out of premises owned by an FBO, staff from Joseph’s Place felt they could not provide services concerning sexual health because it was considered unacceptable to the religious beliefs of the host organisation. As one informant noted ‘Normally in projects, any projects, community centres, you would get them [ ].’ (Project worker ‘a’, Joseph’s Place). Another project worker elaborated on a similar issue:

_We would like to run a needle exchange and I think there is a bit of a discussion about that at the moment. I am not sure if they [landlord] are happy about it because of their religious viewpoint._ (Project worker ‘d’, Joseph’s Place)

The Director of Joseph’s Place also raised a point about this in relation to the women who use their services:

_Well one of the things we can't do and one of the things we're desperate to do, we get about, 15, 20 per cent of our customers are female. Is to give, you might say advice on sexual matters._ (Director, Joseph’s Place)

This overt example of ‘faithfulness’, forced on Joseph’s Place was considered by staff as having an impact on what they could do because it curtailed what they were able to offer their service users.

### 9.9 Staff motivations

In the previous sections, the focus was on comparing organisational characteristics. This section turns to consider the reasons that interviewees gave for working in the field of homelessness, or for particular organisations, which may also potentially be a route for faithfulness to impact.
As noted above, there was certainly an element of ‘faithness’ in choice for people working directly with service users in Trinity 3, because it was a faith-based organisation employing a OR. It was also clear that at least some staff with a personal faith affiliation were attracted to the visible faith element of Trinity 3, with one such informant spoke about their first encounter with the organisation ‘coming here it was plain to me that all of the staff are Christian affiliated.’ (Project worker, Trinity 3). Interestingly, though, two informants, one working for Joseph’s Place and one with Kana, also drew on personal positions of faith when describing their motivations for working in these organisations:

*I used to volunteer at night and enjoyed the opportunity of being able to provide to some people who are less fortunate. There by the grace...*

(Project worker ‘b’, Joseph’s Place)

The informant from Kana was drawn by a combination of business ethics and faith:

*I was self-employed, I had my own company and it was all sort of business related of different facets. I felt from there that skill set was something I could come and use and offer here..... So the two, the recent things I'd done, my work history and my faith-based guidance all brought me to the one point.* (Service coordinator, Kana)

It is also important to emphasise that there was great similarity in the way that informants expressed their motivations for working where they did. People across all three organisations articulated equally strong convictions about wanting to work with their organisations because they were about social care and homelessness or supporting peoples’ rights. Previous experience of the organisation was a factor for some Joseph’s Place staff (paid and unpaid) in their decisions to work there. As one key informant who had done a work experience placement commented:

*First of all, I was made to feel really welcome, the whole staff team, but the atmosphere, the work that is done, it is really a vital service.* (Project worker ‘c’, Joseph’s Place)

One of Kana’s informants made a choice based on similarities with other providers that they knew of:
I did a wee bit of research on them and I found the diversity of the work that they did, which was similar to another organisation I was familiar with, and that attracted me to them. (Service manager ‘b’, Kana)

Another paid worker from Joseph’s Place reflected on their interest in the organisation because of a personal focus on the rights of homeless people:

*It is about justice for me, that is spot on, for me it should be about equality, the people that come in here deserve a home, the same as everyone else, opportunity.*  
(Project worker ‘d’, Joseph’s Place)

All three organisations had a similar emphasis on volunteering and the views of volunteers across the organisations offered slightly different perspectives from their paid counterparts, as their interest related to gaining work experience in social care or continuing in a field they had an interest in during their working life. As part of an international volunteering programme (faith-based) the Trinity 3 volunteers (both long-term) had different routes into the organisation and drew out their previous experiences with other FBOs:

*I worked with an organisation, the YWCA. It’s a woman’s shelter, so both facing homelessness and domestic violence and other church run charity units. I suppose that really broadened my, I guess you could say service. So through those relationships I then found out about here.*  
(Volunteer ‘a’, Trinity 3)

*I’m part of an organisation and they partner with us, with the Lutheran Church and they partner with a group[]. Most of the placements they have here in the UK are with churches and doing youth work and stuff like that. ..... I got the email about work up here with the homeless and I just interviewed and met some of last year’s volunteers and it seemed like a cool place to come to.*  
(Volunteer ‘b’, Trinity 3)

Volunteers that worked with Joseph’s Place were similarly motivated by wanting to work with people who were homeless, but without the faith influence in evidence:

*I worked in the DWP local offices for a long time so had lots of links into homelessness and homeless people. I knew the work of the original organisation and when I retired, I contacted people about volunteering opportunities.*  
(Volunteer ‘a’ Joseph’s Place)
I had heard about the organisation from a friend and was interested because I had worked in social care for twenty years. I retired and turned to voluntary work with the luxury of doing things I wanted to do. (Volunteer ‘b’ Joseph’s Place)

9.10 Conclusion

In this chapter the concept of ‘faithness’ was used to compare the operational bases of the case study organisations. The concept was effective in showing that all the three cases were ranged across the scale of ‘faithness’ in keeping with the positions suggested by the theoretical framework set out in chapter six. Trinity 3 was at the highest end of the scale because of faith influencing their identity, structures, operations and routines. Joseph’s Place was positioned towards the lower end of the scale with Kana further down again because they did not operationalise faith.

The concept of ‘faithness’ was also introduced to show the degrees to which faith was present or indeed absent, with the latter seen as more likely in describing secular organisations. However, with regard to general organisational aims and staff motivations, Trinity 3 was similar to the other cases in that these aspects were focused on supporting homeless people in ways that respected the individual nature of their homelessness and upheld their rights. Organisational management and operational responsibilities were also comparable between the cases and in keeping with organisations which operated as homeless providers.

In a general sense, the concept of ‘faithness’ confirmed that elements of faith exist in non-faith based organisations often as a remnant of the longstanding influence of faith in the voluntary sector (Bowpitt, 1998; Dinham et al, 2009; Williams et al, 2012; Birdwell, 2013). This was also demonstrated through how characteristics may appear to convey one thing which is not translated into practice as shown in the cases of the faith components of the names of Joseph’s Place and Kana.

Religious symbols were present in Trinity 3 and Joseph’s Place although not in Kana. Although limited, this aspect of ‘faithness’ was different for the two organisations. In Trinity 3, it underlined their Christian position whereas in Joseph’s Place, it represented their landlords’ identity as a religious organisation.
Furthermore, ‘faithness’ was a significant marker for Trinity 3 in that it overtly infused its characteristics and practice. In addition to the general aims expected of a homeless provider noted above, Trinity 3 had specific aims designed to support their vision of ‘faithness’. This included statements reflecting on their faith position which were infused with faith references.

The most striking difference between the organisations that could be attributed to ‘faithness’ was in Trinity 3’s application of an ‘Occupational Requirement’ (OR) on religious grounds, a provision made through the Equality Act 2010. This meant that the organisation could choose not to recruit people to frontline posts, (that is, as support workers), who did not share their religious values. This aspect of ‘faithness’ appears incongruous in organisations which receive public funding, in part, to deliver services. Upholding such an odd position as a homelessness provider is more marked when considered against the approach of Joseph’s Place where they removed the religious practice, of the time, to seek a live faith connection on becoming an independent charitable organisation.

Furthermore, the concept of ‘faithness’ could be used to explain the faith components in terms adopted by other commentators. Trinity 3 was similar to a ‘faith-permeated’ organisation (Unruh and Sider, 2005). However, they were in receipt of government funding which was not apposite to that categorisation of Unruh and Sider (2005). Secondly, Joseph’s Place in the middle/lower range of the scale had evidence of coupling (Smith and Sosin, 2001) and elements of faith integration (Goggin and Orth, 2002; Monsma and Mounts, 2002) because of their landlord being a religious organisation. Thirdly, Kana was at the lowest end of the scale because there was no indication of current religious coupling (Smith and Sosin, 2001) or integration of faith (Goggin and Orth, 2002; Monsma and Mounts, 2002) in their routine operations.

Perhaps the benefit of conceptualising faith as ‘faithness’ is best demonstrated through the cases of Joseph’s Place and Kana. Using the classification system of Unruh and Sider, (2005), the traits of both organisations could be ordered across three different categories, that is ‘faith-background’, ‘faith-secular partnership’ and ‘secular’ making definitions overly complicated and not entirely accurate about their positions. The fluidity of ‘faithness’, one of the reasons for introducing this concept, was also well illustrated in the case of Joseph’s Place because it shows how secular and faith interests intermingled and
how the latter could be of detriment to the former. Joseph’s Place chose to maintain a low level ‘faithness’ connection (through very limited religious observances) as it was seen to offer service users something that they had availed themselves of in the past. However, ‘faithness’ had a negative impact where staff adherence to the sensitivities of the religious position of their landlord restricted the services staff felt they should be able to provide.

Chapter ten will now examine the data to ascertain whether ‘faithness’ makes a difference to the ways in which the three case study organisations operate in the homelessness system and interact with other sector stakeholders.
Chapter ten: The difference that 'faithness' makes to organisational relationships in the Scottish homelessness system

10.1 Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to examine the types of relationships the three case study organisations had with other homelessness sector stakeholders and what difference (if any) 'faithness' made to these relationships. The lines of enquiry in this chapter focus on answering questions around how and why the case study organisations interacted in the ways that they did with statutory agencies and other voluntary sector organisations.

Section 10.2 examines the types of funding arrangements the case study organisations have, while Section 10.3 focuses on their position in local authority strategic frameworks. Section 10.4 considers how the case study organisations worked with other voluntary sector organisations. Section 10.5, the chapter conclusion, draws together the main findings on the impact of 'faithness' on organisational positioning and relationships.

10.2 Funding arrangements

Chapter seven above found that the FBOs profiled often accrued a large proportion of their income from donations and legacies, though most accepted at least some public money, whereas the more secular organisations generated less significant funds from donations and were more reliant on public sector contracts and grant-making trusts. Housing Benefit was a key source of income for all accommodation-based services, regardless of 'faithness'.

This section examines the ways in which the three case study organisations generated their income and whether they reported that faith influenced their options and choices. Figure 10.1, derived from the respective organisational annual accounts, highlights the percentage breakdown of income generated by the case study organisations for financial year end 2016 (note that the percentage breakdown of income is for the whole organisation rather than the specific services which were the focus of the case studies.)
Figure 10.1: breakdown of main sources of income

The first thing to note is that all three case study organisations generated income from a variety of sources including the public sector, grant-making trusts and donations and legacies (see also Chew and Osborne, 2009; Teasdale et al, 2013). Trinity 3 was distinctive because its accommodation units attracted two sources of public funding, the first being a grant for the provision of support, with Housing Benefit covering rental. In total, then, Trinity 3 derived almost half of its income from public sources (46%), a considerable amount, even if it was lower in comparison to the 66% for Joseph's Place and 70% for Kana. Trinity 3 was also different to Joseph’s Place and Kana in that it only generated a small percentage of its income through grant making trusts (3% as compared with 23% for Joseph's Place and 70% for Kana). In keeping with the results of the overall profiling, Trinity 3 generated considerable levels of resourcing through donations and legacies (29%) in sharp contrast to Joseph’s Place and Kana which gained only 7% and 6% of their income via these sources respectively. Finally, Trinity 3 generated significantly more income through ‘other’ means for example, retail facilities. Thus, Trinity 3 had a similar pattern of income generation to the other profiled FBOs delivering accommodation services, as noted in chapter seven above and to findings from other research (Ebaugh, 2003; May et al, 2003; Smith et al, 2006).

In the next three sections, each source of income will be explored in turn, to ascertain whether the differences shown in figure 10.1 above can be attributed to ‘faithfulness’.

Public sector funding
All three organisations received public sector funding for services they delivered as part of statutory responses to homelessness. They were also similar in that they had long-standing funding relationships with local authorities. The evidence laid out in this section will suggest
that being in receipt of public funding benefitted and challenged the perspectives of all organisations, but its impact on Trinity 3 was different because of their faith-base.

Trinity 3, as just noted, had the lowest percentage of public funding within the case study organisations although the funding for their accommodation units (including the resettlement project) was higher because they received Housing Benefit to maintain the fabric of the building along with a local authority block grant for supporting residents. This was detailed by Trinity 3’s service manager:

*It [the contract] says you are going to support whatever level [number of residents] is set out...the number of support hours is all culminated [sic] together and then they put a price on that and they give us money for that.* (Service manager, Trinity 3)

The council use contracting arrangements to ensure that statutorily homeless households were provided with services. As councils must ensure they get value for the money spent from the public purse, they determined how the services they fund would be delivered. In relation to publicly funded temporary accommodation, the council, with which Trinity 3 had contracting arrangements, set out new ways for referring service users. The reasons for these changes were explained by one of Trinity 3’s deputy service managers:

*It was all the hostels, and they [council] decided they wanted to have more control over what they were paying for, so checking that the people that are staying in the hostels are ones that they have a duty to support.* (Deputy service manager ‘b’, Trinity 3)

Trinity 3’s other deputy service manager indicated what these new arrangements meant for them:

*We would also take people from other areas, it's only very recently that [the council] stopped or really clamped down on people coming from other areas.* (Deputy service manager ‘a’, Trinity 3).

In choosing to accept public funding for their services, Trinity 3’s value of open acceptance of homeless people (including those who were not owed a duty) had to change. But, despite this, Trinity 3 made a business decision to continue to access public funding to deliver accommodation services because of the difficulties they would have in generating
sufficient income through other means. Values, nonetheless did play a part in their funding choices, as noted by this Trinity 3 service manager:

*If some source was questionable that wasn’t necessarily in line with what we believe, then maybe there will be conversations about that.* (Service manager, Trinity 3)

A final point that can be made about faith influences and organisational positioning within public sector funding arrangements emerges from an intriguing comment made by Trinity 3’s service manager, about their not speaking about faith with their funders:

*We try to have good relationships with people, yes, but like I suppose we wouldn't necessarily talk about Christianity at something like a council meeting when they are talking about the business of doing referrals to us.* (Service manager, Trinity 3)

Judging to underplay an organisation’s faith position in a practical context requires a fine balance in thought. A religious position could have relevance to the ways in which an FBO supports their service users, so the council needs to be well versed about such matters to determine whether a placement will best meet a person’s needs.

The relationships that non-faith based organisations have with public sector funding is more straightforward. One of the project workers from Joseph’s Place indicated that they thought the (now) secular nature of their organisation had been a benefit to them, with an implication that their secularising agenda was driven in part by ‘The opportunity [which] was there to get government funds through Social Work.’ (Project worker ‘b’, Joseph’s Place). In the years following Joseph’s Place’s separation from their faith-base, their being in receipt of public funding was fundamental for their survival as recounted by their team leader:

*So in 1990, we were going to fold... But by that time they [council] knew about us and we had a good reputation so we went from 1990 to Section 10 Grant Social Work funding from the City Council.* (Team leader, Joseph’s Place)

The director of Joseph’s Place reflected on their current position in the council’s new funding arrangements:
But we feel, being part of the collaborative partnership, and because the local authority, and it’s a council motion passed it, that it’s very much at the forefront of how they want to work in the future with other parts of organisations. (Director, Joseph’s Place)

The director of Joseph’s Place recognised that it was the council’s role to determine how public funding was to be used and their organisation’s position in being part of that process.

As part of managing the public purse, local authorities need to ensure that the types of commissioning frameworks they set up meet their strategic objectives. Some new commissioning models move away from holding contracts with single organisations to operating a list of ‘preferred providers’. This both increases access to organisations who have strategic relevance for the council, by making tendering processes less frequent and reduces the bureaucratic burden of annual tendering on the council. One of Kana’s service managers spoke about the benefits of this business model for them:

They took the decision that they would like to, rather than recommission and re-tender the service, extend our contract and ask us if we would like to participate in PSP [Public Sector Partnership] with other partners and other external providers (Service manager ‘b’, Kana)

Another of Kana’s service managers summarised how these collective approaches were applied to different elements of the local homelessness system:

So there’s one contract which deals with people who are roofless; there’s another contract that deals with people who are in danger of becoming homeless; there’s another contract that deals with people who need advice only and can make it along to an office to meet an advisor. (Service manager ‘a’, Kana)

Organisations, within public sector commissioning frameworks, produced returns to demonstrate to the local authority that they were delivering the services they were funded to provide and achieving the desired outcomes, as one of the project workers from Joseph’s Place explained:
We know that the council wants outcomes, the council are quite big on outcomes and the reason is funding .... So outcomes are what the council is looking for, so we have to evidence [what is done]. (Project worker ‘a’, Joseph’s Place)

A long-standing volunteer from Joseph’s Place spoke about the responsibilities of monitoring requirements:

While, in essence, I think all these [monitoring requirements] are very important I think it's sometimes takes us away from the actual caring work that needs to be done. (Volunteer ‘c’, Joseph’s Place)

Staff from all three case study organisations saw that the current financial climate posed threats to homelessness services funding, a problem identified in research spanning a number of years (Warnes et al, 2003; Jones and Pleace, 2005; Cloke et al, 2010). They shared concerns about uncertainties with regard to the future because of efficiencies agendas implemented by local authorities as a response to central government cuts. An informant from Kana gave a stark assessment about the impact of this on the sector’s capacity to deliver services:

The council are ditching services they deliver and the third sector are going to be absolutely bursting at the seams trying to deliver the same on half the budget. (Service coordinator, Kana).

The potential impacts of this rather gloomy forecast are many. If some organisations do not survive cuts, the remaining providers would face increasing pressure from higher numbers of service users approaching them without the capacity to provide the services. Moreover, organisations that choose to deliver non-essential services because of their ethos and mission might find themselves delivering other types of service which are less in keeping with their mission. Alternatively, if organisations need to rely on their own means, they might choose to deliver non-essential services as these better reflect their values. Reduced levels of income could mean that some organisations would not survive, as noted by the Director from Joseph’s Place, ‘There will be cuts. There's no question, there's going to be casualties next year.’ (Director, Joseph’s Place). Resource intensive services, such as those that operate within the ‘personalisation’ agendas, were also seen to be at risk from funding cuts:
Re-engaging people with their community, sorting out their financial problems, maybe helping them to get back to work, those sorts of things, it takes longer than four to six months to get most of these things done. (Service manager ‘a’, Kana)

However, services that were less dependent on public funding may be better positioned to adapt to cuts. An informant each from Trinity 3 and Joseph’s Place offered perceptions about the potentially strong positions of FBOs in this situation:

So I would hope that we keep going, even when secular third-sector organisations just can't access the funds anymore. I would hope that the church isn't like that.

(Project worker, Trinity 3)

Especially with government cuts etc, services – faith based and non-faith based organisations are vital. I think they could have an even bigger role to play.

(Project worker ‘c’, Joseph’s Place)

This section has shown, first of all, that the choice to accept public funding had a marked effect on Trinity 3. That is, their ‘faithness’ value of offering open access to homeless people (and those outwith the statutory system) had to give way to the local authority’s referral system, because as funder, the council rightly determined the client groups they would support. ‘Faithness’ was potentially a contributing factor to the scale of the income they generated through public funding, as they derived less income (%) than either Joseph’s Place and Kana. This factor could put them in a better position to survive a climate in which there are severe public sector funding cuts, because they were used to generating income outwith public sources.

Charitable Trusts and Philanthropic Foundations

There are a wide variety of charitable trusts and philanthropic foundations in Scotland, which provide funding for organisations supporting people who are homeless or vulnerable. Voluntary organisations apply to grant making trusts for a range of reasons, for example to access funding reflecting organisational values (FACIT, 2009; Robinson, 2011), or which allows them to work with people who are outwith the statutory homelessness system, or to support them to create services which are ineligible for funding
through the statutory sector. This section considers whether faith makes a difference to the position of organisations in seeking income from grant making trusts/foundations. Grant making foundations set their own application criteria, administration arrangements, application cycles and operational requirements. They generally operate on a mix of business principles combined with traditional notions of philanthropy. Kana’s chief executive offered two examples in which the latter offered flexibility to organisations, in the first instance noting ‘funding is for outcomes rather than for specific projects. You can sometimes spend that on more than one place because you are going to deliver the outcome.’ (Chief Executive, Kana). They went on to say how they were able to use one source of funding on their service users so that ‘they could get [sum of money] a week to spend on their own personal development.’ (Chief Executive, Kana)

The data suggested that the secularised Joseph’s Place and secular Kana had greater success in accessing these resources than did Trinity 3 as noted in figure 10.1 above. The service coordinator from Kana explained part of the approach they adopted to access this source of income:

_We’re quite principled in this is what we want to do. If we do this, how much funding will we get for that and then we decide that that's what we want to do if it's still available, as opposed to see the pot and work out what we have to do to get the pot._

(Service coordinator, Kana)

Trinity 3 generated 3% of its resources from grant-making trusts, significantly lower than either Joseph’s Place or Kana (23% and 15% respectively). Some authors have touched on how an organisation’s ethical stance may preclude it from seeking funds through certain sources (Knapp and Kendall, 1993; Chew, 2006; Johnsen with Fitzpatrick, 2009). It was notable that Trinity 3 informants did not speak about this form of income generation. There was no sense from Trinity 3’s staff that there was a conscious decision made not to seek this funding which related to their Christian base, which was all the more interesting given the openness in which they spoke about other issues in relation to their faith.

Staff and volunteers from Joseph’s Place and Kana named a range of trust funds available to them which they thought might prove challenging to access for FBOs. There were two reasons for this. On the one hand, FBOs might exclude themselves from applying to funding bodies because of connections to practices seen as contrary to religious ideals.
This point was raised by Joseph’s director who spoke about the ethical stances taken by FBOs known to them: ‘They will never apply to the Big Lottery for example because they say it's gambling.' (Director, Joseph’s Place). This viewpoint was also shared by the team leader from Joseph’s Place who had this to say:

I know one issue for some faith-based services, wouldn't apply for Lottery funding.  
For ethical reasons because it would impinge on their ethics regarding gambling  
(Team Leader, Joseph’s Place)

There was also evidence, in some of the grant-making bodies’ literature, that FBOs in turn would be ineligible from accessing resources. Joseph’s Place director knew of such instances where award bodies excluded FBOs, ‘Some of the funders are anti-faith based and will not give to faith-based organisations which I think is wrong.’ (Director, Joseph’s Place). A project worker from Joseph’s Place indicated that their shifting away from their faith base had supported them gain income through grant-making bodies:

We are funded by the National Lottery and the Council and I am not sure how a religious organisation works really. Maybe we thought we could move forward more. There are things more available to us. (Project worker ‘d’, Joseph’s Place)

This evidence suggests that ‘faithness’ was an important factor in relation to the position that organisations took when considering grant-making bodies as income sources and that Trinity 3 was more restricted in their choice than either the secularised Joseph’s Place or the secular Kana.

Donations and legacies

Religious institutions and charitable organisations may augment their resources through donations and legacies. The strategies they adopt in this aspect may be no less demanding than those required to attract other forms of income (Chew and Osborne, 2009). FBOs may seek donative resources because it lets them pursue organisational values in ways that public funding does not allow, for example the ways in which they base their support on notions of charity, hospitality and unconditional acceptance (Conradson, 2003; Cloke et al, 2010; Johnsen, 2014). Organisations may therefore utilise strategies reflecting on these values to approach individuals, organisations and companies with corporate giving structures. As well as the money raised through donations, legacies and bequests,
organisations target potential benefactors for household goods and practical gifts in kind, which may support the alleviation of the impact of homelessness on people.

The three case study organisations were similar in that they had all developed donative bases and collected donations to offset service costs, support small service developments and provide service users with basic items to support them. Trinity 3 derived over a quarter of their resources from donations and legacies. This was a significantly higher proportion than either Joseph’s Place and Kana, which were both below ten percent (as noted in the two sections above, Trinity 3 generated proportionately less income through public sector contracts and grant making bodies).

All three organisations thought that faith influenced giving and FBOs like Trinity had greater potential to accumulate donative resources through their connections to churches and other religious bodies. One of Trinity 3’s deputy managers gave their view on how faith influenced giving:

*We are very, very well supported by different churches and organisations and by different individuals who have a faith. I think from that point of view there is a desire amongst people in the churches, in these organisations, to do something and wanting to help, whether it's just to provide some money or actually physically go out and do it.* (Deputy service manager ‘a’, Trinity 3)

Informants from Joseph’s Place and Kana, with experience of FBOs, backed the above viewpoint, attributing faith influences (such as congregational giving) as beneficial when trying to attract resources in this way:

*But the thing is they [local faith based organisations] attract enormous funding from the church organisations. [ ] was telling me the other day they've just been left a legacy of [six figure amount].* (Director, Joseph’s Place).

*They [local faith-based organisation] are faith based and raise their funds through churches and such like.* (Project worker ‘b’, Joseph’s Place).
They give some to here but again it would be most of the donations from churches go to the evening centre because they're completely dependent on voluntary donations.

(Volunteer ‘c’, Joseph’s Place)

Kana’s chief executive was specific in relating the opportunities that FBOs had through religious giving, which they did not have:

The communities upon which they are built have a particular type of commitment so that they will provide support. They have this extraordinary network of churches who when they need volunteers, when they need some cash etcetera, etcetera they can draw on in a way that an organisation like mine has to create.

(Chief Executive, Kana)

Joseph’s Place and Kana both had examples of successful strategies to attract corporate donors (not mentioned by staff from Trinity 3). Joseph’s Place benefited from the support of ‘corporate banks, they'll do collections for us.’ (Director, Joseph’s Place) whilst Kana’s project worker spoke about regular donations from supermarkets, which helped them ‘alleviate the money situation’. A project worker from Joseph’s Place also placed donations, small and large, financial or practical, as important resources within challenging financial contexts:

Funded services are under threat. .... the night centre will always run, they are independent of any outside agencies. They might have some council funding but it is minimal if they do. They are faith based and raise their funds through churches and such like.

(Project worker b’, Joseph’s Place)

All three organisations sought and received practical items that they could pass on to service users. Although they used or distributed these in different ways, this was based the needs of their client groups rather than on the premise of faith. In the case of Joseph’s Place, furniture was made available for people ‘moving into a tenancy and just needing a bit of furniture to get them settled.’ (Project worker ‘a’, Joseph’s Place), whilst Kana, in setting up the recovery drop-in used ‘donations of furniture, which peers and volunteers spray painted.’ (Project worker, Kana).
Thus, all three organisations were active in generating resources through donations and faith played a role in that. The significant difference in the resources Trinity 3 generated through donations can be attributed to their having a larger target audience (faith-based) than the other two. Joseph’s Place and Kana searched for other opportunities because they felt they could not exploit faith sources to any great degree. However, they also targeted corporate donors, who were not faith-based, to their advantage.

10.3 Working with local authorities

Chapter three above detailed the way that local authorities had a corporate responsibility for the statutory duties around homelessness (although housing departments generally took a lead role in delivering them). The growing place of inter-agency approaches, which brought together local authority departments, other statutory agencies and voluntary sector organisations as part of their strategic frameworks, was also outlined in this chapter.

This purpose of this section is to examine the relationships that case study organisations formed within these contexts, the roles they play and the stakeholders they worked with, and whether faith makes a difference to the positions they take. Another focus of this section is to determine whether joint working arrangements are signs of an increasingly professionalised voluntary sector.

All three organisations were in receipt of local authority funding, which necessitated their involvement in inter-agency partnerships driven by the local authority. As the faith-based Trinity 3 was part of similar structures to Joseph’s Place and Kana, it appears that faith did not play a part in their accepting or being accepted into these arrangements, so that they could access funding. The composition of these partnerships, as was noted by a range of stakeholders, was determined by the local authority. Trinity 3’s service manager described the affiliations of other stakeholders in the hostel managers’ group they attended:

*Managers from lots of other hostels in the city, at least ten other managers at any one meeting. They could be anything from [council] through to non-council ones and also non-Christian hostels that are maybe inside the city.* (Service manager, Trinity 3)

Joseph’s Place and Kana were in a similar position to Trinity 3, in that they took part in inter-agency fora as part of delivering publicly funded services. However, staff
from both organisations also indicated they were involved in processes that resulted in new working arrangements. Joseph’s team leader spoke about a review carried out by the authority as being ‘different from previous times’ and how the organisation had ‘definitely felt involved in that [review process].’ (Team leader, Joseph’s Place). One of Kana’s service managers also indicated their integral position in the changes their local authority made:

*A lot of people were being supported by two or three different services, and the council felt that .... And we agreed that it would be better if we could form a consortium where there was one referral.* (Service manager ‘a’, Kana)

Arrangements brought in by the council to support people with complex needs, or long-standing histories of homelessness, meant that Joseph’s Place accepted a different model of working to their usual arrangements (where all staff shared generic roles). One of the project workers from Joseph’s Place explained the new practice:

*There are a few agencies that are part of it, so where the service user most frequents/ benefits from, some [of our organisation’s staff] are key workers as part of this scheme.* (Project worker ‘c’, Joseph’s Place)

This positive tone was also adopted by the director of Joseph’s Place who saw the impact of the new arrangements in terms of it being better for sector cohesion:

*All the best bits of each organisation is being brought to the table so there is no – we’re not fighting against each other. In fact it's working very well actually.*

(Director, Joseph’s Place)

Kana’s chief executive reflected on another element of cohesion in relation to cross sector working:

*I think that's a huge credit to them [council] for that willingness to do that. We are in a public-social partnership with health, two with health actually because the health board are really trying to get this kind of thing sorted.* (Chief executive, Kana)
Kana were also implementing changes in the ways that they worked because of new arrangements formed through a Public Social Partnership (PSP) agreement. One of their service managers saw this as a ‘good opportunity for us to look how we can develop that aspect of our service provision.’ (Service manager ‘b’, Kana).

This section has shown that on the surface, faith had little impact on relationships formed as part of local authority strategic frameworks. And, all three organisations embraced joint working arrangements which focused on creating a cohesive and professionalised sector. However, there was limited evidence suggesting that, at operational level, staff from Trinity were less sure of how to accommodate the principles of the system along with the values they held such as unconditional acceptance.

10.4 Working with other voluntary sector organisations

In addition to inter-agency approaches that support meeting statutory homelessness objectives, organisations position themselves alongside other voluntary sector service providers to work with homeless people. This is similar to findings from other research about voluntary sector collaborations (Randall and Brown, 2006; Lane and Power, 2009; Dinham et al, 2009) although different in some respects to theories in which organisations are seen as needing to compete for business (Chew, 2006’ Chew and Osborne, 2009). This section examines the relationships which the case study organisations forged in relation to working with other voluntary sector organisations and interest groups. It investigates the types of links that organisations have, who they are with and the ways in which faith-based and non-faith based organisations work together.

Evidence from the fieldwork suggested strong individual connections between organisations, including those with faith and non-faith bases. Their interactions were effected through liaison between individual organisations, or as part of local service networks (several bodies came together with a shared purpose). The structures and use of local area networks in coordinating service provision has been commented on by different authors (Cloke et al, 2002; Lane and Power, 2009), and explained in chapter six above. The service profiling (discussed in chapter seven above) showed there were similar arrangements in some areas in Scotland. The clearest examples of network structures in the fieldwork were in relation to temporary shelter provisions, in which FBOs worked together and faith had a strong influence.
Faith did not appear to influence the stances organisations took with regard to working with organisations who held different philosophical positions. The organisational literature of all three case studies had a strong emphasis on partnering, and this was reflected by the comments of key informants. One of the core values of the faith-based Trinity 3, for example, was focused on ‘partnership’, with the project worker explaining what that meant to them:

*I don't think the work we do is any better than them [non faith-based organisations], and I recognise awesome values, and great motivation, and incredible people doing work in the secular organisations. I think it's great that we work together and we learn from each other.* (Project worker, Trinity 3)

As a non-faith based organisation, Kana’s service coordinator indicated similar arrangements with faith-based counterparts:

*We wouldn't discriminate there because we don't anywhere else. So we work alongside various different organisations, faith based and non-faith based.* (Service coordinator, Kana)

Faith was not an influence either when the focus of collaborations was on increasing resources to service users. A basic pragmatism underpinning these approaches was captured by one of Joseph’s Place project workers when they noted ‘*I think, as an organisation, thinking that us alone can transform lives is naïve.*’ (Project worker ‘c’, Joseph’s Place). The staff from Joseph’s Place thought it important that a day-centre created relationships with specialist support services to signpost service users onward. Their team leader highlighted linkages favouring the delivery of rights based approaches to homelessness:

*....we've a very strong partnership link with the [local legal agencies] as well who can intervene in that legal way with a solicitor and set a judicial review of the case if appropriate. They can take that up.* (Team leader, Joseph’s Place)

One of Kana’s service managers had a similar understanding about the connections they had with agencies who were seen to have ‘*specialist knowledge of things like welfare*
rights or housing law or we might interact with agencies that have expertise in the area of substance issues or mental health.’ (Service manager ‘a’, Kana).

Although many of the partnering arrangements, identified through the fieldwork, happened through connections made between individual organisations, there was evidence that organisations participated in collective efforts to coordinate services and resources. Within the fieldwork context, ‘faithness’ was perceived (by all organisations) to be an important factor for forming and managing these structures, with the delivery of night shelter services being an example of these types of collaboration. Trinity 3 and Joseph’s Place were involved in delivering seasonal shelter schemes. An informant from Trinity 3 thought that peoples’ commitment to these types of provisions was part of a personal faith:

You also see a desire in churches of people wanting to do something. We see a lot of people volunteering for the shelter because it does make a difference; it saves people's lives, especially when the weather gets really bad. (Deputy service manager ‘a’, Trinity 3)

One of Kana’s service managers echoed this sentiment, as they reflected on their experience of ‘faithness’ motivating this form of action:

Whether it's a collective of the churches in the area or individual denominations, whether it's the Church of Scotland, or the Catholic church, or the Baptist church, or whoever, will take on programmes to do something about those who are marginalised in society. (Service manager ‘b’, Kana)

The secularised Joseph’s Place played an organisational role in a shelter programme operated by churches and FBOs, as pointed out by one of their project workers:

We are part of a winter night shelter programme. Our boss regularly attends planning meetings so he is actively involved in that and he relays that to us in terms of what is happening with that. (Project worker ‘b’, Joseph’s Place)

Trinity 3’s service manager explained the organisation’s place in coordinating an inter-organisational issue based network that brought together different philosophical outlooks:
So [the strategic group] is chaired by our director and that invites along people from across the third sector to talk about relevant issues that may be coming up, so an example might be housing and Syrian refugees, approaches to homelessness prevention and talking through, having a dialogue about current issues. (Service manager, Trinity 3)

This section appears to show that ‘faithness’ could be accommodated in relationships between voluntary sector organisations, as Joseph’s Place and Kana were accepting of ‘faithness’ and in some ways valued different approaches. This may be due to them each having adherents working for them, or a desire to focus on ensuring cohesive systems to coordinate services and therefore alleviate the impacts of homelessness.

10.5 Conclusion

This chapter has examined the ways that the case study organisations generated income, and the working arrangements between them and other stakeholders (public and voluntary sectors). It has considered the difference ‘faithness’ made (did not make) for organisations working within local authority strategic frameworks and in their connections with other voluntary sector organisations and charitable bodies. The evidence has shown that the extent to which ‘faithness’ exerted influence in these different arrangements ranged from insignificant to significant, as will now be explained.

The way that organisations fund themselves is discussed widely in literature with some differences noted between the generation of income by FBOs and secular organisations (Warnes et al, 2003; Chapman, 2008; Dinham et al, 2008). However, in this research, all three case study organisations were in receipt of local authority funding, which suggested that ‘faithness’ made no difference in choosing to generate income in this way. This could suggest that pragmatism is in play when decisions are made about funding accommodation services, as generating levels of income required to sufficiently cover high operating costs would place additional pressures on providers. There is a possible trade-off for FBOs in this position (FACIT, 2009) in that accepting public funding and the secular principles thereof for some services releases more income generated independently for other activities, which are more in keeping with a faith-base.

The position of Trinity 3 in generating income was traditional for FBOs in that they relied heavily on donations, legacies and trading activities (Sider and Unruh, 2004). However,
within a larger ‘corporate’ structure, all their accommodation units (including the case study) were atypical, in that the entire income for their operation was drawn from public sector funding (grant and Housing Benefit). This case therefore adds, in a small way, to discourses about whether FBOs focus their attention on alleviating the individual impact of homelessness through, for example, notions of unconditional acceptance (Conradson, 2003; Lane and Power, 2009; Cloke et al, 2010; Bowpitt et al, 2013; Johnsen, 2014), become part of statutory frameworks in which the main aim is to end homelessness, or both.

There was a slight implication that the apparent rapprochement between Trinity 3 and the state exerted a dynamic between ‘faithness’ and secularist principles, which was sometimes testing for staff, particularly where the latter were seen to take precedence. This finding is similar to those identified in previous research (Cloke et al, 2010; Williams et al, 2012; Birdwell, 2013). The feelings of Trinity 3 staff about the impact of their placement in the statutory system were evidenced when they were talking about changes to the referral system (driven by the Council’s funding criteria), in which the council made all referrals which meant that Trinity 3’s primary role was supporting residents out of homelessness.

‘Faithness’ was not an active influence in the way that organisations aligned themselves to other voluntary sector organisations and charitable bodies and were active in offering wider services to homeless people, regardless of whether they were in the homeless system, in keeping with their philosophical roots. Trinity 3 worked with non-faith based organisations and Joseph’s Place and Kana worked with faith based in an accepting fashion, where sector cohesion was recognised as important, as was sharing limited resources; a similar finding to previous research around these themes (Randall and Brown, 2002; May et al, 2003; Dinham and Lowndes, 2008; Lane and Power, 2009).

Finally, public sector management of the system means that organisations acting within it should, at least in theory, be accountable (through their contractual obligations and sector regulation systems), which one would see as offering safeguards to service users against imposition of strong belief systems (both faith and non-faith based). This forms the line of enquiry in the next chapter which examines whether faithness has an impact on service user experiences.
Chapter eleven: The impact of ‘faithness’ on service users’ experiences

She talked upon religious subjects—about Jesus Christ always having a soft spot for poor rough men like us, and about how quickly the time passed when you were in church, and what a difference it made to a man on the road if he said his prayers regularly. We hated it. (Orwell, 1933/2013 p 142)

11.1 Introduction

The main thrust of the thesis so far has been to consider the impact of ‘faithness’ on the operations of organisations. This chapter now turns to examine whether ‘faithness’ has a bearing on the service user experience.

Drawing on data from eight semi-structured interviews and one focus group with four participants, the purpose of this chapter is to examine whether ‘faithness’ has an impact on how homeless people experience services and if so, how?

Section 11.2 summarises the types of homelessness experienced by the service users. Section 11.3 outlines the views service users have on religion and whether they hold personal positions of faith. Section 11.4 details how service users identified the faith orientation of the organisations they used. Section 11.5 describes whether service users considered service conditions to be different because of ‘faithness’. Section 11.6 examines what service users said about ‘faithness’ in their relationships with staff. Section 11.7 discusses religious practices and the impact that has on service user experiences. The concluding section 11.8, draws together the main chapter findings on whether service users think that organisational ‘faithness’ made a difference to their experience.

11.2 Homelessness experiences

There were nine men and three women interviewed whose ages ranged from 24 to 51, all of whom were white Scottish. Although the composition of the service users interviewed differed to national demographics for gender and age (Fitzpatrick et al, 2015, Scottish Government, 2016) they were representative of the client groups identified by staff, in their interviews, as using their services.
Five service users, who were in the resettlement unit, spoke about having contact with children from previous relationships although they were not part of their current households. Being reunited with children was important for Susan, ‘I am aiming to leave here and get my kids.’ (Susan, Trinity 3). Wider family connections were also spoken about, ‘Here, I have family contacts, everything, my mum can phone up, she has peace of mind.’ (Tony, Trinity 3) or gatherings, ‘I’m going through to my family at Christmas.’ (Jack, Trinity 3). The social networks that the services users from Joseph’s Place spoke about were different in that they related to the people they met at the centre, ‘it’s social, I know people here basically.’ (Liam, Joseph’s Place), ‘a lot of friendships have been formed in this place.’ (Sandy, Joseph’s Place).

The service users from Trinity 3 were living in the resettlement unit because the council had placed them there. All four service users from Joseph’s Place, had been rehoused many years previously but continued to use the service on a daily basis to eat and socialise as mentioned above.

Service users mentioned learning as something they either aspired to or which had been disrupted because of their homelessness. Susan had previously attended nursing college before her circumstances changed but her experience of homelessness had given her an interest in ‘wanting to go to college to become a support worker.’ (Susan, Trinity 3). David wanted to be rehoused close to college so ‘I could walk to it, I want to go to college to do computer game design.’ (David, Trinity 3). Three of the four service users from Joseph’s Place had attended IT classes that the organisation offered them. It was noted in chapter eight above that staff from all three case study organisations had indicated they offered volunteering opportunities for people with lived experiences. Margaret volunteered for a service which she had been signposted to. Jack volunteered for a project he had used in prison, ‘They supported me and noo I work for them as well.’ (Jack, Trinity 3). Liam reported on his experience with Joseph’s Place, ‘When you think of it, all these years, me a drug addict, and they gave me a voluntary role.’ (Liam, Joseph’s Place).

Nine service users (out of all 12 that participated) had slept rough. Jim briefly explained what it had been like for him being on the streets:

When you are on the streets, you are moving from one spot to another, a lot of people coming in off the streets are in really quite serious situations. (Jim, Trinity 3)
Bob also touched upon his perception of the gravity of rough sleeping from his experiences, ‘Peoples’ lives are at risk, they are lying out on the streets.’ (Bob, Trinity 3). Three service users indicated rough sleeping experiences of single nights. Margaret, the only female service user to say she had slept rough, indicated that it was the night before she had presented to the local authority when she was placed in a hostel (prior to her coming to Trinity 3). Alec had slept rough on one or two occasions after being unable to access temporary accommodation from the local authority noting, ‘sometimes there’s a space but more often than not, there’s none.’ (Alec, Joseph’s Place). Three of the six service users who had longer periods of rough sleeping indicated they used winter shelters where, Bob indicated, ‘you get bunked doon for the night, in the churches, they gie you a hot meal.’ (Bob, Trinity 3). Jim had also used a winter shelter, ‘I was sleeping on the streets proper, for four days and three nights and I was frozen out there.’ (Jim, Trinity 3). Tony had slept rough the night before getting into Trinity 3, where following discharge from hospital he found ‘the council had booked me out of the last place.’ (Tony, Trinity 3) and reported times when he had used winter shelters. Two of the younger service users interviewed had slept rough for longer periods with David reporting ‘I was on the streets when I was sixteen, seventeen, it’s hard.’ (David, Trinity 3). Liam was also of a young age when he was rough sleeping and started using Joseph’s Place:

I was homeless, I was underage when I first came here but they opened the door. The people I ran about with told me about it although they thought I would be too young. But this place, they gave me sandwiches and that, noo and again they would let me in for a shower, because they knew I was living out on the streets. (Liam, Joseph’s Place)

These pictures of rough sleeping mirror descriptions found in literature about the experiences of people sleeping rough (Foord et al, 1998; Anderson, 2007; Cloke at al, 2010; Fitzpatrick et al, 2015). The length of the service users’ current homelessness situation ranged from a week to over a year. Ann, describing herself as coming from an ‘affluent’ background, was going through a first experience of homelessness feeling she was ‘new wave homeless, not unique, but I don’t fit the traditional need.’ (Ann, Trinity 3). She also described the realisation of her impending homelessness, ‘The whole thought of becoming homeless was horrendous.’ (Ann, Trinity 3). In some cases, service users indicated episodic homelessness from a young age with Jim noting ‘I had a few times when I was homeless in my twenties.’ (Jim, Trinity 3). Jack related his homelessness to spells in
between prison sentences, ‘I’ve been in and oot of prison since I was sixteen, I’ve only been oot two years since I was sixteen.’ (Jack, Trinity 3). The youngest service user, David, in his late twenties, with issues spanning ten years, indicated the impact his homelessness had on him, ‘I feel like I have the body of a seventy-year-old’. (David, Trinity 3).

Margaret, Susan and Ann, all Trinity 3 residents indicated that their homelessness was a new experience for them. Ann was the most open about how she felt about her homelessness:

I am not someone who rates social embarrassment high, I could see how foolish I had been to let myself get in this position. (Ann, Trinity 3)

The residents in Trinity 3 had been in the resettlement unit for different lengths of time from one week to just under 6 months. Jack provided brief details about the situation he was in before moving into Trinity 3, ‘[council name] would put me in a bed and breakfast for a night and then another place for a night and so on, it was brutal, brutal. (Jack, Trinity 3). Margaret reported having a similar experience to Jack prior to her coming into Trinity 3, ‘I know I am here until I get rehoused, I know I won’t be moved about like I was before.’ (Margaret, Trinity 3). Susan had made a direct request to the council to go to Trinity 3 because she believed that it could offer her the right kind of space as she explained:

I don’t take drugs so didn’t want to be in that type of environment and heard this place was a dry house (Susan, Trinity 3)

All five of the male service users from Trinity 3 revealed their homelessness had been their situation for a number of years, with three of them indicating they were of a young age when they had their first experience. Both female and male residents from Trinity 3 identified long standing issues including struggling with finances, drug and/or alcohol use and poor health (mental and physical) for which they had sought support. A couple of the male residents noted periods of incarceration. The detail about the issues which homeless people experience, captured through the interviews, was similar to descriptions in other research (Tsemberis et al, 2004; Neff et al, 2006; Jones and Pleace, 2010; Wilson, 2017)
This section has shown that the homelessness experiences of the 12 service users who took part in the interviews were varied with respect to the number of times they had been homeless, their family circumstances and incidences of rough sleeping. It also showed that the majority of interviewees, even where their homelessness was of a relatively short duration or a new experience, had had other issues around mental health and alcohol and drug use.

11.3 Personal faith and views on religion

Four out of the 12 service users interviewed with two identifying themselves as Christian and two as being spiritual which was a similar viewpoint found in other discussions about the personal faith positions of homeless people (Goggin and Orth, 2002; Smith et al, 2006; Gravell, 2013). Two out of the 12 service users specifically said they were atheists or had no faith, six expressed no view about holding a personal belief.

Two of the Trinity 3 service users spoke about the place of faith in their lives. For Bob, his faith was a current part of his life making the statement: ‘I am a Christian, are you?’ (Bob, Trinity 3) early on in the interview and reiterating: ‘I am a Christian and it matters to me and being involved in that.’ whilst Tony indicated links to religion when he was growing up, ‘I used to go to Sunday school when I was a kid, my dad used to take me.’ (Tony, Trinity 3) as well as in his current situation in which he reported, ‘I know him from prison so I did a prayer with him on Monday night.’ (Tony, Trinity 3). Ann and David appeared to hold religious spiritual positions. David explained his position, ‘I believe in something higher, not God, but something.’ Ann spoke about what she thought was the relevance of ‘the spiritual dimension’ in the homeless experience because she understood that ‘there was an element of people being ‘spiritually broken, so you can’t, in my view, look at homelessness without looking at the spirit.’ (Ann, Trinity 3). David also used the greeting ‘God bless him’ when describing another resident (Trinity 3) with Sandy saying ‘God bless you’, (Sandy, Joseph’s Place) to me when he left the focus group.

Jim, who did not report holding a personal faith position, had thought about the place of religion in the homelessness experience when he was living out on the streets and how tough it had been. His perception was that, ‘people living on the streets tend to be religious anyway, they have to believe in something, I think, to get by on their own.’ (Jim, Trinity 3).
11.4 Knowledge of the faith orientation of services

Six of Trinity 3’s residents knew that the resettlement unit had a faith base before using it, while the other two were unaware of this factor. Although Joseph’s Place was not an FBO, three of the four service users had started using the service when it was run by religious organisation and two of them knew about its affiliation. Sandy had not known about the day centre’s affiliation because of the acute situation in which he found himself:

*I was on legal highs, I dinnae know what I wis doin fir a week at least. I found oot they got me a doctor.* (Sandy, Joseph’s Place).

Seven of the twelve service users reported they had used other services, such as foodbanks and soup runs, when times were hard for them. All of them knew that these were run by organisations with a faith base. The significant contribution that FBOs make to these types of services for homeless (and other vulnerable) people has been highlighted throughout this research and other studies (Johnsen et al, 2022 a, b; Warnes et al, 2003; Glasgow Homelessness Network, 2005; Lane and Power, 2009) with recent research also indicating a rise in the use of food distribution services (Sosenko et al, 2013). As mentioned above in section 11.2, three service users from Trinity 3 had used night/winter shelters when they were sleeping rough which were delivered by organisations that were not participating in the case studies.

Susan was aware of the faith characteristics in Trinity’s name, ‘*I didn’t know anything about the organisation other than the name was [reference to religion].’* (Susan, Trinity 3). Jack knew about the work of Trinity 3, because of a local service in the area in which he lived, and he drew attention to the name on an organisational leaflet in the interview space, ‘*It’s obvious, look it says it [reference to religion] there in its name.*’ (Jack, Trinity 3). Although Joseph’s Place operated as a non-faith based organisation, members of the focus group saw the link between the name and the organisation’s religious heritage ‘*The name of the organisation is after [person], it’s [religious].’* (Alec and Liam, Joseph’s Place).

Tony learnt about Trinity 3’s faith base through other people:

*My auntie’s friend told me about them, she had volunteered with them and told me about who they were.*’ (Tony, Trinity 3)
Ann, Jack, Jim and Bob also knew that the resettlement unit was faith-based because they had all used other Trinity 3 services. Ann reported she had ‘met [Trinity 3] when I was putting together a flat after six years of continual drinking.’ (Ann, Trinity 3). Bob also had a longstanding connection: ‘I used [organisations’ name] years ago, I knew that it was a Christian organisation.’ (Bob, Trinity 3). Jim, Bob and David knew that Trinity 3 was a dry house and delivered faith based recovery programmes and that the resettlement unit employed an addictions worker. David noted, ‘If people are serious about getting off the streets and kicking a habit, they should ask to get a room here.’ (David, Trinity 3).

With regard to using services that were not delivered by the case study organisations, Bob reflected on the people that provided the services he had used when he had been sleeping rough, ‘I used to go round places, the Nuns down that way, you know?’ (Bob, Trinity 3).

Margaret, Susan and Tony spoke about foodbanks they had used which were run in churches, that were not linked to the case study organisations. Jim and Tony also mentioned churches in relation to shelters that they had used when they were rough sleeping:

\begin{quote}
At this time of the year, it’s freezing oot there. They open the churches at nine in the evening and a bus picks you up in town to get you there. (Jim, Trinity 3)
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
If you have nowhere to go, churches are very handy and I know it’s just a mattress on the floor buts it’s a roof you know. (Tony, Trinity 3)
\end{quote}

Out of the twelve service users interviewed, three (all from Trinity 3) had used recovery programmes (faith and non-faith based) for alcohol and drug issues, which were delivered by organisations that were not taking part in the case studies. Ann had used a faith based recovery programme over a number of years because, for her:

\begin{quote}
It is a lifelong commitment, I am still involved in working with the 12 steps, you have to want it, it’s not for everyone, self-awareness is the key if you are determined to do something about your drinking, it [12 steps] will give you a pattern to give up the drinking. (Ann, Trinity 3)
\end{quote}
Bob, waiting for a space in a Christian rehabilitation centre, also indicated he had longstanding connections with other faith based programmes: ‘when I was younger I was involved with ‘Teen Challenge’, I tried AA before, I’m waiting for rehab in [location name].’ Jim had also used faith and non-faith based recovery services and thought that the former had long connections to recovery programmes, ‘Addiction programmes and faith, they go hand in hand like a stick of Blackpool rock.’ (Jim, Trinity 3). He went on to reflect on what he saw as a similarity between faith and non-faith based recovery programmes, because he had found in the latter, references to, ‘a higher power rather than God.’ (Jim, Trinity 3). Other pieces of research also indicated a range of recovery programmes available to people seeking support about their substance abuse (Neff et al, 2006; Smith et al, 2006; White and Kurtz, 2006).

This section has described the range of homelessness and allied services that the service users have accessed over the years, including those they knew to be delivered by FBOs (night shelters, foodbanks, soup vans). Service users’ reflections on the FBOs of which they had experience suggested that they used them as lifeline services when their needs were acute (rough sleeping) and/or when other services could not meet all their needs (bed and breakfast). The remaining sections of this chapter focus on illustrating where ‘faithness’ makes a difference to service users’ experiences of services.

11.5 The difference 'faithness' makes to conditions of use of services

This section focuses on service users’ experiences of conditions placed on them when they are using services and whether ‘faithness’ makes a difference to what these are.

Trinity 3 was in receipt of public sector funding and the council referred people to them and Joseph’s Place was non-faith based, so ‘faithness’ made no difference to service user experiences in either organisation in relation to conditions placed on them accessing the service. Indicators that point to ‘faithness’ being part of conditions on service access would be where service users reported that they had been told that they could not access the service unless they had agreed to participate in religious practices or work towards a religious conversion as part of their support plan. Another way in which ‘faithness’ could make a difference to service users’ access is if they were being told that they need to behave in a manner that respects the religious principles/ideals of the organisation.
Like any organisation in receipt of public sector funding, the purpose of the Trinity 3 service was solely to support the council meet their statutory duties of moving people forward into housing. The council’s expectation on the organisation was that they would ensure residents would work towards securing housing. Actively searching for accommodation was therefore incorporated into each resident’s support plans. Susan explained the personal responsibility in achieving that:

\[ \text{There is a wake-up call at nine thirty, so we don’t sleep all day, we can get on with our lives, take ourselves forward. Otherwise how do you get on with getting a house or a job?} \] (Susan, Trinity 3)

There was no indication from the service users that ‘faithness’ played a part in the rules laid out by either organisation, that is no service user was expected to behave in ways that were guided by religious principles. This finding is similar to other pieces of research about FBOs in which any conditions placed on service users were practical, to safeguard the service users rather than promote a religious perspective ( Warnes et al, 2003; Cloke et al, 2010; Bowpitt et al, 2013). Trinity 3’s house rules were set out in the occupancy agreement which Bob alluded to:

\[ \text{They are in the handbook, that tells you what they are, the likes of no drugs or drink.} \] (Bob, Trinity 3).

Margaret, Ann and Jim also made reference to the rules around abstinence (because Trinity 3 was a dry house), as well as indicating they saw the rules as part of living in shared accommodation:

\[ \text{Aye there’s no drink, drugs, we have to keep rooms and flat tidy, they’re not intrusive at all.} \] (Margaret, Trinity 3)

\[ \text{They are living guidance, no drugs, violence etc. We share kitchen duties.} \] (Ann, Trinity 3)

\[ \text{There are what I call therapeutic duties. You know keeping the place tidy, the flat clean, but its relaxed.} \] (Jim, Trinity 3).
There was also a curfew in place which Susan explained:

I am a night person, so it’s [curfew] hard for me, that we have to be in for twelve o’clock during the week and one a.m. at the weekends. It’s hard if I am out with my friends or family.’ (Susan, Trinity 3)

Although a curfew might be seen as institutional and out of place in an adult accommodation service, the Trinity 3 curfew was not different because it was faith based. The service users from Joseph’s Place spoke about rules that they had to adhere to with three of them referring to rules about drugs: ‘Nae drugs or paraphernalia in the building, nae fighting, nae arguing.’ (Alec/Liam, Joseph’s Place). ‘Nae dealing.’ (Drew, Joseph’s Place). Sandy summed up the group’s views about keeping these:

They’re no exactly hard, it’s about common courtesy, good manners, nae disrespecting the staff it’s what you’d be doin anyway. (Sandy, Joseph’s House)

Similar descriptions about the practical nature of rules were found in other pieces of literature (May et al, 2003; Warnes et al, 2003; Cloke et al, 2010).

However, the members of the Joseph’s Place focus group had experience of organisations outwith the case study group, in which they felt order was not maintained because of softer approaches to handling drinking issues. As mentioned in section 11.2 above, all services users had used other faith-based services and it was one of these services that three of the men from Joseph’s House spoke about. It was in relation to an evening drop-in food service, run by a faith-based organisation (and staffed mainly by volunteers) in which they had encountered disruptive behaviours due to drinking:

They’re a different crowd to this one, they turn up drunk. (Alec, Joseph’s Place).

There’s a lot of drinking before people get to the front door. (Drew, Joseph’s House)

The service users felt that this had got out of hand and put them in awkward positions, as Sandy explained:
There was a pack of guys brawling about drunk so I didn’t feel comfortable. The staff said that they would sort them out but I didn’t want them throwin’ the guy oot into the street. I said to the staff, ‘drunks shouldnae be allowed in in the first place’.

(Sandy, Joseph’s Place)

As the men knew from their experience of Joseph’s Place, this behaviour would be seen to be against the rules they had to abide by. Although staff offered to remove the people that were being disruptive, Sandy felt that they were putting the responsibility on him rather than enforcing rules. The men felt that the volunteers (religious adherents) who were working in the drop-in did not have the skills to prevent people from accessing the service in the first place, or were initially overly tolerant and accepting of people because of their faith. This type of concern was raised in other pieces of research where it was noted that staff in FBOs may be more accepting of behaviours than other agencies because of an underlying value of unconditional acceptance (Conradson, 2008; Lane and Power, 2009; Johnsen, 2014)

Many of the service users did indicate that their lives had changed but attributed the changes they noticed to the work of the organisation rather than ‘faithness’. Margaret had experienced a practical change since being in Trinity 3:

*Being here, I am settled, I know I can be here until I move, so I know I won’t be moved about like I was before.* (Margaret, Trinity 3)

The reference Margaret made was to her stay in bed and breakfast prior to getting a place in Trinity 3. She spoke about another change to her daily routine resulting from her move:

*In bed and breakfast, you have to be out early in the morning and come back in the evening...here you are not forced out on to the streets during the day.*

(Margaret, Trinity 3)

Jack also spoke about the changes in his life making no indication that these were due to conditions placed on him by ‘faithness’:
This is probably the best one I have been in. If I wisnae in this place, I would be back in prison, definitely. This is the longest I have been oot of prison since I was sixteen. (Jack, Trinity 3)

David, the youngest service user, attributed the change in himself to the atmosphere he found in Trinity 3:

It’s this happy warm, family environment here and it’s give me the gumption to change my life, it feels safe. (David, Trinity 3)

This section has highlighted that conditions applied to service access and use of services were practical in nature and rarely different because of ‘faithness’. However, the experience of services users in Joseph’s Place gave indication of the negative impact on them where ‘faithness’ was seen to be a factor.

11.6 The difference ‘faithness’ makes to the relationship between staff and service users

There were strands of discussion in other studies about whether people who work in FBOs (or adherents working in non-faith based organisations) believe or hope that faith is part of effecting personal change for people using their services (Dinham et al, 2009; Bowpitt et al, 2013). This may imply seeking service users’ conversion to faith through active proselytising. Service users did not report that this had happened in either of the case study organisations.

David indicated that he and the staff held different belief systems which was okay, ‘I believe in something higher, not God but the staff don’t mind that.’ (David, Trinity 3). Sandy (who had a longstanding connection to Joseph’s Place) spoke in similar terms, ‘As far as they are concerned, religion is your own thing, they dinnae hold it against you whatever you are.’ (Sandy, Joseph’s Trust). This point maybe showing that, service users may perceive remnants of ‘faithness’ present within a secularised organisation. Drew also spoke about the staff in another organisation (outwith the case study grouping) which he had connections to:
[That organisation] is Proddie [Protestant], but the staff dinnae preach God tae you, I’ve been going there for the last fifteen year. (Drew, Joseph’s Place)

Susan, speaking about her efforts to resolve issues she had around trusting people and not being honest with them as a result, noted the way in which Trinity 3 staff supported her:

Without Trinity staff, I would have done worse. I feel I am becoming a different person since I came in here. (Susan, Trinity 3).

Again, Susan made no reference to this change being informed by ‘faithness’, rather the change was her own doing because she had learnt to trust the staff. Jack and David also described support in terms of it being practical rather than influenced by ‘faithness’, ‘They don’t just leave you, they support you, it’s there all the time.’ (Jack, Trinity 3). David’s experience of the staff was that they were there for him no matter the time:

It’s amazing here, three or four in the morning, you can come and speak to staff, that’s the way they are, they are nice here. (David, Trinity 3)

Although Bob indicated he held a personal faith position, and therefore might have discussed the ‘faithness’ of staff, he described the staff approaches in a similar vein to other service users:

The staff here don’t just treat you, they treat you like human beings, all of them, night staff as well. (Bob, Trinity 3).

All four service users from Joseph’s Place had long standing connections to the organisation and indicated their relationships were based on trusting staff and there was no ‘faithness’ influencing staff values. Alec reported that it ‘disnae matter who’s on, you know what I mean, the staff are aw brilliant’ (Alec, Joseph’s Place) ‘I am comfortable with them all, I’ve known the staff for years.’ (Liam, Joseph’s Place). Sandy and Drew had similar perspectives:

Whoever’s on that day, whoever’s on duty, that is who is you see but disnae matter because we trust them all. (Sandy, Joseph’s Place)
They help build up your confidence, you get lots of confidence from them. (Drew, Joseph’s Place)

It has already been noted in chapter eight above that Trinity 3 operated an ‘Occupational Requirement’ (OR) for support staff meaning they had to have an active Christian faith. This was considered as signifier of ‘faithfulness’ and one which might impact on the way staff approached their work. Service users perceived ‘faithfulness’ in the caring attitudes of staff rather than thinking staff were overt in their views. Although Ann thought that faith was a motivating factor for staff, she did not feel they promoted it, ‘It is very subtle, in the background, no-one’s running around splashing holy water on anyone.’ (Ann, Trinity 3). Ann elaborated further on how she thought that faith permeated the organisation’s way of working:

They are hugely disciplined, it is the Christian belief, very gentle and powerful, the way they handle things. They’re a Godsend, keeping me motivated, I was previously suicidal. (Ann, Trinity 3)

Jim was also of the opinion that he could ‘go to any worker, they are all brilliant, very approachable.’ (Jim, Trinity 3) because he saw their values as:

It’s more Christ-like than Christian. (Jim, Trinity 3)

‘Faithfulness’ did make a difference however, in some circumstances. The service users from Joseph’s Place spoke about recruitment practices which they knew happened in organisations (that were not part of the case studies). Alec indicated he knew of organisations where ‘staff even hae to be religious.’ (Alec, Joseph’s Place). Liam indicated that he thought ‘they shouldnae be getting away wi that, that’s nae right.’ (Liam, Joseph’s Place), a point with which the other group members agreed.

There were instances, in the way that Trinity 3 service users described some of their perceptions of staff, that did suggest the presences of values (highlighted in chapter five above) to which adherents might subscribe. Ann spoke about how she found the staff:

Their kindness and forgiveness, it is about people being of worth, you know all that kind of stuff. (Ann, Trinity 3)
Bob also felt that the staff had a different approach from those in secular services he had experienced:

*They accept you the way you are, they really want to help you, they enjoy working with you. It’s not just a job to them, they want to support you, their approach is over and above.*  (Bob, Trinity 3)

What might be reflected in Ann and Bob’s words is the same sense that the service users from Joseph’s Place spoke about. That is, FBOs see themselves as having a Christian duty of charity and acceptance or being where people are at (Bowpitt, 1998, Friedman et al, 2002, Gravell, 2013). Ann’s perception about forgiveness though does need unpicking because it suggests she saw herself as needing forgiveness for being homeless or having issues. There are two points to make about this thought. The first being that if services users have this mindset, they need to hear alternative viewpoints that focus on their reasons for believing this. The second point relates to the inappropriate nature of this value within a homelessness system which is based on structural causes of homelessness, that is, if staff have a belief that service users need forgiven or narratives are suggestive of that.

Another way in which service user testimonies hinted at the presence of ‘faithness’ was where there were suggestions that staff talked about their own experiences, which Susan and Jim alluded to:

*They [staff] know what it is like, they’ve changed their lives around so know about it.*
(Susan, Trinity 3)

*A lot of them [staff] have been in the same situation, they know where we are coming from.*  (Jim, Trinity 3)

These statements could be indicative of two things, staff spoke about faith in terms of them seeing it as having transformational power which had supported them when they were struggling. The alternative interpretation was that all staff running the accommodation unit were peer workers with lived experiences. The latter was not what staff had indicated, as they noted only one or two members of staff had lived experiences and the language used by David to describe a staff member with lived experience was far more explicit:
They [staff] know, they’ve had issues themselves, they’ve been there on the street. They know how hard it is, other places don’t. (David, Trinity 3)

If there were undertones of ‘faithness’ in staff narratives about their own experiences, by setting an example of the transformative power of faith on themselves, they could give the impression that they view the ultimate way for service users to change their lives is through a religious conversion.

The focus group offered insights about staff and ‘faithness’ in the secularised Joseph’s Place. Liam, speaking of Joseph’s longest serving staff member, indicated that ‘they’re the only religious person on the staff.’ (Liam, Joseph’s Trust). As some other staff had indicated they had an active faith connection, Liam may have only connected ‘faithness’ to the one person because of their involvement in the organisation when it was faith based and their current position in facilitating religious observances.

11.7 The impact of religious practice on service users

All of the staff interviewed from Trinity 3 spoke about the daily religious observances of team prayers at handovers and daily optional sessions called ‘devotions’ to which service users were invited, with residents noting their voluntary nature:

*They are on the go, but it doesn’t get forced on you, it happens every day.’* (Margaret, Trinity 3).

*There are devotions at one thirty, they’ll read the Bible and likes but they dinnae force you, if you dinnae want it you dinnae dae it. (Jack, Trinity 3)*

Although Bob was very open in expressing that he was a Christian, he too focused on the voluntary nature of devotions, ‘they don’t put pressure on you and they don’t drum religion into you.’ (Bob, Trinity 3), rather than on the content or what he got out of them, which was somewhat surprising given his emphasis on the place and usefulness of ‘faithness’ in recovery programmes.

Ann spoke about how devotions had changed the way she reflected on the Bible, ‘I used to speak about the Bible, now I call it my Bible.’ (Ann, Trinity 3). The context of this change
was also marked in that she had previously thought of ‘the big book being the one for the 12 step programme I attended.’ (Ann, Trinity 3).

Jim explained about devotions and another optional activity based on ‘faithness’:

_They have devotions which include readings, relaxed discussions and options of going to church on a Sunday morning as well but they leave that up to you._ (Jim, Trinity).

Tony spoke about how he took the chance for individual reflection with a pastor he knew: ‘I know him from prison so I did a prayer with him on Monday night.’ (Tony, Trinity 3).

Service users in Joseph’s Place also pointed to discreet religious observances, ‘there is a service upstairs for people if they wanted to go.’ (Alec, Joseph’s Place). They knew that these activities happened two or three times a week and they were facilitated by a volunteer staff member. Sandy summarised what he perceived to be the overall approach to these observances ‘it’s mellow back here’ (Sandy, Joseph’s Place). As explained in chapter eight above, Joseph’s Place had limited religious observances because of their enduring coupling to their landlord which was a religious organisation (Smith and Sosin, 2001).

The men also knew about other organisations with religious practices taking place, which they perceived to be compulsory, from the briefest, _‘they maybe say thanks for 30 seconds before they get their food’_ (Sandy, Joseph’s Place) to those of longer duration with which they felt uncomfortable:

_In there [organisation], you have to sit and listen to it [religious observances] for half an hour, or you need to go away and come back again half an hour later._ (Alec/Liam, Joseph’s Place)

Moreover, the men went on to discuss their thoughts about how these types of practice and the accompanying rhetoric gave false assurances:

_Even when they’re not making you do that, sometimes they just try and push it too much._ (Alec/Drew, Joseph’s Place)

_Aye, it’s really annoyin, because people in these situations are living comfy lives._ (Liam, Joseph’s Place)
It’s nae right to suggest that God can sort all your problems, if you are away to sleep outside, sleeping in a sleeping bag, just sounds a bit pretentious. They tell you ‘if you surrender to God, you will be alright’ they cannae promise things, it’s nae right.

(Alec, Joseph’s Place)

Their reports on these situations provided insights into the potential of exclusive and unwarranted religious practices, in which pressures were placed on service users to conform to a certain view, or where they were required to ‘perform’ in a way which had nothing to do with their situation or them accessing services. This illustration of the negative impact of ‘faithness’ that the service users spoke about most closely mirrored Orwell’s quote at the beginning of this chapter. It is somewhat disheartening that harmful practices of a similar nature to those described in 1933 still exist, given the elapsing of nearly ninety years has seen the advent of homelessness services which are not based on these types of narratives.

11.8 Conclusion, overall, do service users feel that ‘faithness’ makes a difference to their experience of homelessness services?

While based on only 12 service interviews from two case study services, so not necessarily generalisable to other contexts, this study’s findings nonetheless indicate that ‘faithness’ was present in degrees in faith-based and secularised organisations and it characterised and influenced organisations in different ways. This chapter has demonstrated that ‘faithness’ shaped service user experiences when religious practices were overt and discriminatory, a finding similar to other research findings (Cnaan and Boddie, 2002; Sager and Stephens, 2005; Johnsen with Fitzpatrick, 2009) but had little bearing where practices and observances were voluntary and discreet and not pushed on them again this was a similar finding to other pieces of research (Goggin and Orth, 2001; Smith et al, 2006; Johnsen, 2014).

The service users’ testimonies from the faith based Trinity 3 showed that they were aware of the overt nature of its ‘faithness’, identifying practices and values influenced by faith but reported that these influences did not place additional conditions on them or affect their experience of the services:
No, it doesn’t matter to me that they are the way they are. (Margaret, Trinity 3)

I think it’s a really good thing, it doesn’t put me off. (Tony, Trinity 3)

Aye, I am a Christian and [name of organisation] having a Christian base makes a difference to me. (Bob, Trinity 3)

Further, residents who had experienced other services reported favourably on the resettlement unit, with David and Bob perhaps going the furthest in their descriptions:

I have used a lot of hostels and I think this is the Rolls Royce of hostels. (Bob, Trinity 3)

If people are serious about getting off the streets and changing their habits, I suggest that they should ask to get a room here. (David, Trinity 3)

The service users from Joseph’s Place also detected the presence of the faith influences of the organisation’s landlord, which again did not impact on their experiences. As would be expected of a secularised organisation however, their experiences were largely not influenced by faith, but by the way the staff supported them:

They’re here to help you. Let’s be clear one of the ladies in here saved ma life
(Sandy, Joseph’s’ Place)

They’re good here, they really help you. (Drew, Joseph’s’ Place)

The staff are aw brilliant - always supportive here – try and do things with you, make you confident in yourself. (Alec, Joseph’s’ Place)

They’ve helped an awfy lot of people here, so they have. (Liam, Joseph’s’ Place)

The service users from Joseph’s Place however, reported two instances where they saw ‘faithness’ as having a negative impact, which were of concern. The first in relation to how volunteers from an FBO (not from the case study grouping) handled episodes of drunken behaviour, which the focus group from Joseph’s Place thought showed signs of
acceptance and overly tolerant attitudes because the views held were influenced by faith. Moreover, they had experienced overt and unwarranted practices in which an FBO (again not one from the case study grouping), required service users to participate in religious observances prior to their accessing services, a practice which they rightly found objectionable and exclusive.
PART 4: CONCLUSIONS
Chapter twelve: Conclusions

12.1 Introduction

This thesis has examined the contributions that faith based organisations (FBOs) make to homelessness systems in Scotland. More specifically, it has analysed the impact faith has on how these organisations operate and the way their services are received by homeless people. This chapter concludes the thesis by drawing together the key findings on these issues and highlighting the contributions made to debates in this field.

Section 12.2 focuses on what FBOs are and what role they play in the homelessness sector in Scotland. Section 12.3 details the findings about degrees of organisational ‘faithness’ and the difference it makes to organisational functioning in a range of key dimensions. Section 12.4 provides a review of the concept of ‘faithness’. Section 12.5 sets out three policy implications identified in this research. Section 12.6 acknowledges the study’s limitations. Section 12.7 closes with some ideas for further research.

12.2 What are faith-based organisations and what is their role in the Scottish homelessness sector?

The answers to these questions were formed through conducting literature reviews and service profiling, that is, an examination of national data sources to identify organisations and evidence of ‘faithness’ in their characteristics. The concept of ‘faithness’ was developed in this research to examine a range of organisational dimensions to ascertain what the ‘faith’ in FBOs meant. These actions undertaken at the early stages of the research established the study’s theoretical framework.

The literature reviewed revealed that the current homelessness system in Scotland had evolved from religious and state institutions jointly delivering poor law provisions, to the gradual emergence of state control over welfare services, to a bespoke homelessness system which currently includes involvement of both the public and voluntary sectors. The former was noted to have responsibility for discharging statutory duties to homeless people (Anderson, 1993, 2003), which they did by delivering services themselves and through commissioning services to be provided by voluntary sector organisations (which often had a faith provenance, Johnsen, 2014). A third element of the current service sector is formed by the activities of groups of people, motivated by their faith, operating within the auspices
of religious organisations. These actions retain continuity with the historical trajectory of religious influences in services, that is the provision of basic services of drop ins or food distribution points, which are high volume and low intensity in nature (Johnsen with Fitzpatrick, 2009).

It was clear from literature reviews, that the task of defining these FBOs is not straightforward (Jeavons, 2004; Beaumont, 2008; Johnsen, 2014). Some authors classified organisations by examining the levels of faith found in organisational characteristics (Sider and Unruh, 2004; Clark, 2008; FACIT, 2009), while others captured a more general sense of how faith was linked to and could influence organisations and their operations (Smith and Sosin, 2001; Goggin and Orth 2002; Monsma and Mounts, 2002). I noticed that questions about what constituted an FBO were commonly raised within the North American context, because religious congregations were in receipt of government funding (Wright 2009; Biebricher, 2011). As church congregations/groups delivering basic social care services (including those allied with homelessness) in the UK were not funded by government, I established a simple basis for defining what constituted an FBO for the purpose of analysis, using two criteria. The first to be met for the term ‘organisation’ was an agency established for the purpose of delivering homelessness services and registered as a charity with the Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator (OSCR). The second, ‘faith-based’, was that organisations had a faith provenance which still influenced the ways in which they identified themselves and their operations.

After extensive searches of national data sources as part of the service profiling, I identified 38 organisations which met the criteria above and which I therefore considered to be FBOs within the context of this research. Furthermore, 38 services were identified which were delivered by groups who were part of a larger religious organisation whose main function was faith related, rather than providing services for homeless and other vulnerable people. I also identified and included 12 secular organisations in the service profiling, to compare their characteristics against those of the faith-based agencies. Including 88 separate entities for full profiling helped me build up an understanding of what it was that constituted organisations that were delivering services to homeless people and what it was that was particular to FBOs, faith-wise. This full examination also underlined that using a basic definition of FBO was sufficient, in the first instance, to generate data to offset an over simplification of the term FBO (Smith et al, 2004) and illustrate where the 88 organisations sat along the spectrum of ‘faithness’.
The literature review highlighted the traditional role that FBOs played in UK homelessness services, which was largely related to single homeless households who fell outwith statutory definitions of homelessness (Warnes et al, 2003; Pawson and Davidson, 2007; Fitzpatrick et al, 2012). The profiling was also used to identify the types of homelessness services that Scottish FBOs delivered and found day-centres, drop-ins, and accommodation projects. An initial overview of this data showed that larger organisations providing a range of services, including highly professionalised support in accommodation settings, were lower down the ‘faithness’ scale, whilst the smaller organisations providing general advocacy and advice and/or food and clothing in drop-ins were at the higher end of the ‘faithness’ spectrum. Newer organisations had notions of traditional faith-based values present in their operations, for example the distributive hospitality of soup runs and food exemplified by foodbanks set up to meet the needs of people struggling as a result of welfare cuts (including homeless people). However, these organisations’ position on the ‘faithness’ scale was radically different to other organisations delivering food services, because foodbanks did not necessarily have religious sounding names, they had secular objectives and worked in partnership with a range of secular organisations.

There was empirical evidence, drawn from the service profiling, suggesting that the role of FBOs had evolved, or was evolving, because of changes to the way in which the homelessness sector operated. There had been significant expansion in the part played by the voluntary sector, including FBOs. In particular, as was found in previous studies, a range of national policy initiatives had resulted in FBOs (along with other voluntary organisations) being commissioned to receive public sector funding for the services they delivered to single homeless households. Another form of evolution that was evidenced through the profiling was organisations updating their constitutional forms to acquire a legal identity, with this being the case in organisations whether they were part of public sector commissioning frameworks or not.

This literature review and profiling also revealed the highly complex, nuanced and fluid nature of faith influences across organisational dimensions, including their stated objectives, constitutional forms and funding sources. Regarding the last characteristic, FBOs and secular homelessness organisations varied dramatically, as the former obtained smaller amounts of income (and in some instances, none) from government sources and were far more dependent on donations and legacies, whereas the latter drew on government funding, charitable trusts and philanthropic foundations.
The profiling also identified examples of religious ‘coupling’ (Smith and Sosin, 2001) which included those found as part of the historical foundations of voluntary sector organisations and importantly, in the development trajectories of more recently established FBOs (those formed in the last fifteen to twenty years), where organisations had disengaged from the FBOs that supported their early development and had gone on to form new couplings with other faith institutions (but also with non-faith based organisations).

This led me to develop the concept of ‘faithness’, by which I mean the degrees to which faith was present in organisational characteristics and, more importantly, how these then influenced their operational base. The concept of ‘faithness’ also recognises that a definition of what constitutes an ‘FBO’ is not sufficient, on its own, to explain what ‘faith’ might mean in relation to organisational ethos and practice. ‘Faithness’ allowed me to capture the fact that, viewed through the lens of faith, homelessness organisations in Scotland did form a continuum, with strongly faith-based organisations at one end and entirely secular organisations at the other. Furthermore, the concept of ‘faithness’ highlighted ‘secularising’ processes, for example organisations lying in intermediate positions distanced from religious origins. Finally, the continuum of ‘faithness’ used in this study suggests that the Scottish homelessness sector (as in parts of the UK) grew out of faith affiliations (Bowpitt, 1998; Johnsen with Fitzpatrick, 2009; Johnsen, 2014), as some of the secular organisations at the lower end of the continuum had faith foundations which they had retained (Johnsen with Fitzpatrick, 2009).

12.3 What difference does ‘faithness' make in practice?

‘Faithness’ was thus employed as an analytical lens to examine a spectrum along which organisations could be arranged in relation to the presence and/or absence of operationalised faith. This was then used as the basis for selecting three case study homelessness organisations - one with an overt faith base (Trinity 3), one with a historical faith base but which had now secularised (Joseph’s Place) and one which was founded by a religious person, but was set up and had operated on secular principles from the outset (Kana) to ascertain whether they operated in different ways and whether ‘faithness’ was the element that made the difference. Trinity 3, a large organisation, provided a range of services, including the resettlement project which took part in the study. Joseph’s Place, the smallest case study organisation, offered general support (advice and information, help with form filling, basic food services) and access to specialist counselling services. Kana, like Trinity 3, was a large organisation with services ranging from the drop-in service (the
focus of this study) to accommodation units and resettlement projects. Each organisation
delivered services that were characteristic and uncharacteristic of their ‘faithness’. Some of
the accommodation services of the faith-based Trinity 3 were part of statutory provisions,
whilst others were based on faith principles (addictions rehabilitation); the secularised
Joseph’s Place provided the high volume, low intensity services usually associated with
FBOs; whilst Kana’s drop-in, of a similar nature, sat alongside the organisation’s statutory
provisions. All the organisations had religiously based names which demonstrated that
characteristics may appear to convey something which is not then translated into practice,
as shown in the cases of Joseph’s Place and Kana, although both organisations had chosen
to retain this religiously influenced identifier.

My in-depth comparison of these three homelessness organisations revealed that there
were a number of areas where the organisations were actually very similar, or where
differences seemed unconnected to faith. This included the board structures, which
interviewees from across all organisations reported operated on a business footing.
Operational management and responsibilities were also comparable between the cases, in
that they concentrated on the practical aspects of delivering services. All three
organisations worked with statutory bodies and other voluntary sector organisations and
charitable bodies, whose philosophical positions differed to their own. All organisations
were in receipt of local authority funding (although to differing degrees).

However, there were also important ways in which the case study organisations differed
and the ‘faithness’ in Trinity 3 often seemed to stand apart from the other two which were
more similar to each other. In addition to the general aims associated with delivering
homelessness services, Trinity 3 had specific aims designed to support their faith
orientation. This included statements reflecting on their faith position which were infused
with faith references. More substantially, the faith position of Trinity 3 was emphasised
through their deployment of an ‘occupational requirement’ (OR) on management and
support staff (including relief workers) to be Christian. An OR was found to be
permissible under the Equalities Act 2010, despite the general prohibition on
discrimination on the grounds of religious belief. Its deployment has been discontinued by
a number of other faith-based homelessness service providers in Scotland.

There were signs of ‘faithness’ in Trinity 3 and Joseph’s Place. This included limited
religious symbols, religious observances (Sager and Stephens 2005; Bowpitt et al, 2013)
and staff who reported they were Christian. However there were different reasons for the
presence of these examples of ‘faithness’ in the two organisations. In Trinity 3, religious observances (prayers) were mandatory for staff, as was them having a live faith position (because of the OR). In the 'secularised' Joseph’s Place, the symbols represented their landlords’ identity as a religious organisation and the observances (optional) were formed through their previous coupling to a FBO, which staff from Joseph’s Place reported they retained to provide continuity for service users who had previously used the services of the other organisation. Furthermore, the staff in Joseph’s Place who were Christian indicated that their faith was a factor that motivated them to work in the field of homelessness, but that it did not necessitate their working in an FBO.

The service users’ testimonies from the faith based Trinity 3 service showed that they were aware of the overt nature of its ‘faithness’, identifying practices and values influenced by faith. Service users also understood that religious beliefs underpinned the values of some organisations and staff, but this did not seem to make a difference to their experiences (even where staff hoped it might). The Trinity 3 residents appeared to be accepting of these influences because they did not report that they placed additional conditions on them or affected their experience of the services. The service users from Joseph’s Place also detected the presence of faith influences (as mentioned above). The services users reported that these signs of ‘faithness’ did not impact on their experiences. Therefore, the (admittedly somewhat limited) data derived from service users in this study suggests that the presence of faith was not necessarily off putting to them and, in some instances, it was welcomed because some service users themselves hold personal faith positions.

That said, the four service users from Joseph’s Place had encountered different practices in a couple of FBOs (not case study organisations), where access to services was conditional on participation in mandatory religious observance. In these circumstances, the service users found religious practices troubling and offensive (see also Cnaan and Boddie, 2002; Sager and Stephens, 2005; Bowpitt et al, 2013).

Digging a bit deeper, and beyond these organisational attributes and ways of operating, I wanted to investigate whether the theological values of ‘salvation’, ‘love’, ‘charity’, ‘hospitality’, ‘solidarity’ and ‘fighting injustice’ which are so significant in religious teaching regarding the treatment of vulnerable others, were present in the ethos and practices of some, all or none of the case study organisations and the values held by individuals working in the organisations. I felt that the presence or absence of these values
would be a particularly important indicator of whether faith truly made a difference in homelessness services.

My findings indicated that the notion of ‘salvation’ was not present at all in connection with it being a requirement for personal transformation in any of the case study organisations including the overtly faith-based organisation (Trinity 3). Trinity 3 did stand out from the others in that the theological notion of love (‘Christ’s love’) was an explicit and articulated organisational objective, with staff understanding it as such and that it underpinned their support models.

The remaining four values were in evidence across all case study organisations, although in some instances, they were interpreted differently. In Joseph’s Place, notions of charity (Friedman, 2002; Cloke et al, 2005) were tempered with protocols that sought to ‘responsible’ service users by, for example, asking that they make a small payment for food. ‘Hospitality’ was interpreted by all three organisations as the importance placed on wanting to make service users feel welcomed. The notions of solidarity and fighting injustice were evident in all three organisations. In the overtly faith based Trinity 3, two members of staff used the phrase ‘walking with service users on their journey’ when describing solidarity. However, interestingly, ‘journeying’ with service users as a solidaristic notion which also supported the tenets of social inclusion, was most pronounced in the secular Kana with all their staff speaking about this form of support. In Joseph’s Place, staff and volunteers emphasised service user rights’ as being a foundational way of fighting injustice.

Another important aspect of my research questions concerned whether ‘faithness’ impacted on how FBOs were perceived by, and interacted with, other providers in the sector. In relation to inter-organisational engagement, the study found that organisations across the spectrum of ‘faithness’ worked together in local service networks and strategic forums, but that FBOs were also sometimes perceived as being less professionalised when they had an ethos grounded in the religious notions of hospitality and/or unconditional acceptance of service users, with no requirement on them to change. FBOs perceived as evangelistic in tone (overtly promoting the religious nature of their organisation) were received with caution by secular (and some other faith-based) stakeholders because of their perceived desire to promote religious conversion. Secular perceptions of FBOs, however, related to how overtly FBOs expressed their faith. Where FBOs did not emphasise their faith in their
dealings with other organisations, or place religious conditions on service users, and were seen to operate in similar ways to non-faith based organisations, secular stakeholders were unconcerned about their presence in the sector.

Finally, the evidence derived from this research suggests that FBOs often have a successful development model supporting their sustainability (as indicated by the age of some of them and their longstanding contributions to social care). Further, they could be sustained into the future by public sector funders, who continue to fund FBOs and increasingly include them in service planning structures as well, because they are seen to have strategic relevance. Highly relevant here is the recently published governmental programme ‘A Nation with Ambition: The Government’s Programme for Scotland 2017-18’ in which it is stated:

_There are councils, charities and religious (sic) and advocacy groups all over Scotland providing vital emergency shelter and food to people sleeping rough in Scotland. Their work is deeply admirable and a credit to them and the communities they serve._ (2017, p20)

This statement was made in relation to the Scottish Government’s announcement of new funding (£70 million in total over a period of five years) for tackling various types of homelessness, and suggests that the current administration anticipates an ongoing involvement of FBOs in the delivery of homelessness services, including those supported by public funds.

Moreover, many of the stakeholders I interviewed (from faith and non-faith based organisations), believed that FBOs would continue to develop and play a role in homelessness provision because they could mitigate downturns in public sector financing through their ability to generate income and resources from mixed sources, including faith communities. They also, crucially, had assets available to them (such as people, money/donations/in kind gifts, buildings and equipment) to which organisations did not have access. This placed them in a strong position to weather the storm of public policy change, such as that seen in recent years associated with national austerity programmes.
12.4 Review of conceptualising faith through ‘faithness’

The methods other studies have used to identify and qualify the faith elements of faith-based organisations are documented in this thesis. Introducing a new conceptualisation (‘faithness’) as the main analytical lens for this research therefore requires some justification. This includes the reasons for using a new concept and how effective the lens was in analysing the organisations identified through the research.

This research concurs with the view of previous research that ‘faith based organisations’ are heterogenous and their definition should never be over-simplified (Sider and Unruh, 2002; Ebaugh et al, 2003; Jeavons, 2004; Smith et al, 2006; Johnsen, 2014). In a piece of research covering organisational faith, it is necessary to capture (and understand) how organisations express their faith and the impact (if any) that has on their operations. The reasons for proposing a new conceptualisation were fourfold. Firstly, previous literature was set within the context of congregational social services in North America funded as part of various government initiatives (DeVita et al, 1999; Cnaan and Boddie, 2001; Sager and Stephens, 2005), whereas this research was focused on examining FBOs operating in the Scottish homelessness system. Secondly, current research inevitably seeks to revisit (and potentially refresh) theoretical frameworks formulated over ten years ago. Thirdly, it was of interest to ascertain whether the difference between FBOs and secular organisations could be explained as the former having all faith-based characteristics with the latter predicated on an absence of faith. Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, the word ‘faithness’ made immediate sense as a descriptor of organisational faith and the complexity of its qualities.

The lens of ‘faithness’ was largely effective in achieving its objective, that is to answer research questions about the faith component in FBOs and whether that made a difference in the way they operated. It was applied in two ways, the first analysis conducted as part of the service profiling and its second iteration in examining organisational practice through the fieldwork. Through the profiling, ‘faithness’ first of all added detail to the basic definitions attached to the term FBO and identified fluidity between the presence and absence of faith in FBOs and secular organisations. Interrogating this basic finding further was accomplished through the fieldwork, where the concept was particularly useful in considering the essential element of organisational ethos and mission (Cloke et al, 2005; Chapman and Lowndes, 2008; James, 2009; Biebricher, 2011; Johnsen, 2014). One of the main points to examine was whether an FBO’s ethos comes across as missionary zeal.
(evangelising practices) which could affect the way that other providers viewed FBOs and more importantly, whether it negatively impacted on service users’ experiences (Sager and Stephens, 2005; Johnsen with Fitzpatrick, 2009). Using ‘faithness’ to investigate this element included comparing informants’ (national stakeholders, case study staff and service users) testimonies with the theological values set out in chapter six. Perhaps unsurprisingly, the overtly faith based Trinity 3 was found to reflect on theological values in their mission and ethos along with other FBOs identified by fieldwork participants. Furthermore, the apparent rapprochement between FBOs (Trinity 3 and other non-case study organisations) and secular organisations was based on an understanding that the focus was on rights based approaches and there was no place for evangelistic mission and ethos.

The concept of ‘faithness’ was not utilised to sub-categorise organisations through a complex classification system, as that had already been done. However, in common with previous research, ‘faithness’ did seek out to capture the complexities that faith influences convey and refresh thinking about how and what difference faith made to the ways in which contemporary FBOs operate in the Scottish homelessness sector.

### 12.5 Policy implications

Successive governments across the UK have created mechanisms affording voluntary sector organisations (including FBOs) the means to contribute to the statutory homeless system. The accepted position seems to be that they bring particular skills and expertise which have positive benefits for service users. The voluntary sector also physically increases the capacity of the system to provide a safety net that both meets and goes beyond statutory provisions, by supporting homeless people who still do not fit statutory definitions of homelessness but who require solutions nonetheless. If fiscal and market (lack of usable social housing stock) constraints limit the capacity of the public sector to fulfil the obligations placed on them through legislation, then the support providers (faith and non-faith based) they fund need to be seen to deliver required outcomes, whilst achieving value for the money spent from the public purse.

The experiences of the four service users from Joseph’s Place highlight potential implications that organisations (that were not part of the case studies) with religious positions might have on the safety net mentioned above. These interviewees highlighted risks associated with notions of ‘unconditional acceptance’ endorsed by some
organisations and enacted by religious volunteers in low threshold faith-based services, in that high levels of tolerance of user drunkenness on the premises had left the service users feeling uncomfortable and worried about their own safety. Furthermore, whilst these individuals had found ways to circumvent requirements regarding participation in religious observances (prayers and readings) in these other (non-case study) services, questions might be raised re the defensibility of such conditions being placed on service user access in the first place. In a slightly different vein, policies imposed on Joseph’s Place by their religious landlord restricted the range of services they were able to offer, including most notably sexual health and needle exchange services which are commonly available in other secular organisations.

Whilst the Equality Act 2010 allows for the application of an ‘occupational requirement’ (OR) on religious grounds, this is interpreted as applicable to positions where the post-holder is responsible for embedding the religious ethos of the organisation. Applying an OR on religious grounds in the field of homelessness and support might therefore be considered by some as troubling, because it contradicts principles of equal opportunities in employment practices (even aside from any specific impact on service users). It also leaves the moral and policy question of whether the case for an OR is well made. This is particularly so where organisations like Trinity 3 are in receipt of public funding. The interviewees from Trinity 3 explained that the common faith perspective they shared (which was a direct result of the organisational OR) helped to bind them together as a staff team, explaining that everyone had the same focus and wanted to achieve the same outcomes (to support homeless people as an outpouring of Christ’s love). Whether these views are thought to be convincing might depend partly on the observer’s personal faith position. The evidence of a high degree of commonality in values amongst the staff in all three case study organisations as discussed above, however, undermines the argument that an OR adds anything in such settings.

12.6 Study limitations

This research adopted qualitative methods to analyse homelessness and ‘faithness’ because they allow the researcher flexibility in approaching these subjects with care and sensitivity, that is, in the way that interviews are conducted. These methods allowed for an in-depth, nuanced and ethically-informed approach to be taken that I feel was most appropriate to the subject.
However, there were important limitations to the research. In part, these are the standard limitations in qualitative research associated with the small-scale and intense nature of data collection, together with the purposive sampling approach, that limits the generalisability of the findings. However, there was also one specific, and unintended limitation, in that the comparison of the impact of ‘faithness’ on service user experiences was incomplete because I was unable (despite numerous attempts) to interview service users from the non-faith based service (Kana). This limited my ability to draw firm comparisons across the full ‘faithness’ spectrum as regards service user experiences.

12.7 Future research

Future research might valuably examine in more detail the metaphysical positions held by homeless people and consider how (if at all) any associated religious or spiritual needs are met within homelessness services. This might be used to inform the development of services that are equipped to meet these needs and/or to signpost people elsewhere as appropriate, whilst also being sensitive to, and respectful of, the stances of those who do not share them.

Moreover, there is scope for a more detailed examination of service user views about using day-centres, food distribution points, soup runs, seasonal night shelters, foodbanks and how these experiences compare with using statutory services. In particular, an assessment of the impacts of differing forms and levels of conditionality in each would enhance understanding of the impacts of different approaches to service delivery (by faith-based and non-faith based services, as relevant).

Finally, more research could valuably be conducted into the ways FBOs evolve, in particular the ways they adapt to sustain (and in some cases grow) their position in the homelessness sector. This might assess the impact such changes have on the extent to which they do (or do not) maintain a faith-base, and also on the quality and type of services provided.
Appendix 1: Key Informant Interview Topic Guide

Introduction
- Thank each person for agreeing to be interviewed
  - Reiterate the importance of the key informants
  - Conversation about work, the organisation and the homelessness sector
  - Questions act as a guide
  - My neutrality
- Reiterate purpose of study (information sheet)
- Explain consent, confidentiality and anonymity
- Outline timescales for analysis – of PhD and wider study (information sheet)
- Ask permission to record interview
- Any questions before we proceed

Personal Role
I would like to start the interview by getting you to tell me about your role.

Please tell me about your role in the organisation?

Organisation
I would now like to discuss the work that [name of organisation] does.

First of all, what are the organisation’s main activities?
- Direct provision [probe type of service, whether Scotland wide or specific locations]
- Support services [probe whether they provide services to other organisations for example training, education resources, funding]
- Campaigning [probe whether this is local/national, alone or with other organisations]
- Liaison with decision makers [probe what form this takes, formal/informal, local/national]
  [Probe challenges]

Can you tell me a bit about the day to day structures of the organisation?
- Staffing [probe whether paid/volunteers]
- Management [probe person/team/board make up]
- Funding sources
- Values [probe underpinning ethos]

Before we move on to the next section, I am interested in finding out how [name of organisation] has evolved, can you tell me a bit about its history
- When established [probe whether they know, year/decade it was set up in]
- Founder/s [probe whether they know who set the organisation up]
• Reason [probe whether they know why the organisation was set up]
• Faith - the main focus of the study is to understand the role that faith plays in organisations –
  [probe whether organisation has ever had faith affiliation, whether it is still present, how it is expressed, any advantages/disadvantages]

**Differences between faith-based and secular organisations?**
In your experience, how do FBOs and secular providers differ [if at all] with regard to:
• The types of services they deliver [probe focus of service, locations]
• The client groups they support [probe single homeless or wider, recently housed, people in poverty, levels of need/complexity, people on the margin of other services, support offered]
• Service dynamics [probe how providers/service users respond to each other, atmosphere]
• Resources [probe types of funding, government/charitable grants, donations whether sustainable resourcing]
• Their effectiveness [probe alleviating crisis/the immediate impacts of homelessness/ending homelessness, providing sustainable solutions]

Earlier, we spoke about the values of [name of organisation]. I would now like to look at this element in relation to whether there are common or distinct factors motivating faith based and secular providers.

What do you think, influences the ethos and principles of service providers, concepts like
• Standing together with people (solidarity, recognising that we rely on each other – that we identify with each other
• Looking after people, giving them food and drink (hospitality, welcoming, taking care of the stranger, recognition the divine in the other)
• Giving to people because they are in need (charity, serving people as good works)
• Reaching out to people (outreach, going where the need is, itinerant ministries taking the word to people)
• Challenging social inequalities (fighting injustice, bringing in justice and order in the divine sense)
• Espousing the purpose of the service with conviction (mission, taking the word out to people)
  [Probe extent in FBOs and secular]
  [If discussion is flowing, continue with following, what about the following concepts]
• Caring for people and wanting the best for them (love, borne out of faith in divine love as action in the world)
• Trying to give people safe space (sanctuary, contested notion that faith spaces are safe)
• Promoting the values of the organisation as morally superior (zeal, religious singularity)
• Promoting the cause (proselytising, seeking to convert people to faith, change their current faith)
• Effecting a persons’ transformation (conversion, the person believes that the new position is better and moves to it)
• Saving people from themselves (salvation, working towards personal salvation by supporting people)

In your experience, how are these concepts expressed in practice?
[probe delivery approaches, use of rules, conditions imposed (or not) on service users, adherence to specific practices, conditional/unconditional acceptance of conduct/behaviours, language]

Interventionism

Another area I am exploring is the extent to which homelessness practices are based on [moving towards] interventionist approaches. By interventionist I mean, practice that is focused on changing the way the homeless person is living [impact of that on their/others wellbeing] or stopping their homelessness from continuing. A non-interventionist approach may be considered as one in which the there is unconditional acceptance of the person.

Are these concepts familiar to you? [probe whether they are aware of organisations that have a stance on interventions/non and why they have the stance]

The future of the Scottish homelessness service sector

What, do you think, are the main challenges to and opportunities for the Scottish homelessness sector over the next five years?
[probe what they are, eradication of homelessness, more fluid housing markets, effective prevention policies and practice, housing options, improved outcomes for homeless people]
[probe where these come from, welfare reforms/austerity agenda, reducing budgets, greater need/demand]

What role, if any, do you think FBOs should play in the delivery of services for homeless people in the future? What makes you say that? [probe capacity, sector fragmentation, greater competition for resources, changes to the value base of homelessness service sector, professionalism]

What would you like to see the Scottish homelessness sector achieving over the next five years?

That is the end of the questions THANKS
• Is there anything else I should have asked or anything you would like to ask?
• Anything you want to ask?
• Suggestions for other contacts.
Appendix 2: Information sheet for key informants

The changing nature of faith based contributions to single homelessness services in Scotland

Study background
This is a PhD study aimed at assessing the contributions that Faith Based Organisations (FBOs) make to single homelessness services in Scotland and, in particular, examining how faith influences what they do.

Aims
This study seeks to: identify which FBOs provide single homelessness services in Scotland and what they do; examine the relationships between FBOs and secular providers; investigate how the values of FBOs and secular providers influence their practice; and explore what role FBOs are likely to play in the future.

Methods
Conducting key informant interviews forms the first part of the empirical research. This method draws on the perspectives of people in the field with knowledge and experience of the homelessness service sector in Scotland. In the main, the key informants work for national/regional organisations within the voluntary and statutory sectors.

A case study approach is the main method for collecting data and will include interviews and focus groups within a small number of selected organisations. The views of homelessness service users will be sought during the case study.

Ethics
The information you provide through interviews will be treated in confidence. You/your organisation will not be named in any research reports and any direct material quoted will be anonymised. A findings summary will be made available to you after key informant interviews are completed.

If you have any questions about the research, prior to interview, please feel free to contact me: Fiona Jackson
Email: fj40@hw.ac.uk

1 The research is associated with an Economic and Social Research Council study, information about this is available from http://www.welfareconditionality.ac.uk/
Appendix 3: Key Informant Interview Topic Guide Survey

Fiona Jackson: fj40@hw.ac.uk

Please highlight any/all numbered point/s that reflect what your job entails OR make an answer in the cell under each list (row should expand when text is added)

Personal Role

Please briefly outline what your role entails?
1. Meetings with other national bodies (statutory and non-statutory)
2. Conferences (internal and external) e.g. in attendance or facilitating/managing/organising
3. Policy development
4. Membership of Scottish/UK working groups
5. Other

ANSWER (or comment to detail response above)

Organisation

Please tell me a bit about what the organisation does?
1. Direct services for people who are homeless (Scotland wide or specific locations)
2. Services provided to organisations (statutory and non-statutory) e.g. training, publications, education resources
3. Campaigning/lobbying/influencing (local/national, any partnering in this area)
4. Liaison with decision makers (local/national, formal/informal)
5. Conferences/events (if not covered above)
6. Other

ANSWER (or comment to detail response above)

Please tell me how the organisation operates?
1. Staffing (general number of paid and any volunteers working for the organisation)
2. Management committee structure and responsibilities
3. Funding sources (government, other grant funds, services to other organisations, Social Enterprises – I do not require details of individual funding or amounts)
4. Other

ANSWER (or comment to detail response above)
Organisation (cont)

Please tell me how your organisation has evolved?
1. Its vision
2. The services it delivers
3. The stakeholders it works with
4. The organisational values
5. Other

ANSWER (or comment to detail response above)

Faith and non-faith based organisations

If you have experience of Faith Based Organisations providing homelessness services, do you find that they differ (or not) from non-faith based with regard to:
1. The types of services they deliver
2. The client groups they support
3. How they are resourced
4. Their connections with statutory organisations
5. Their values
6. Other

ANSWER (or comment to detail response above)

The future of the Scottish homelessness/voluntary service sector

What, do you think, are the main challenges to and opportunities for homelessness in Scotland over the next five years?

When I worked in the voluntary sector it was always known as that – can you explain a wee bit about the difference in role/structure of the ‘third’ sector?

ANSWER

THANK YOU VERY MUCH
Appendix 4: Information sheet for prospective case study organisation

Faith based contributions to single homelessness services in Scotland

Study background
This is a PhD study aimed at assessing the contributions that Faith Based Organisations (FBOs) make to single homelessness services in Scotland and, in particular, examining how faith influences what they do. This is set within the wider context of comparing the nature of services delivered in the voluntary and third sectors and those within the statutory services.

Study aims
This study seeks to: identify which FBOs provide single homelessness services in Scotland and what they do; investigate how the values of providers influence their practice; and explore what role FBOs are likely to play in the future.

The Case Study approach
The case study approach forms the main part of the empirical research. Using a case study approach provides a narrative (story based) analysis. I have chosen this approach to draw on the perspectives of people with experience of the organisation and the services delivered. I am conducting three case studies, two with a faith base and one with none. The focus of all case studies is the same in that I am exploring how organisations operate within the homelessness sector, the organisational ethos the types of services delivered and the client groups supported.

What is the organisational commitment?
The most important element of the case study approach is talking with people in the organisation: staff, volunteers and clients (the number of each set in discussion with the organisation). These discussions can take place through individual interviews or focus groups). If appropriate, I would also like to view (unobtrusive) service delivery points.

This would likely be two/three days full time work. I would rely on the organisation setting out how the time was split up to accommodate their operational commitments and staffing arrangements.
**Ethics**

There are considerations to be made about health and safety, confidentiality and privacy during case studies. That is important to safeguard the organisation and the people using spaces for day to day living activities and who are vulnerable due to the impact of their homelessness.

The information gathered on site (interviews, focus groups and observations) will be treated in confidence. You/your organisation will not be named in any research reports (without permission) and any direct material used will be anonymised.

**Fiona Jackson, fj40@hw.ac.uk**
Appendix 5: Case Study Topic Guide, Managers

Introduction
- Thank each person for agreeing to be interviewed
- Reiterate purpose of study (information sheet)
- Reiterate the importance of the case study organisations and interviewees
- Conversation about work, the organisation and the homelessness sector
- Questions act as a guide, not a test, want people to feel comfortable
- My neutrality, I am not seeking particular responses
- Explain consent, confidentiality and anonymity
- Outline timescales for analysis – of PhD and wider study (information sheet)
- Ask permission to record interview
- Any questions before we proceed

Personal role
1. Can you briefly tell me how long you have worked with the organisation and about your current job?
2. What was it about this organisation that interested you?
   [Probe, interest in homelessness, faith affiliation]

Project history and faith affiliation
3. Can you tell me a little about when and why the organisation was set up?
   Was it set up by one person or a group of people?
4. How would you say that the organisation has evolved since it was set up?
   Do you know whether service types have changed/are the same?
   [Probe, policy drivers, organisational focus]
   Do you know whether the client group has changed/is the same?
   [Probe, need, homeless/non-homeless, statutory/non-statutory homeless]
   Do you know whether the organisation ever had a faith affiliation?
   Do you know whether funding sources have changed?

Current operational context
5. Can you tell me a bit about how the organisation operates on a day to day basis?
6. How many staff and volunteers work here?
7. What sources of funding do you access? (any limitations/sources that are not tapped into)
   [Probe, government/charitable grants, donations, in kind]
   Are levels of funding secure?
8. Can you tell me a bit about how the organisation is managed?
9. Do you have a management board?
   [Probe, members, influence over organisational priorities, manager’s role re board]
10. Is there a business plan?
    [Probe: monitoring, service/policy review, measuring outcomes]
11. Do you ever work with other organisations to deliver services, campaign/lobby?
Clients and services
12. What client groups do you support?
   [Probe: single homeless or wider, recently housed, people in poverty, people on the margin of other services, support offered]
13. What types of services do you provide to homeless people?
   Accommodation/temporary shelter, access to housing
   Food, wash/shower facilities,
   Access to health care, education, employment opportunities
   Social activities, befriending, peer support
   Advice and information, budgeting, welfare rights,

Ethos
14. What is the ethos that underpins the organisation and its work?
15. Which of the following (if any) help describe the organisation’s ethos?
   To achieve social justice
   To support peoples’ rights
   To be charitable
   To offer hospitality
   To be alongside people in need
   To transform people’s lives
16. How, if at all, does faith influence the organisational ethos?

17. Are there any conditions for accessing the service? What are these?
   [Probe, whether referring agencies also set conditions]
18. Are there any rules that service users have to adhere to?
   What are these?
   What happens if these are broken
19. Service user fails to engage with the service?
   [Probe, work to find another service for person]

Personal motivation
[refer back to Q 15]
20. Which of these (if any) describes why you work with this organisation?
   To achieve social justice
   To support peoples’ rights
   To be charitable
   To offer hospitality
   To be alongside people in need
   To transform people’s lives
Aims
21. What are the organisational aims?
   Where are the organisational aims set out?
   [Probe, mission statements, annual reports, displayed in office/service space]
22. How, if at all, are these influenced by faith
23. How are these aims achieved in practice?

Faith influences
24. Are there other areas, do you think, where faith influences the organisation’s work?
   In its staff recruitment/development structures
   Where the organisation gets its funding
   Work with other organisations
   Links to religious bodies
25. Is faith referred to in service areas/in the work with service users?
26. In your experience, how aware are service users to the faith affiliation of the project?
   [Probe: impact of this, their response to this like/dislike, welcome/resent?]

The homelessness sector, current and future
27. What do you feel are the main issues homeless people face at the moment?
   [Probe: poverty, welfare cuts, policy changes, lack of services/housing, complex life situations]
28. I have read/people have said that they think faith based organisations often support people on the margins of/excluded by other services, is that your experience?
29. How well placed is the sector/organisation to deal with each of these?
30. What role, if any, do you think FBOs should play in the delivery of services for homeless people in the future? What makes you say that?

That is the end of the questions THANKS
• Is there anything else I should have asked or anything you would like to ask?
• Anything you want to ask?
Appendix 6: Case Study Topic Guide, Frontline staff

Introduction
• Thank each person for agreeing to be interviewed (or attending focus group)
• Reiterate purpose of study (information sheet)
• Reiterate the importance of the case study organisations and interviewees
• Conversation about work, the organisation and the homelessness sector
• Questions act as a guide, not a test, want people to feel comfortable
• My neutrality, I am not seeking particular responses
• Explain consent, confidentiality and anonymity
• Outline timescales for analysis – of PhD and wider study (information sheet)
• Ask permission to record interview – thank you this will help me a lot for collecting the data
• Any questions before we proceed

Personal role
1. What do you do/what does a ‘typical’ day here <name of organisation> look like?
   [Probe: speaking to/advising/informing service users, advocating on person’s behalf, supporting their basic wellbeing, contact with agencies, buddying people]
2. Why did you want to work here?
   [Probe: interest in homelessness, faith affiliation, organisations reputation, pragmatic needed a job (and for supporting volunteering)]
3. What are the project aims?
   [Probe: alleviating the impact of homelessness, changing/ending their homelessness]
   Where are these expressed?

Services and clients
4. What client groups do you support?
   [Probe, single homeless or wider, recently housed, people in poverty, people on the margin of other services, migrants]
5. What services does the organisation provide to homeless people?
   [Probe: accommodation/shelter, food, shower facilities, outreach, access to other services, social activities, befriending learning/access to learning, advice and information, employment]
   [Probe: does interviewee have a view on how effective these are]
6. What outcomes do you hope clients would achieve using the project?
   People moving on from their homelessness or recovering from an addiction
   Engagement with other support services
   Less dependence on the project/support
   Building up social networks
   Being drug/alcohol free
   Mixing with other people
   More confident
Services and clients (cont)

7. What helps/hinders their achieving their goals?
   [Probe, structural/individual]

8. How does the service respond if service users aren’t engaging with support/are engaging in behaviours that are known to be detrimental to their wellbeing?
   [Probe: acceptance of people as they are, empowerment, change/rehabilitation/intervention]

Conditionality

9. Are there any conditions that clients have to agree to before accessing the service?
   [Probe, what they are, sign up to support plan, whether referring agencies set conditions]
   [Probe: use of rules, conditions imposed (or not), adherence to specific practices]

Organisational ethos

10. How would you describe the ethos that underpins the organisation and its work?

11. How, if at all, does faith influence the organisation’s ethos?
   Are there any particular religious influences underpinning what the organisation does?
   [Probe, scriptural - bible, gospels; doctrinal - social doctrines, social responsibility committees; theological]

Organisational faith

12. To what extent, if at all, is faith expressed in the organisation?
   In name, objectives, public documents
   Composition of the staff team
   The way organisation work, rules/regulations, expectations on service users

13. In what ways is the faith affiliation of the organisation visible (if at all)?
   In the physical environment?
   [Probe, staff space, service spaces]
   Do staff talk about faith?
   [Probe, in what ways, amongst themselves, with service users if they initiate it or not]
   [Probe for both team and service users: prayer, religious materials, readings, preaching]

14. To what extent does the organisation seek to transform homeless peoples’ lives?
   In what ways?
   What do you mean when you say that?
   [Probe, salvation, conversion, changes in behaviours, acceptance of faith values, moving out of homelessness] BE AWARE OF NO CHANGE RESPONSE

PROBE IF NOT INCLUDED

Is the organisation trying to achieve social justice?
Does it want to serve people in need?
Is it about supporting peoples’ rights?
Are homeless people offered hospitality?
[Probe, sanctuary, safe space]
Is it about solidarity when working alongside people in need?
IF FAITH BASED
15. In your experience, how aware are service users to the faith affiliation of the project? Is it obvious to service users that it is faith based?
   [Probe, what makes them say that, whether clients express their feelings about it]
   Do they find the faith base useful?
   Do they find it off putting?
   Do they think it supportive?

The homelessness sector, current and future
16. What do you feel are the main challenges that homeless people face at the moment? [Probe: poverty, welfare cuts, policy changes, lack of services/housing, complex life situations]
17. What role, if any, do you think FBOs should play in the delivery of services for homeless people in the future? What makes you say that?

That is the end of the questions THANKS
• Anything you want to ask me?
Appendix 7: Case Study Topic Guide, Volunteers

Introduction
- Thank each person for agreeing to be interviewed (or attending focus group)
- Reiterate purpose of study (information sheet)
- Reiterate the importance of the case study organisations and interviewees
- Conversation about work, the organisation and the homelessness sector
- Questions act as a guide, not a test, want people to feel comfortable
- My neutrality, I am not seeking particular responses
- Explain consent, confidentiality and anonymity
- Outline timescales for analysis – of PhD and wider study (information sheet)
- Ask permission to record interview
- Any questions before we proceed

Personal role
1. What do you do/what does a ‘typical’ day here <name of organisation> look like?
   [Probe, speaking to/advising/informing service users, advocating on person’s behalf, supporting their basic wellbeing, contact with agencies, buddying people]

2. Why did you want to work here <name of organisation>?
   [Probe: interest in homelessness, faith affiliation, organisations reputation, pragmatic needed a job (and for supporting volunteering)]

3. Have you volunteered with other organisations?
   [Probe, how experiences compare]

Services and client groups
4. What do you think the organisation is trying to do for client group/tease out who they are?
   - Serve people in need? Support peoples’ rights? Offer hospitality? [Probe, sanctuary, safe space]? Work alongside people in need?

5. What do you think clients get from using the service? transformation
   - People moving on from their homelessness or recovering from an addiction
   - Engagement with other support services
   - Less dependence on the project/support
   - Building up social networks
   - Being drug/alcohol free
   - Mixing with other people
   - More confident
   - What helps/hinders their achieving their goals?
     [Probe, structural/individual]

6. Are there any rules that clients are expected to adhere to?
   [Probe, how they respond to these]
Organisational faith
7. This is a faith/non-faith based organisation?
   Do service users talk about faith at all?
   [Probe, staff clients]

That is the end of the questions THANKS, anything you want to ask me?
Appendix 8: Case Study Topic Guide, Service users

TOPIC GUIDE

Introduction
- Explain who I am
- Explain what I am doing
- Explain the purpose of the focus group
- Explain how the focus group will run
- Explain about consent, confidentiality and anonymity (‘name’ protocol)
- Ask permission to record interview – thanks helps a lot when writing up
- Any questions before we start?

Introductions
I have introduced myself, can you briefly tell me who you are, name and age?

Experience of the project
8. How long have you used this service?

9. How did you find out about the service?
   [Probe, word of mouth, referral, other]

10. How often do you use this service?
    [Probe, when they use it, whether there is an order]
    [Probe, whether used for a particular function]

11. How does the organisation support you?
    [Probe, types of services, staff, support plans, access to other services, meeting other people]

12. Are there any rules you have to stick by?
    How do you feel about that?

13. Do you feel the organisation has supported you to make changes in how you live?
    In what ways?
    [Probe, end rough sleeping, change behaviours that are doing them harm, getting support]
    Is this a good/bad thing, do you think?

Experience of other services/how they compare
14. Do you use other services as well?

15. Which other services do you use/have you used?
    [Probe which types, day centres, hostels, soup runs, LA homelessness services, TA]
16. What do these other services give you?  
   Is it similar/different to this project? In what ways?  
   [Probe practical support, better understanding, friendlier, more open]

**Faith**

17. Do you know if any homelessness services you have used, have been religious in any way?  
   [Probe: did that matter, was it any different?]

That is the end of the questions THANKS Anything you want to ask me?
Appendix 9: Survey, Service users

Introduction

- Have you time to answer a few questions/speak to me (10 – 15 minutes)
- Briefly what I am doing (information sheet)
- Explain consent, confidentiality and anonymity
- If not comfortable with anything I am asking, just say
- Ask permission to record interview – thank you this will help me a lot for collecting the data
- Any questions before we proceed

1. How long have you been coming along here? (Tease out their story)

2. How did you hear about the service? (Tease out their story)

3. What is recovery about?
   What activities can people do?
   How does that support your recovery?
   Is that the same as other recovery activities?
   Are there any recovery programmes that are based on faith?

4. Are you part of any other recovery programmes? Have you used other services?

5. What happens for you next? (as a result of the service)

That is the end of the questions THANKS   Anything you want to ask me?
Appendix 10: Node tests

Stage 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aims</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement and not</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless system</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job role</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting people where they are at</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership working</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoples Rights</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal motivation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules and conditions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting people</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transformation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Identifying nodes: stage 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of node</th>
<th>Number of transcripts with references</th>
<th>Number of times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aims</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client group</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement and not</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless system</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job role</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting people where they are at</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnership working</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peoples Rights</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal motivation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules and conditions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting people</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transformation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Identifying nodes: stage 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parent nodes</th>
<th>Child nodes*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aims</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless system</td>
<td>Peoples’ rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homelessness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Funding; Partnership working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal motivation</td>
<td>Volunteering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules and conditions</td>
<td>Engagement and not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting people</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>Meeting people where they are at; Standards</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* child nodes included breakdown per interview grouping (case study organisations and key informants)
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