

Bangor University

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Power and Control: The Lived Experiences of Homeless Youth in Supported Accommodation

Roberts, Natalie

Award date:
2023

Awarding institution:
Bangor University

[Link to publication](#)

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**Power and Control: The Lived Experiences of Homeless Youth in
Supported Accommodation**

Natalie Roberts

A Thesis Presented for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Declaration

'Yr wyf drwy hyn yn datgan mai canlyniad fy ymchwil fy hun yw'r thesis hwn, ac eithrio lle nodir yn wahanol. Caiff ffynonellau eraill eu cydnabod gan droednodiadau yn rhoi cyfeiriadau eglur. Nid yw sylwedd y gwaith hwn wedi cael ei dderbyn o'r blaen ar gyfer unrhyw radd, ac nid yw'n cael ei gyflwyno ar yr un pryd mewn ymgeisiaeth am unrhyw radd oni bai ei fod, fel y cytunwyd gan y Brifysgol, am gymwysterau deul cymeradwy.'

Rwy'n cadarnhau fy mod yn cyflwyno'r gwaith gyda chytundeb fy Ngrichwyliwr (Goruchwyliwr)'

'I hereby declare that this thesis is the results of my own investigations, except where otherwise stated. All other sources are acknowledged by bibliographic references. This work has not previously been accepted in substance for any degree and is not being concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree unless, as agreed by the University, for approved dual awards.'

I confirm that I am submitting the work with the agreement of my Supervisor(s)'

Natalie Jayne Roberts

Abstract

Despite the common use of supported accommodation projects to house homeless youth, there are a relatively small number of studies which fully explore the experiences and social systems of those within and more specifically, the role of the institution itself in those experiences. In response to this gap in the research, this thesis uses an ethnographic approach to build on the existing research and examine the complex day-to-day diverse experiences, attitudes, and relationships of both the young people housed in temporary supported accommodation and the staff members who act in the capacity of key workers and managers. Drawing on interactionism as a theoretical foundation combined with classical theories such as Goffman's Total Institution Theory (1961) and Stark's later seminal application to homeless hostels, along with wider theories of hard (Crewe 2015), soft (Nye 1990), and shared power, the thesis explores the meanings of the resident and staff interpersonal relationships, interactions and engagement and recognises that they are implicitly linked not only with approaches to control and regulations of space, but also to the resident's responses to the power mechanisms and their levels of resistance.

The findings primarily derived from in-depth semi-structured interviews although general informal conversations noted as part of participant observation also complemented the analysis. Together these methods explored the experiences and complex interactions between residents and staff members as they navigated the social and physical environment. In total, ten residents of the hostel between the ages of 16-24 participated, along with three staff members and two managers. One of the managers interviewed was in position in 2015, and the second was newly appointed in 2016.

Due to substantial changes brought on by austerity and funding cuts during the study, interviews with participants were conducted over an extended period, with a pause in data collection part way through. First beginning in 2015, followed by the pause, interviews recommenced in 2016 shortly after the changes had taken effect. The twelve-

month gap in the data collection presented some unexpected and unique challenges, primarily as this period of change brought about the departure of several staff members and the introduction of new management personnel and a new management style. These challenges included difficulty in re-accessing the research site and, upon returning, difficulty in interviewing staff members.

To reflect the changes in the culture and environment of the hostel during this period, the findings are organised into three distinct chapters: Care and Making a Home, Power and Control in the Hostel, and The Staff Perspective. Care and Making a Home concentrates almost entirely on the data collected prior to the pause in fieldwork, where the hostel operated primarily, although not exclusively, as a space of care; and where social relationships and positive social interactions were used as a base to achieve compliance. Conversely, the second chapter of the findings - Power and Control in the Hostel - concentrates on the data collected following the pause, capturing the changes in the environment, the emphasis on hard power techniques to replace social relationships and the consequences of this change. The final chapter of the findings looks at the perspective of the staff members and explores their feelings towards the changes experienced, along with other aspects of their role, including the challenges of its complex nature, team culture and self-legitimacy.

This study is distinctive in that the rare set of circumstances during data collection rapidly changed the environment from one predominantly focused on being a space of care to one that focused more on control. Consequently, unlike other studies which look at the hostel environment as a snapshot in time and which observe a single management style, this study is able to capture and compare the contrasting experiences and realities of residents and staff within the same hostel but experiencing different control methods. The findings, therefore, although generally applicable to wider institutional environments and other settings, provide a unique contribution to our knowledge of the hostel environment and working with young people experiencing

homelessness.

Contents

Abstract.....	3
List of Figures.....	10
List of Tables.....	10
List of Appendices.....	10
Chapter One: Introduction	12
___Theoretical Framework.....	17
___Definitions of Homelessness and Inherent Issues with Statistics.....	18
___Hidden Homelessness.....	21
___A Brief Overview of Intentional and Unintentional Homelessness.....	23
___Structure of the Remainder of the Thesis.....	25
PART ONE: The Study in Context.....	29
Chapter Two: History of Homelessness and Homelessness	
Policies.....	31
The Supporting People Program and Financial Constraints.....	40
Pathways to Homelessness.....	42
The Homeless Population in Wales.....	43

Defining Youth and Adolescence.....	44
The Reported Effects of Homelessness.....	45
Summary.....	47

Chapter Three: Homeless

hostels.....	50
A History of Hostels and Emergence of the Supported Accommodation.....	51
The Hostel Role and Function.....	54
Institutional Design and Use of Space.....	56
Home and Place-Making in the Hostel Environment.....	60
Social Activities in Institutions.....	61
Understanding Institutional Rules, Policies, and Social Control.....	62
The Hostel as a Total Institution.....	73
Summary.....	77

Chapter Four: Social Relationships in

Hostels.....	79
Social relationships and Networks of Homeless People.....	80
Social Dynamics Among	

Residents.....	86
Staff-Resident Social Relationships and Everyday Interactions.....	90
Psychologically Informed Environments and Trauma-Informed Environments.....	93
Challenges Embedded in the Staff-Resident Relationship.....	98
Staff Experiences and Working Culture.....	101
Summary.....	104

PART TWO: Researching a Hostel for Young Homeless

People.....108

Chapter Five:

Methodology.....	109
Ethnography in Bank	
Hostel.....	109
Reliability of Case	
Studies.....	110
Validity of Qualitative	
Research.....	113
The Research	
Participants.....	114
Analysis of Hostel	
Documents.....	115
Conducting Participant	
Observation.....	116
Semi-Structured	
Interviews.....	121

Ethical Considerations when Undertaking Fieldwork.....	123
Data	
analysis.....	128
Summary.....	1
30	
Chapter Six: Researcher Reflections.....	132
Researcher Positionality.....	132
The Pause in Fieldwork.....	136
Summary.....	139
Chapter Seven: Context of the	
Hostel.....	140
Characteristics of Bank	
Hostel.....	141
An Overview of the Design Features of Bank	
Hostel.....	143
Design of Staff	
Space.....	152
Funding Cuts to the	
Organisation.....	154
Resident	
Characteristics.....	155
Staff	
Characteristics.....	161
Pen	
portraits.....	162
Summary.....	168

PART THREE: Care and Control in Bank Hostel: Resident and Staff

Perspectives.....	170
-------------------	-----

Chapter Eight: Care and Making a Home.....	173
Pathways to Homelessness and Social Networks Outside of the Hostel.....	<u>173</u>
Social Relationships with Housed Peers.....	<u>179</u>
Social Media Habits of Homeless Youth.....	<u>187</u>
Constructing Relationships – Showing That They Care.....	<u>189</u>
Building a Community and Developing Hostel Cultures.....	<u>197</u>
Informal Surveillance as a Soft Power Measure.....	<u>205</u>
Relationships with Management.....	<u>207</u>
Controlling Through Caring Relations.....	<u>209</u>
Resident Rule Perception and Staff Application.....	<u>218</u>
Shared Power as a Tool of Empowerment.....	<u>222</u>
Summary.....	<u>22</u>
5	

Chapter Nine: Power and Control in the Hostel.....	<u>228</u>
Staff-Resident Relationship Breakdown.....	<u>229</u>
Arrival of the New Staff.....	235

The New Manager.....	239
Shifting from Care to Control.....	244
New Rules and Restrictions.....	244
Sanctions.....	25
3 Enhancing Formal Surveillance.....	256
The New-Style House Meetings.....	260
The New Bank Hostel.....	262
Using Resistance as a Coping Mechanism.....	267
Conflict, Bullying and Counter Power.....	271
Disempowerment and Principles of Shared Power.....	279
Summary.....	27
9	

Chapter Ten: Staff

Perspectives.....	281
Staff Attitude to the Role and the Challenges Experienced.....	282
Changes in the Staffing Structure.....	290
Crossing over Professional Boundaries.....	295
Superficial Staff	

Power.....	299
Self- Legitimacy.....	301
Group Identity and Team Identity.....	305
Summary.....	310
Chapter Eleven: Conclusion and Recommendations.....	
Original Contributions.....	316
Future Implications for Policy and Practice.....	319
Recommendations for Further Research.....	324
Limitations of the Study.....	325
List of References.....	328
Appendices.....	350

List of Figures

Figure 1: Ground Floor of Bank
Hostel.....145

Figure 2: Living Area
2.....147

Figure 3: Games
Room.....147

Figure 4: The
Kitchen.....149

Figure 5: Typical Resident
Bedroom.....151

Figure 6: 1st Floor of
Hostel.....152

Figure 7: 2nd Floor of
Hostel.....152

Figure 8: Staff
Office.....153

List of Tables

Table 1: Participant
Characteristics.....156

Table 2: Repeat Hostel
Residents.....157

Table 3: Identified Issues and
Behaviours.....160

Table 4: Staff
Characteristics.....162

Table 5: Residents Pathways to

Homelessness.....	174
-------------------	-----

List of Appendices

Appendix 1: Participant

Factsheet.....	350
----------------	-----

Appendix 2: Consent Form for

Participation.....	352
--------------------	-----

Appendix 3: Consent Form for Tape

Recording.....	353
----------------	-----

Appendix 4: Themes and Coding

Frame.....	354
------------	-----

Chapter One: Introduction

Homelessness has long been recognised as a serious, multi-faceted, worldwide problem, which can have devastating effects on those experiencing it, particularly when combined with other issues. Yet despite its prevalence, it is a phenomenon that is notoriously difficult to solve. To apply context to the scale of the problem, research by Centrepoin (2021) concerning the recent Coronavirus pandemic notes that pre-March 2020, when the pandemic first grasped the country, levels of homelessness had exponentially increased across all forms (Centrepoin 2021). Similarly, the homeless charity Shelter stated in 2017 that the general homeless population had increased by 13,000 people in the UK, despite several government initiatives to tackle the phenomenon (Shelter 2017).

Across Wales, statistics indicate that an estimated 7,000 young people sought assistance with homelessness in 2017 (Llamau 2018). In terms of housing solutions, the latest homeless monitor report for Wales published in 2021 (Fitzpatrick et al., 2021) states in the period 2016-2020 leading up to the Coronavirus pandemic, individuals being placed in temporary accommodation increased by 24%. Since 2020, however, they note the effects of the pandemic have led to further increases in demand (Fitzpatrick et al., 2021). Other statistics reported from the past decade suggest that youth homelessness in the UK in general, is rising (Crisis 2012), while research by the Welsh charity Llamau estimates that 150,000 young people spend at least one night homeless each year (Llamau 2018).

In respect of youth homelessness, supported accommodation projects have played a vital role in housing insecurely housed young people between the ages of 16-24, who, because of their age, may experience significantly more challenges than their adult counterparts and will often experience different effects. Supported accommodation hostels function to provide physical necessities such as warmth, shelter and cooking facilities whilst simultaneously aiming to provide the emotional and practical support and tools necessary to prepare a young resident for independent living. Given their age together with their often-traumatic childhood experiences, homeless youth are typically considered to be one of the most vulnerable groups in society and thus in need of support, guidance, consistency and stability (Bantchevska 2008; Crisis 2012; McGrath and Pistrang 2007; Hodson 1998; Van der Ploeg 1997; Meade and Slesnick 2002; Collins 2009). However, although supported hostels operate on a non-judgemental sympathetic basis aimed to empower young people and encourage autonomy, research has shown that many feature stringent control and surveillance methods designed to curb and reform any perceived undesirable behaviours, which can result in feelings of disempowerment and thus a direct contradiction to the aims of the organisation (Glenn and Goodman 2015; Stark 1994; Stone 2010). As rule adherence is usually a condition to remain in the hostel, young people who do not submit to such rules, regulations and

mandatory support, are deemed in breach of their tenancy and can face punishments, warnings and even eviction, which can be carried without the need for a Possession Order from the court. Under these circumstances, an evicted young person may be labelled 'intentionally homeless' by the local authority, which may impact any further housing support they receive.

Despite their central role in shaping a young person's experience of homelessness, research relating to the lived experiences of homeless youth specifically within hostels is relatively sparse. Those studies which do explore this particular complex environment often examine the setting generally, failing to explore the more nuanced aspects, such as social dynamics and cultures, use of space, power and control methods and finally, the experiences of staff. Comparatively, adult hostels have received considerably more scholarly attention, with researchers over the past few decades questioning the role of the institution together with the potential adverse effects of hostel life. Within this context, hostels for homeless adults have often been described as all-encompassing and disciplinary total institutions (Goffman 1961), which exercise coercive control methods to strip residents of their autonomy, self-identity and independence and which cumulatively reduce the probability of successful reintegration into society (Stark 1994; DeWard and Moe 2010; Goffman 1961). Despite their historical standing as a method to house those in need, because of these reported issues, there have been some concerns about the general suitability of hostels as a response to homelessness (Stark 1994; DeWard and Moe 2010), particularly as a recent report by Schwan et al., (2018) on behalf of the newly formed Wales Centre for Public Policy, highlighted that young people experiencing homelessness do not transition from their precarious situation quickly enough, meaning prolonged exposure to a negative environment is likely to impact on personal wellbeing and lead to further adverse short and long term consequences for a young person as they progress into adulthood.

Given this, the overarching purpose of this study is to contribute to the relevant

literature and expand our understanding of the complex and sometimes ambiguous nature of homeless hostels that support young people aged 16-24. The study draws on interactionism as a theoretical basis to deconstruct and provide meaning to the social and power dynamics and cultures within the hostel sphere and helps inform how these elements interact. The research goes beyond providing a general overview of the hostel setting and focuses on examining the institution as a site whose holistic ethos aims to empower and teach independence to homeless youth, whilst simultaneously enforcing what appear to be contradictory rules and other disciplinary control methods. The tension between power and control and care and welfare is therefore a key theme to be explored in the study, alongside the social relationships and interactions within the environment.

Importantly, by focusing on a hostel for homeless youth, the study provides the young residents with a voice to narrate their lived experiences and day-to-day lives within the scope of the research themes. In addition to the young people, the research provides a voice to the often-neglected staff members, whose participation in related research generally focuses on their perception of residents, rather than their personal experiences managing the role and the construction of their identity as a staff member, despite the key role they play in the lives of the young people and the stressful demands associated with the job. This study, therefore, aims to address the gaps in the knowledge and answer the following research questions:

- 1) What role do social relationships play in the experiences of homeless youth?
- 2) How do hostel staff exert power and control, and how do these methods influence the social atmosphere and levels of rule adherence?
- 3) How does the use of space in the hostel affect the social relationship dynamics of residents?

4) What impact does social change have on residents and staff in the hostel environment?

To address the research questions, an ethnographic approach was adopted to gather data, using an exploratory longitudinal qualitative case study. Data collection primarily focused on semi-structured interviews with residents, staff members and management, along with supporting elements of participant observation and hostel documentary analysis. By examining and collating various aspects of data, I was able to delve into the social world of the case study hostel and understand more about the inherent social and power relations, particularly how they interact, complement, and contrast with each other.

Data collection began in 2015, when five residents were interviewed at the research site, along with the hostel manager. Following the completion of these interviews, the hostel experienced some structural changes stemming from substantial funding cuts to the Supporting People Programme, which is explored in more detail in Chapter Six. Briefly, several key staff departed from their positions due to the effects of the new constraints on their role, leading to a period of high staff turnover and uncertainty. A new manager was appointed in the midst of the staff changes, who subsequently introduced a new more authoritarian management style and approach to rule enforcement. Data collection paused during this period of change due to the instability in the staffing structure and the inability to establish a new point of contact for my research. For a short while, the possibility of continuing data collection appeared unrealistic; however, in 2016, after approximately 12 months away from fieldwork, access was re-established, and the research recommenced with new participants in what was now a significantly different social environment to that of the earlier (2015) fieldwork period.

The findings, therefore, aim to contextualise the changes in the environment by focusing

on the themes of power and control and the effects of the change in power dynamics on social relationships and interactions. To accurately capture and reflect the changes encompassing the hostel during the pause, the findings in Chapters Eight, Nine and Ten are structured in a way that first focus on the experiences of the 2015 residents, who considered the hostel as a space which prioritised care and welfare through social relationships, positive informal interactions, flexible rule enforcement and power sharing. The second chapter of the findings, Chapter Nine, focuses on the data collected from the 2016 residents and examines the hostel post-changes, where hostel policies and provisions had shifted so that the environment resembled more of a punitive and disciplinary institution (Foucault 1977; Dandeker 1990; Williams 1996). In contrast to the caring narrative underpinning the environment described in Chapter Eight, this chapter discusses the residents' perception of and responses to the harsher control techniques and processes that were introduced.

Together, the comparison of the site and social interactions under two divergent approaches to power and control provides a better understanding of how institutions function and *can* function to balance aspects of care and control, thus achieving organisational goals without reinforcing existing negative stereotypes and prejudices found in wider society and reflected in UK policy, as to be detailed in Chapter Two. The findings of the study also highlight concerns in respect of financial cuts to homeless services and how these constraints can impact social relationships within the hostel and influence hostel quality, policy, practices and unavoidably, the experiences of homeless youth.

Theoretical framework

The study was conducted using symbolic interactionism as a theoretical perspective to understand the meaning behind the social interactions which shape and are shaped by the institutional policies and practices and to better understand how the participants

navigate and make sense of the social world within the hostel. Often used alongside ethnography (Hoolachan 2015), the early ideas surrounding the premise of symbolic interactionism as a method of explaining changing actions and behaviours in society through repeated meaningful interactions, were first introduced by Mead (1934) and were later developed and described as 'symbolic interactionism' by Blumer (1969). According to Blumer (1969), who believed symbolic interactionism to be a continual process in society, the theory can be understood to be constructed around three basic principles:

- 1) That humans interact with physical and social objects on the basis of the meanings ascribed to those things
- 2) The meaning of objects derives from a person's social interactions with others in society
- 3) The meanings given by a person are not permanent and are handled, modified and interpreted depending on the experiences of the person.

Therefore, underpinning these basic processes, are the concepts of change and deconstruction which are deeply interwoven and influenced by social interactions and individual experiences (Carter and Fuller 2015). Blumer believed that as the meaning people ascribe to objects changes and evolves depending on their interpretations of their interactions, a person's behaviour and actions cannot necessarily be predicted (Blumer 1969).

In the context of homelessness, symbolic interactionism has previously been used as a tool in research to better understand the experiences of homeless people, including how they construct meanings of place in public spaces (Addo 2018), placemaking in homeless hostels (Hoolachan 2015) and the impact of homelessness on a person and the choices they make during the process (Ravenhill 2003). Symbolic Interactionism according to Ravenhill (2003) is central to researching homelessness and homeless culture as it helps to understand the homeless process, experiences, and how those experiencing the

phenomenon perceive themselves compared to other homeless people and those who are securely housed.

Definitions of Homelessness and Inherent Issues with Statistics

Homelessness is a complex phenomenon renowned as being difficult to measure accurately (Kisley 2008). Therefore, perhaps unsurprisingly, several studies report that official statistics likely significantly under-estimate the extent of the problem (Crisis 2012; Homeless Link 2014; Centrepont 2010). The most likely explanation for the lack of reliable statistics relates to there being no universally accepted definition of homelessness, which when taken together with the ambiguousness surrounding the legal definition and the varying definitions offered by researchers, can be problematic. Primarily, this is because the way the concept of homelessness is defined has a profound impact both on how it is understood by society and how policies and services are created. The legal definition of homelessness under the Housing Act 1996 is as follows:

- 1) A person is homeless if he has no accommodation available for his occupation, in the United Kingdom or elsewhere, which he:
 - a) Is entitled to occupy by virtue of an interest in it or by virtue of an order of a court,
 - b) Has an express or implied licence to occupy, or
 - c) Occupies as a residence by virtue of any enactment or rule of law giving him the right to remain in occupation or restricting the right of another person to recover possession.

A person is also homeless if he has accommodation but—

- a) He cannot secure entry to it, or

- b) It consists of a moveable structure, vehicle or vessel designed or adapted for human habitation and there is no place where he is entitled or permitted both to place it and to reside in it.
- c) A person shall not be treated as having accommodation unless it is accommodation which it would be reasonable for him to continue to occupy.
- d) A person is threatened with homelessness if it is likely that he will become homeless within 28 days.

If a person were to fall under the above criteria, the local authority is still not obliged to intervene until they establish:

- 1) Whether a person is homeless (or is threatened to be in 28 days)
- 2) Whether they are eligible for support
- 3) Whether they are priority need
- 4) Whether they are intentionally homeless
- 5) Whether they have a local connection

(Rose and Davies 2014)

Under the criteria above, only those deemed to be unintentionally homeless, as explained below, would be entitled to receive assistance from the local authority; however, the local authority can offer to house a person or household who is intentionally homeless for 28 days in temporary accommodation. Essentially, when a person meets the above criteria, they are deemed entitled to assistance from the local authority, although many of the above terms provide slight expansion and explanation and as a result, are also complex and ambiguous. The criteria for who is considered to be a priority need is outlined in the Housing (Homelessness Act) of 1977 (amended in 1996). According to the Act, the local authority has the discretion of deciding who needs assistance to find suitable accommodation and who would be able to find suitable

accommodation without the local authority intervening. Those who are considered priority need are listed below:

- (1) families with dependent children
- (2) pregnant women
- (3) those made homeless because of an emergency
- (4) young adults leaving care settings
- (5) young people under the age of 18.

(Rose and Davies 2014)

A person can also gain assistance from the local authority if they are considered to be a vulnerable person (Rose and Davies 2014). However, the definition of vulnerability is even more ambiguous and again is generally left to the local authority to determine. Typically, a 'vulnerable person' includes those persons with mental health issues, an older person and one who is a victim of domestic abuse (Rose and Davies 2014).

Academic researchers in the past have extensively critiqued the legal definition of homelessness and its implications for practice and research. Neale (1997) argued that the homelessness definition in the eyes of the law is vague and ambiguous, failing to include important groups of people who do not have a home. A study by Kenway and Palmer (2003) highlighted that the legal definition is somewhat basic as the actual definition of a person experiencing homelessness is more complex. As a result, several authors have offered their definition of homelessness, for example, Smith (2005) attempted to widen the then narrow criteria, by defining homelessness as "being without accommodation or being at risk of losing secure accommodation" (Smith 2005 pg 22), whereas Van der Ploeg (1997), presented their definition of youth homelessness as a young person who has been cast out, abandoned, or rejected by their family and who has no fixed address.

Hidden Homeless Population

Aside from the issues surrounding the definition of homelessness, a further complexity concerning quantifying homelessness is the rising number of 'hidden homeless' across the UK. This can particularly be an issue for the young homeless population, as they are believed to be more likely to be able to find friends to stay with and who allow them to 'sofa surf' (Quilgars 2010; Centrepont 2010; Buchanan et al., 2010). Hidden homelessness is often defined as the broader version of homelessness, including those who live in temporary housing such as supported accommodation and those who are street homeless (Quilgars 2010). Although the Rough Sleep Count takes place annually in an attempt to quantify those who are street homeless, this population are difficult to accurately measure as individuals can easily slip through the net during this process (Robinson 2008). Exacerbating the issue with statistics further is the reluctance for someone people experiencing homelessness to contact their local authority or other support services, meaning their period of homelessness is never recorded (Robinson 2008). While the reasons behind why individuals do not contact their local authority or homeless services will undoubtedly vary, research suggests that many often fear the stigmatisation and marginalisation associated with the label of homelessness (Robinson 2008).

Types of Homeless Hostels

As previously noted, this study specifically focuses on the experiences and lives of homeless youth between the ages of 16-24 who are living in temporary supported accommodation, along with the staff members who support them during their journey. However, these self-contained supported accommodation hostels which are staffed 24 hours a day and offer a holistic package consisting of elements of intensive support and housing, are only one particular type of hostel that are designed to offer a solution to

those who are experiencing homelessness. Other forms of temporary accommodation can include adult hostels, follow-on accommodation, specialist hostels such as hostels for victims of domestic violence, night shelters, cold weather shelters, day centres and bed and breakfasts.

It is widely acknowledged that there is no universally accepted definition of a homeless hostel (Edgar and Meert 2005; Busch-Geertsema 2007), as each homeless hostel differs, with its own provisions, ethos, criteria, policies, and application and admissions process (Homeless UK 2014), depending on its nature and the ages and needs of the clientele. The term 'hostel' can therefore be considered ambiguous, as it covers a wide range of accommodations that function to prevent homelessness and offer basic shelter. As to be discussed in more detail in Chapter Three of this thesis, the lack of a universal type of hostel means the degree of support and variation in clientele and rules can be significant. Hostels can therefore greatly vary in size, either being large enough to simultaneously house dozens of individuals temporarily in wholly shared spaces or can be smaller and provide furnished private bedrooms and shared communal facilities (Big Issue 2022). Likewise, in terms of design, specialist hostels and those which are longer-term, may aim for a domestic design intended to create a homely atmosphere and minimise an institutional feel (Garside et al., 1990). Conversely, others, which are usually shorter-term night shelters and similar, may only offer a basic standard of accommodation as they are intended for emergency shelter only (Big Issue 2022). Thus, in contrast to longer-stay hostels which often have high rental and utility costs, the temporary night shelters are usually free to use (Shelter 2020).

Although the site where the data for this study were collected offer 24-hour staff supervision, other hostels may offer less staff cover and may be more restricted in their opening hours. For example, some may not be open for 24 hours of the day, instead, requesting residents remain away from the premises during the daytime and returning in the evenings (Shelter 2020). Although not typically a feature of emergency shelters,

longer-term hostels will offer different levels of support, ranging from 'low' to 'high', meaning the individuals who access the service must meet certain criteria. Medium and high support hostels will typically only accept those individuals with higher needs, such as those with substance abuse issues or who have higher mental health needs. The individuals who are considered to require low levels of support are unlikely to be placed in one of the higher-need hostels as the support that they require may be considerably different to the others in the environment, and being in shared spaces with individuals with higher needs may exacerbate their own issues (Shelter 2020).

The length of time an individual can remain in a hostel also varies depending on its nature and service offered. For example, supported accommodations which house marginalised individuals such as Bank Hostel, can house people experiencing homelessness for a period of up to two years. This is primarily due to the mandatory 'support' element attached to the 'tenancy' of the young people that aims to prepare residents for independent living and therefore requires more time. Elsewhere, some services such as night shelters are considered emergency schemes and may only permit their service users access overnight. Unlike supported accommodations which often have a referral process and lengthy waiting list, emergency shelters may be considered 'direct access' hostels which offer immediate and easily accessible but extremely temporary relief of homelessness (Shelter 2020). Importantly, however, as discussed in Chapter Three, despite their differences, hostels of all kinds offer physical shelter and will have some common features, such as staff supervision to at least some degree, hostel rules which must be adhered to, shared spaces and their intrinsic temporary nature.

A Brief Overview of Intentional and Unintentional Homelessness

As will be discussed in Chapter Two, the concepts of intentional and unintentional homelessness are closely aligned with the historical notions of the 'undeserving' and

‘deserving’ poor, which underpin homeless legislation and reinforce social exclusion and stereotypes of homelessness. Broadly, those who are deemed to be the ‘deserving’ poor, are those who are not considered blameworthy for their precarious situation and are thus ‘deserving’ of assistance from the government (Robinson 2013). Conversely, those who are deemed to be the ‘undeserving’ poor, are believed to be the cause of their misfortune due to their personal deficiencies, general ‘laziness,’ or questionable personal traits (Robinson 2013). Historically, those who are deemed to be ‘undeserving’ have been subject to marginalisation by the UK government and excluded from assistance and support in social policy. This led to the ‘undeserving’ poor gaining negative connotations, which extended more widely to the general public, impacting their perception and understanding of homelessness and their treatment of homeless people (Robinson 2003).

When an individual approaches a local authority for assistance with homelessness, the underlying cause of their homelessness is carefully examined prior to any support or help being offered. If it is deemed that an individual is deliberately homeless, for example, if they left their previous accommodation of their own accord or were evicted for antisocial behaviour, the local authority need not provide any assistance unless the individual falls within ‘priority need’ (Rose and Davies 2014) as described earlier in this chapter. In Wales, local authorities have discretion both over whether they apply any ‘tests’ to determine if a person is intentionally homeless and how they are applied (Shelter 2020).

In the context of homeless hostels, if a young person is evicted or chooses to leave a hostel, they are deemed to be ‘intentionally homeless,’ meaning the local authority may absolve themselves of responsibility and refuse to provide replacement housing or assistance, unless the young person falls under the priority need category outlined earlier. As a young person can be evicted from a hostel for not adhering to hostel rules and regulations or for refusing to engage with the support from staff aimed to ‘correct’

their behaviour or perceived deficiency (Durrant 2014), this practice is generally considered to be reflective of broader UK official policy and influenced by negative historical social constructions of homeless people as individuals in need of reform and with problematic behavioural tendencies (Durrant 2014).

Structure of the Remainder of the Thesis

The thesis is organised into three parts and a total of eleven chapters, the first of which is this introduction. Part One: The Study in Context, comprises three chapters and aims to begin to build the foundation of this study and examine the relevant literature and theoretical perspectives whilst simultaneously drawing attention to any gaps in current knowledge. The first chapter within Part One is Chapter Two, which provides a brief history of homelessness and some of the key issues that have emerged over the last 200 years which underpin both past and present legislative responses and policies. The chapter then moves to discuss some of the key statistics available, before exploring some of the reported effects of homelessness in other studies. Chapter Three begins to focus more on homeless hostels and how they have developed and evolved from various institutions over the last century or so. The chapter provides some general information on the role of hostels, their function, design and their rules and policies, again noting the limited literature available on these matters and highlighting some important gaps in the research.

Of primary importance in Chapter Three is the discussion surrounding Goffman's (1961) 'Total Institution' concept and later associated studies. The Total Institution Theory is used as a theoretical basis later in the study when attempting to understand the findings and is therefore central to this research. The remaining sections of the chapter examine existing studies surrounding power and control both in homeless hostels and wider institutional settings, noting how various disciplinary power techniques and strategies are often imposed on homeless people in hostels and how these mechanisms often

contradict organisational aims to empower and support the individual. The final chapter within Part One is Chapter Four, which focuses on social relationships in homeless hostels and provides an account of what we currently know about the social networks of young people experiencing homelessness, both within and outside the hostel sphere. As this thesis examines the perspectives of staff in the hostel and their experiences in the role, the chapter closes by detailing some of the research surrounding the challenges experienced by staff working in high-support settings and other institutions, including reasons behind the stresses and pressures associated with the role.

Part Two of this thesis concentrates on the research process and is separated into three chapters. The first, Chapter Five, concerns the methodology used for this study. It provides an outline of the research methods selected along with details of data collection and an explanation of the analysis process. Chapter Six follows Chapter Five and focuses on researcher reflections. The chapter begins by exploring the researcher's positionality, including its influence on data collection and the research process. This chapter also examines the difficulties experienced when accessing the research site and provides more detail relating to the pause in fieldwork, which is important for contextualising and understanding the findings presented in later chapters. Chapter Seven examines the case study hostel in more detail, providing a background of the organisation, along with a detailed description of the interior and exterior of the dwelling with accompanying pictures and floor plans to illustrate and provide a visual representation. The purpose of these descriptions is twofold; first to set the scene prior to the discussion of findings, and second, to provide a point of reference during those discussions to enable the reader to gain a better feel of the environment.

Part Three draws upon the findings of the research in the context of the available literature and is formed of four distinct chapters. As noted, Chapter Eight and Chapter Nine mainly focus on the findings of the 2015 and 2016 interviews, respectively. Briefly, the findings in Chapter Eight reject the concept of the hostel as a wholly disciplinary

institution (Stark 1994; DeWard and Moe 2010) and instead examine it as a place primarily of care, but with underlying features of control achieved through 'soft power' techniques (Nye 1990), such as the development and maintenance of strong social bonds between residents and staff formed by positive everyday encounters and interactions. The chapter explores the findings in part through Hirschi's (1969) Social Control Theory, with an emphasis on how attachments formed to staff and the hostel as an institution can shape individual experiences and influence a young person's decision whether to conform to its rules and regulations. The chapter also demonstrates that collaborative and shared power is an effective means of balancing the seemingly conflicting notions of social control with resident empowerment. Ultimately and fundamentally, the chapter points to the irrefutable association between positive social relationships and a willingness to adhere to hostel rules.

Chapter Nine examines the hostel under a new management style and consequently, from a different perspective; that of a place of control. The chapter details and captures the effects of recent financial cuts, staffing shortages and the rapid shift in approach to rule enforcement, which led to a considerably different environment and resident experience. As previously noted, Goffman's (1961) concept of a Total Institution is used as a theoretical basis to examine the findings, along with other research such as Tyler's (2006) characteristics of rule adherence and DeWard and Moe's (2010) typology of strategies employed to adapt to shelter rules. When combined, the application of these existing pieces of work helps us to better understand experiences and resident responses to the change in hostel practices and provisions.

Chapter Ten discusses the findings from the staff perspective, which enables us to gain a better understanding of how staff manage and cope with the challenges in their role and how they too can be impacted by broader factors and changes in the environment. One of the key aspects of this chapter is the concept of self-legitimacy, and how a staff member's sense of self-legitimacy can be impacted by staffing issues, burnout, limited

power, and a lack of group identity. Interestingly, the chapter shows how in the absence of a strong level of self-legitimacy, staff members are less likely to be considered a legitimate authority by residents and as such are less likely to be viewed as a competent and just authority, thus becoming embroiled in almost a self-fulfilling prophecy and exacerbating the stresses and burnout experienced in the role.

The final chapter of both Part Three and the thesis itself is Chapter Eleven, which is the Conclusion and Recommendations. The chapter draws upon the entire study and provides a summary and conclusion of the most notable findings of the research. The chapter includes a discussion on the implications of findings in terms of practice and policy and provides recommendations as starting points for much-needed future research into this complex area. Finally, the concluding chapter provides an account of the limitations of this research and explains the key contributions of this study.

Part One: The Study in Context

The aim of Part One of this study is two-fold: first to provide an overview of the current body of literature and knowledge surrounding:

- historical and modern homelessness
- the experiences of homeless youth
- homeless hostels as institutions
- the social system and cultural dynamics within the institutional environment

Second, Part One provides a context for the application of the findings presented in Part Three by examining the theoretical and conceptual basis rooted in Interactionism and

central theories of power and control. This allows us to gain a better understanding of the research data and how it relates to the broader fields of knowledge. To capture the above, Part One has been divided into three distinct chapters. The next chapter provides a summary of the vast history of homelessness and homeless policy, before moving to discuss the literature available on the pathways to homelessness and its wide-ranging effects on the lives of those experiencing it.

Chapter Three begins by providing some further background information regarding homeless hostels in general along with a more specific examination of supported accommodation projects for young people, including the origins of the homeless hostel, its philosophy, and its changing nature and role in society. As one of the focal themes underpinning this study is the expression of power and control, literature reflecting the use of power and control in institutions and the inherent tensions with the seemingly contradictory care and welfare aspect of the organisational aims are explored to provide insight into the current understanding and debates surrounding these principal issues. Chapter Three draws attention to the discussions surrounding institutions and power dynamics within, with a central focus on the pioneering work of Goffman (1961) and his theory of the 'total institution'. The closing chapter of Part One is Chapter Four, which primarily explores the existing literature surrounding social relationships and dynamics in homeless hostels. The chapter describes what is currently known about the social relationships that homeless youth possess both within and outside the hostel sphere and how those outside the hostel environment can be impacted by a young person's period living in the hostel. Finally, the final chapter of Part One discusses some of the published literature concerning the staff experiences within homeless hostels, including how they engage with the young people and attempt to manage the tensions and pressures within their role.

Chapter Two:

History of Homelessness and Homeless Policies

The association between control and homelessness including the tensions surrounding those who are 'deserving' and 'undeserving' of housing assistance, has a substantial history in society that is characterised and reflected in both historical and contemporary UK government policy. Rather than assisting and supporting homeless people, what has been coined as 'Anti-Homeless' Laws, often reinforce negative constructs of homelessness by excluding homeless people from public spaces, thus restricting their movements and social interactions (Robinson 2013) and leading to stigmatisation from wider society (Ravenhill 2003). Although homelessness and poverty had long been features of society, there was little by way of legislation to 'protect' those in need until the passing of the Old Poor Law in 1597 (amended in 1601), which granted the

responsibility of controlling those experiencing poverty and unable to fend for themselves (namely the deserving poor, those who were old, ill, or 'impotent'), to the parish. Under the care of the parish, those deemed 'deserving' were provided with food, clothing, and other necessities, funded through taxing the middle and upper classes.

As time passed, population levels steadily increased, resulting in rising levels of poverty and a need for more funding to meet these growing needs. The end of the Napoleonic Wars led to a further exponential increase in homelessness, due to high numbers of injured ex-servicemen who, unable to find work, quickly found themselves in the precarious situation of what is now known as rough sleeping (Lignon 2021). Driven by the aim of eliminating homelessness by controlling the begging and street sleeping of the ex-servicemen, both of which were seen as undesirable behaviours, the Vagrancy Act enacted in 1824, prohibited begging and rough sleeping in England and Wales (Fitzpatrick et al., 2000), meaning those who were found to be engaging in either Act were able to be arrested, charged as criminals and potentially imprisoned. The Act was also extended beyond controlling the space of those involved in active begging to include pre-emptive police powers to arrest those based on 'suspicious intent' (Lawrence 2016 p.517). As Mitchell (2003) points out, such legislation enacted to control and regulate homeless individuals in public spaces sought only to exacerbate existing social exclusion and marginalisation from society by suggesting that the actions of homeless individuals are outside the realms of societal norms.

The Vagrancy Act distinguished between various categories of 'vagrants' and included various punishments for vagrancy depending on the circumstances surrounding the offence (Crisis 2019). For those who were found begging within their parish, the punishment was one-month imprisonment. The punishment for those caught begging outside of their parish was increased to three months imprisonment (Wardhaugh 2000). This concept of a homeless person being constrained to their local area shares similar sentiments to contemporary homeless policy, where an individual typically must have

ties or a 'local connection' to an area to obtain assistance from the associated local authority, which regulates the movements of those experiencing homelessness (Shelter 2018). Finally, The Vagrancy Act stated those who were habitually 'criminal' in their begging and street homelessness should be sentenced to imprisonment of one year (Wardhaugh 2000).

Notably, whilst the Vagrancy Act of 1824 is still in force today, with an estimated 1,320 adults prosecuted under the Act as recently as 2018 (Lignon 2021), after many years of campaigns to end the criminalisation of rough sleeping alongside the rapidly increasing levels over the last decade (Crisis 2019), the House of Lords have recently (January 2022) voted to scrap the Act, meaning rough sleeping could be decriminalised in the near future, almost 200 years after its original introduction (Big Issue 2022). Despite this seemingly positive step in decriminalising homelessness and reducing the associated stigma, Crisis (2022) reported that the recent Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill contained a clause which allowed for the reinstatement of the Vagrancy Act, or a similar replacement to re-criminalise and control begging. After significant opposition and campaigning against this attempt to continue the criminalisation and control of those experiencing homelessness, the provision was removed. However, there is currently no date for the repeal of the Vagrancy Act to come into effect, suggesting a reluctance for the UK Government to end the almost 200-year-old law which aims to punish rather than help homeless people.

Later in 1834, The Poor Law Amendment Act was passed by the government to manage the shortcomings of previous legislation, reduce the costs associated with looking after the poor and combat the growing demand and need. This new Act represented a major change in government the approach to poverty and saw the removal of responsibility for the poor from the parish and reduced eligibility for support (Newman 2014). The Act also brought about greater control over the movements of the poor, with those who moved to new areas to search for work being arrested for vagrancy and returned to their

birthplace (Englander 1998). The introduction of the Act received heavy criticism for relying on the use of infamous workhouses, one of the original institutions to house the poor, which deliberately subjected its inhabitants to inhumane practices and poor working conditions, to discourage individuals from accessing assistance unless necessary (Newman 2014). The overarching purpose of the Act was argued to be to deter those able to fend for themselves from relying on the provision under this legislation and reinforced the notion that society was unsympathetic to the issue and generally deemed those who were homeless or poor to be accountable for their situation due to their 'idleness' (Newman 2014). To achieve their aims, the government set legal criteria for those that were considered 'deserving' and those considered 'undeserving' of assistance in other words, distinctions were made between the 'poor' and the 'paupers' (Englander 1998), a feature of homelessness legislation still used today. Unsurprisingly, the Act did little to 'deter' those from homelessness; however, it did result in individuals and families becoming fearful of the workhouse due to its total control of its inhabitants, regulations of space, surveillance, and rigid uniform treatment exercised to correct and punish (Newman 2014). Thus, together with the vast disparity between the social status and power of the guardians and workers (Newman 2014), the early workhouses can be thought to share similar characteristics to Goffman's later pioneering concept of a 'total institution' (Goffman 1961), as will be discussed later in this thesis.

The turn of the century was met with cries for reform to legislation from critics. Simultaneously, society was experiencing rapid social change due to World War One and the subsequent granting of more rights to women, ultimately resulting in a shift in the structure of society. As a result, The Local Government Act was passed in 1929, consolidating and delegating the responsibility for homeless people and those who were poor to the local authority, a feature of legislation that is still practised today. Despite the introduction of these Acts to tackle poverty and homelessness, they did little to impact the rising levels of homelessness across the nation. 1948 saw the introduction of the National Assistance Act, which finally repealed the Old and New Poor Laws and

provided the poor and the homeless with greater assistance by granting more power to local authorities to house certain eligible categories of those experiencing homelessness (Wardhaugh 2000), particularly those in 'urgent need', in temporary accommodation, providing they met a series of tests, including that of having a 'local connection', which further controlled and restricted the movements of those vulnerable to homelessness (Shelter 2018). However, while this Act saw some improvements in comparison to the former two Acts, it still retained some of the less favourable elements of the Poor Law (Greve 1991) and did little to eradicate the rising levels of homelessness. Consequently, the Act has been criticised by researchers as being inadequate, due to its misinterpretation by local authorities as to whom their obligations applied (Fitzpatrick et al., 2000).

The late 1950s and early 1960s began to see levels of homelessness increase (Greve 1991), with the problem being redefined as a political issue (Fitzpatrick et al., 2000) and organisations such as Shelter being established in response (Wardhaugh 2000). During this time, homelessness was very much seen as a London issue and thus, the city attracted the most attention from politicians, academics, and the media (Greve 1991). Yet, conversely, since the 1960s, homelessness in areas outside of London has seen more rapid growth in comparison (Greve 1991). During the following decades, society generally became more sympathetic towards people experiencing homelessness, with the previous stereotypical 'image' of a homeless person being a male with alcohol dependencies being less prominent due to the emergence of the profile of the 'new homeless,' mainly consisting of the more 'empathy-inducing' women and young people who were considered to be more 'deserving' of assistance (Wardhaugh 2000). This sympathy was however short-lived, as contempt towards those experiencing homelessness, including the 'new homeless' began to increase again from the late 1980s (Wardhaugh 2000).

1977 saw the introduction of the pioneering Housing (Homeless Persons) Act, the first

piece of legislation that specifically focused on homelessness. The Act provided individuals with some 'rights' to housing, yet crucially and fundamentally reinforced the notion of the 'deserving' and 'undeserving' poor (Wardhaugh 2000). This was largely due to the legislative instruction that the local authority needed only provide long-term assistance to those who met the statutory requirements and were deemed to be 'unintentionally homeless,' vulnerable or in priority need, such as young people, pregnant women and victims of domestic violence and other traumatic experiences (Fitzpatrick et al., 2000). Consequently, those who fell outside of the priority need category or outside the scope of 'unintentionally homeless' often received no assistance at all. This piece of legislation was considered the turning point for policy responses to homeless people with the shifting of responsibility to housing departments and clarification of the duties and obligations of local authorities which helped somewhat to redefine homelessness as a housing issue (Wardhaugh 2000).

The recession and the subsequent effect on high unemployment rates of the 1980s are widely acknowledged by scholars as the beginning of the rise of youth homelessness and an increase in academic attention (Hutson and Liddiard 1990), which brought about some sympathy for the 'new homeless' (Wardhaugh 2000). Statistics gathered at the time demonstrated the scope of the problem; the number of young people who entered employment directly after completing school fell from 53% in 1976 to 15% in 1986. Likewise, the apprenticeships that had once offered young people a pathway into their chosen career were scrapped (Hutson and Liddiard 1994), meaning that young people had few places to turn once they left full-time education. The introduction of Margaret Thatcher's 1981 'Right to Buy' scheme did little to help the rising homelessness crisis that was developing in Britain, instead exacerbating the shortage of affordable housing (Hutson and Liddiard 1994; Blake 2008). Under this scheme, the government allowed council tenants the 'right' to purchase their council dwellings at a considerable discount. While in principle, the scheme provided many benefits, particularly to the tenants that were now able to own their own home, in practice, the scheme resulted in a mass loss of

over a third of social housing as the number of dwellings built was not parallel to the number that was lost. Scholars argue that the effects of the 'Right to Buy' scheme are still being experienced to date, as there are still more individuals in need of social housing than there are properties available (Hutson and Stirling 2000).

The abolishment of eligibility for Income Support for 16 to 17-year-olds in 1988 led to a further surge in youth homelessness (Smith 2005; Hutson and Stirling 2000), with young people losing the safety net that they could rely on whilst the job market was in turmoil and unemployment rates were high (Fitzpatrick et al., 2000). As noted, with public sympathy towards people experiencing homelessness faltering by the late 1980s and an increase in prosecutions of those caught begging or rough sleeping, the reliance on unsuitable temporary measures to house those in need increased (Wardhaugh 2000). By the time recession hit the UK again in the 1990's the market had little chance to pick itself back up. Youths were particularly affected during this time, and unemployment reached 16%, which was twice the national average (Hutson and Liddiard 2000). While unemployment remained high, benefits were cut, and social housing was decreasing, society faced the compounding problem of rising rent costs for private properties, ultimately resulting in adult and youth homelessness increasing further as the mid-90s approached (Deacon et al., 1995).

The effects of the changing society were prominently witnessed in Wales, the decline of the once profitable mining and steel industry resulted in elevated levels of youth unemployment, and as a result, youth homelessness began to rise (Hutson and Stirling 2000). Since the 1977 Housing (Homeless) Act (amended in 1996), local authorities in Wales have had a duty to process and house homeless people, depending on whether they meet their set criteria (Milbourne et al., 2006). However, due to rising homelessness, the early 2000s saw the introduction of further homeless legislation, to tackle the problem. 2002 introduced The Homeless Act, which placed greater emphasis on preventing homelessness and established 16- to 17-year-olds in the priority need

category for homelessness. Nevertheless, subsequent studies demonstrated (Homeless Link 2013) that despite legislation the local authorities were not meeting their duty to house 16- to 17-year-olds, with over half not being referred or assessed and 17% housed in unsuitable accommodation such as Bed and Breakfasts. While the inclusion of 16- to 17-year-olds in the priority need was applauded, the government faced further criticism for suggesting that vulnerability ends at 17, resulting in 18-year-olds failing to receive adequate support as they are not deemed to be a priority (Crisis 2012).

The significant lack of interest in 18-year-old homeless youths by the local authority was noted in a study conducted by Crisis in 2012. Crisis studied the response and behaviour of the local authorities when an 18-year-old participant approached them for assistance with homelessness. Their results demonstrated that none of the local authorities attempted to provide much assistance and only provided contact details of local hostels that were either considerably unsuitable for the young person's needs or were full. These findings come as little surprise as the reluctance from the local authorities to assist those outside of the 'priority need' group has been well documented in other studies, such as that by the Mental Health Foundation (2006), which indicated that young people were still not receiving adequate support regarding benefits, as local authorities were either repeatedly providing the wrong information, or their benefit claims were delayed, leaving them in a difficult financial situation.

2003 was a crucial year for homeless funding with the establishment of the Supporting People Program, a new scheme that aimed to provide housing support to vulnerable people, including those living in temporary accommodation such as homeless hostels, through local authorities. While Supporting People encountered several obstacles in the coming years, frequent financial cuts severely impacted service delivery, ultimately by 2012, there were 2000 fewer beds in supported accommodations, despite youth homelessness increasing during this time. Supporting People is further explored later in this review. Homelessness continued to increase around the UK, with an 18% rise in

homelessness reported by Shelter in 2012. Further difficulties ensued when The Welfare Reform Act of 2012 introduced Universal Credit, a new single monthly payment that replaced former benefits. The introduction of Universal Credit also saw the government introduce benefit caps, meaning a stated limit is set on the total amount of benefits individuals and families could receive and the infamous 'Bedroom Tax,' whereby people with empty bedrooms faced a reduction in their Housing Benefit entitlement.

Homeless Charities such as Shelter (2016) argue that the 'Bedroom Tax' resulted in people becoming more vulnerable to homelessness and described it as a failing policy. A report by Fitzpatrick et al., in 2015, argued how vulnerable people in Wales were feeling the effects of the 'Bedroom Tax', households were now faced with the choice of either paying for their extra bedrooms or finding smaller accommodation, which proved problematic as not many private landlords had suitable, small properties and as already discussed, there was not enough social housing to meet demand (Fitzpatrick et al., 2015). This resulted in individuals having little choice but to pay the Bedroom Tax and suffer financially. The extent of the adverse effects of the Bedroom Tax scheme has been argued by Fitzpatrick et al. (2015), who estimated that over one-fifth of people in Wales have been directly affected. Further legislation provided more turmoil for those living in private accommodation when the 'Renting Homes (Wales) Bill' was introduced, meaning that tenants would lose their right to 'no fault evictions' during the first six months of tenancy (Robson 2015), denying individuals the opportunity to feel secure in their tenancy. However, notably, Wales has recently announced that from spring 2022, landlords are required to give their tenants a six-month notice for no fault evictions and cannot serve notice for the first six months of the tenancy (Welsh Gov 2021)

As part of an initiative to end homelessness, Welsh Government passed The Housing (Wales) Act in 2014, Wales's first Housing Act. The Act outlined the need for local authorities to take more responsibility for homeless applicants and coincided with a variety of new schemes, including 'Help to Buy,' which was established to assist

individuals and families to purchase their own property. The Welsh Government's commitment to tackling homelessness developed further when it became the first of the four nations in the UK to pilot the new Housing First scheme as a response to homelessness. The Housing First concept moves away from housing people in supported accommodation until they can secure a tenancy and instead focuses on housing a person and then offering support. The introduction of this new concept is thought to have been put in place to combat the expensive costs associated with maintaining supported accommodation (Mackie 2015). However, there have been some criticisms of the scheme in its early days; first, Mackie (2015), highlights how there is confusion among local authorities regarding their duty to homeless people, resulting in homeless people not receiving the support they are entitled. Second, there has been some suggestion that the level of homeless prevention services offered by local authorities in Wales varies widely, meaning that some catchment areas are receiving poor and inadequate support, resulting in inequality among Welsh residents.

The Supporting People Program and Financial Constraints

The Supporting People Programme introduced by the UK government in 2003 allocated the management of funding and delivery to each local authority, replacing individual schemes used in the past. Control over the Supporting People budget, therefore, fell with the local authority, who exercised their judgement on how the allocated budget was spent, based on their priorities and needs (Welsh Government 2018). The main aim of the programme was to assist vulnerable individuals in England and Wales with their housing related issues, including those at risk of homelessness (Welsh Government 2018). For many temporary supported accommodation projects, including Bank Hostel, Supporting People was the main funding agent and so was essential to service delivery. The funding allowed service users to access support for up to two years, which would typically include both a young person's time residing in supported accommodation and their time with the 'Floating Support' team, who continue to support the young person

short-term once they have transitioned to their own accommodation. Given the ages of the young people, there is scope for some flexibility, as if they are deemed to require additional support, the hostel can make a written formal request for the period to be extended. While extensions are usually accepted, the additional time is usually limited to a few months or less.

In England, the Supporting People Programme was no longer ring-fenced from 2009, which coincided with wider significant financial cuts to the budget of the local authority brought about by austerity measures and general funding constraints. The program was eventually amalgamated with The Area Based Grant in 2010 (Cymorth Cymru 2020). In Wales, the Supporting People Grant remained ring-fenced beyond 2009 until the emergence of The Housing Support Grant but experienced similar difficulties in the last two decades with funding cuts in the face of general austerity. Although The Welsh Government have previously highlighted that the Supporting People Programme assisted an estimated 60,000 individuals with their housing issues every year (Welsh Government 2015), the scheme was not without its problems. The Programme suffered over the years due to uncertainty and continued substantial financial cuts from the UK Government, resulting in significant challenges with forward strategic planning being reported by local authorities (National Assembly for Wales 2018). As a result, local authorities in Wales expressed concerns over the quality and usefulness of the Supporting People Programme, describing how its instability and unpredictability meant there was a reluctance to fund the development of new services along with difficulties retaining service staff (National Assembly for Wales 2018). Within the time period of the fieldwork for this study, namely between 2014/2015 and 2015/2016, Welsh Government cut the funding to Supporting People by 7.6% (Welsh Government 2015). Consequently, supported accommodation programmes were required to explore how to make cutbacks in the delivery of their projects and services. In 2015, £124 million was allocated to Supporting People by The Welsh Government (a drop from £134 million in 2014), to distribute among 22 local authorities, who in turn administered the budget to 200

service providers within their jurisdictions (Welsh Government 2015).

In 2017, an inquiry was conducted to explore the Welsh Government's management of the Supporting People Programme in ensuring the delivery of the service was of decent quality (National Assembly for Wales 2018). The inquiry found a lack of clarity around the objectives of the programme as well as a number of shortcomings and concerns, a 'loss of focus' and high levels of inconsistencies between the management of the Programme at regional and local levels. In addition, evidence from the inquiry noted that since 2014/15, local authorities have attempted to manage funding cuts by allocating more of their budget to floating support services, as funding the service was deemed to be more cost-effective and more closely in line with the Welsh Government's aim to promote 'early interventions' in homelessness. The result of this financial priority and focus on floating support services has reportedly led to adverse effects on fixed support services, such as homeless hostels (National Assembly for Wales 2018). As of 2019, the Supporting People Programme in Wales has merged with two other funding programmes to form the Housing Support Grant.

Supporting People had close policy links with some key pieces of Welsh legislation. In 2014, Wales passed its first Housing Act, namely the Housing (Wales) Act, which came into force as part of a new homelessness initiative aiming to combat homelessness and help improve preventive work. Under this Act, local authorities have been granted more power. They are expected to assist all applicants who are at risk of homelessness within 56 days, rather than just those considered to fulfil the 'priority need' criteria listed above (Welsh Government 2018), unless intentionally homeless. The Act brought in other new policies, including greater emphasis on ensuring that landlords provide adequate housing by instating compulsory registration and licensing schemes. In addition, although the historical 'local connection' criterion is not mandatory, the Act places responsibility on the local authorities to determine whether an individual in need of housing assistance must have a local connection to the area (Welsh Government 2018).

However, the Act has been subject to mixed evaluations. Shelter, a key homeless charity, produced a report in December 2015, outlining that while there were some households received substantial assistance under the Act, others had not received remotely adequate, or even any assistance at all (Shelter 2015).

Pathways to Homelessness

Research examining why people become homeless is often divided into two categories; people who have become homeless due to structural factors and those who have become homeless due to individual factors (Kemp et al., 2001). Structural factors include broader social, economic, and political circumstances out of a young person's control, such as housing and high rates of youth unemployment. In contrast, those considered homeless due to individual factors are said to find themselves homeless due to causes such as family breakdowns and lack of skills and education (Kemp et al., 2001). Robust literature has argued that the causes of homelessness tend to be a mixture of individual circumstances and structural factors rather than there being a single attributable cause (Quilgars, 1997). However, scholars do highlight that there is evidence that the reason for a person to become homeless is not necessarily the same as the reason that they remain in this position, due to the effects and challenges of homelessness itself (Busch-Geertsema 2007). There is a consensus that family breakdown and being asked to leave the family home is the leading cause of youth homelessness (Homeless Link 2014; Crisis 2012; Centrepont 2010; Tavecchio and Thomeer 1997; Monfort 2009; Heineman 2010; O'Grady and Gaetz 2009). This theory presents similarities to findings by Buchanan et al., (2010), who argued that the family breakdown leading to homelessness is often the result of long-term family problems, often including elements of physical and emotional abuse by the parents or stepparent. While it is generally accepted that family breakdown is the root cause of youth homelessness, research does stipulate other factors are usually intertwined, such as financial issues, substance misuse and mental health (Homeless Link 2013). Interestingly, research illustrates a possible relationship between

young people growing up with divorced parents and weak social support, thus creating a risk factor for youth homelessness (Tavecchio and Thomeer 1997). Further research details how bad childhood experiences and associated trauma are not only a factor embedded in the young homeless population but are also a significant risk factor for future adult homelessness (Homeless Link 2013).

The Homeless Population in Wales

When exploring youth homelessness there is a wide variety of UK-based literature concerning the homeless population in urban areas, with a particular preference for large cities such as London. While it is important to explore and thus understand homelessness in large cities, youth homelessness is not a phenomenon that is uniquely found in urban areas. Research on homelessness in rural areas notes that it is often hidden and consequently may go unnoticed due to its invisibility; however, it cannot be ignored that youth homelessness remains a significant problem in rural areas (Clope et al., 2002; Hutson and Liddiard 1990). Prior research generally confirms that homelessness is a prevalent issue in Wales (Milbourne et al., 2006; Kealy 1998), with some evidence indicating that homelessness in the nation is up to 70% higher than in England pro-rata to population (Fitzpatrick et al., 2015). Statistics present the extent of the problem by highlighting that between 1978 and 2005, homelessness in rural Wales increased by 309% (Milbourne et al., 2006), whilst, from the year 2000, rural homelessness in Wales surpassed that in its urban areas (Milbourne et al., 2006). Despite these concerns, data surrounding homelessness in Wales is substantially less available than in England (Fitzpatrick et al., 2013).

Milbourne et al., (2006), discussed barriers that rural homelessness can create, noting how services for homeless people in Wales are sparse, with those that are available often still situated in nearby cities. The study also found that rural areas often only have one homeless hostel project in a radius of several miles to accommodate young people,

resulting in individuals experiencing homelessness frequently finding themselves living a distance away from their school, friends, and family (Milbourne et al., 2006), essentially alienating them further. This argument was supported by findings from earlier studies of Kealy (1998) and Hutson and Liddiard (1990), who asserted that young people may find it difficult to present themselves as homeless in rural Wales due to poor access and support. A more recent study by Cloke et al., (2002) provided further support by highlighting that the various support services that do exist in rural areas, tend to be far apart and with poor public transport being a common feature associated with rural living. Together, these issues could create difficulties for homeless youth to access various services, such as the local authority offices, counselling services or even the job centre.

Defining Youth and Adolescence

Adolescence is considered a transitional period between the ages of 13 and 19 whereby a young person develops from a child to an adult and experiences a wide variety of changes, ranging from physical to psychological (Furlong and Cartmel 2007). While no longer a child at this stage, it is generally accepted that those who are experiencing adolescence are still within the parameters of needing care and guidance from their parent or caregiver. Research by Johnson et al., (2005) considers this developmental stage to be of uttermost importance and a critical period whereby young people learn how to develop and manage healthy social relationships, and it is thought that any interruption during this developmental period could have the potential to damage the individual's ability to form normal and healthy relationships in adulthood.

A youth is typically defined as an individual between the ages of 16 and 25 (Furlong and Cartmel 2007). Like adolescence, youth is no longer considered a child as such; however, they are not yet fully adult and are still in need of basic care and boundaries. Whilst youth and adolescence are linked, they are distinctly different in that youth is considered

to be a social concept, whereas adolescence is seen as a physiological process and a time when the emotions, mind, and body of an individual change (Furlong and Cartmel 2007). Youth and adolescence display similar characteristics and overlap in age ranges, although adolescence is a process that lasts significantly less time than youth (Furlong and Cartmel, 2007). Despite these distinctions, both periods are crucial to young people and can shape a person's adult life and concept of social norms and values. Wenzel et al., (2013) introduced a third developmental stage during youth, named 'emerging adulthood', which comes directly after adolescence and is an equally crucial time in an individual's life. Despite the emphasis on the importance of these periods for young people, concerns have been expressed that these crucial developmental age ranges are neglected in homeless research (Wenzel et al., 2013).

The Reported Effects of Homelessness

Young homeless people are frequently described by authors as one of the most vulnerable groups in society (Bantchevska 2008; Crisis 2012; McGrath and Pistrang 2007; Hodson 1998; Van der Ploeg 1997; Meade and Slesnick 2002; Collins 2009) and significantly more vulnerable than their adult counterparts (Crisis 2012). Notably, while it may be true that young homeless people are more vulnerable than adults, there is clear evidence in the literature that becoming homeless during youth is a key factor that may contribute to adult homelessness, as research has shown that 35% of adults first became homeless before the age of 15 and 42% became homeless before the age of 20 (Crisis 2012). Therefore, all aspects of youth homelessness must be fully understood to enable service providers to develop interventions and improve practices to support these individuals in preventing them from becoming a part of the adult homeless population. Understandably, it is well documented that homelessness is linked to a variety of complex issues (Hwang et al., 2009); however, it is important to differentiate what issues were present prior to becoming homeless and what issues appeared as an effect of homelessness.

Existing research indicates that young homeless people are more likely than the overall homeless population to experience many issues including mental health problems, substance abuse and self-harm (Crisis 2012; Llamau 2015). Although it is understood that mental health problems are widespread in the young homeless community, several theories have proposed explanations for the high rate of mental health problems. One theory offered by Riggs and Coyle (2002), is that young homeless people often feel that they do not belong in society, resulting in feelings of isolation and rejection, which ultimately culminate, and for some, lead to experiences of depression and substance abuse. A series of studies have concentrated on the mental health of young homeless people, which is understandable given the prevalence of mental health issues amongst homeless people. Seminal contributions by McGrath & Pistrang (2007) and Collins (2009) estimate that two-thirds of young homeless people experience mental health problems, compared to just one-quarter of their housed counterparts. Buchanan et al., (2010) support these findings and highlight that homelessness trebles a young person's chances of developing a mental illness. Further studies offering similar findings suggest that 50% of young homeless people suffer from a severe mental health disorder (Hughes 2010, Mental Health Foundation (2006). Although figures vary slightly between studies, it is evident that homelessness is a significant risk factor for mental health problems; however, there is evidence these fundamental issues can be overcome or improved if the individual receives sufficient support whilst homeless (Hughes et al., 2010).

There is considerable evidence in the literature that young people often have a history of abusing substances prior to becoming homeless, although existing work depicts that the level of consumption increases during homelessness (Martijn 2005; McCathy and Hagan, 1992). Statistically speaking, The Mental Health Foundation (2006) estimate that 73% of young homeless people in the UK abuse substances, similar high percentages were recorded by Blake et al., (2008), who noted that 100% of participants in their research had abused substances at some point during their homeless period. It is acknowledged

that mental health problems and substance abuse are often interplaying; therefore, there exists a considerable body of literature that addresses both issues simultaneously (Hwang 2001; McCarthy and Hagan 1992; The Mental Health Foundation 2006). Regarding gender differences in substance misuse and mental health, research by Hwang (2001) claims that homeless females are more likely to experience mental health problems in contrast to males, who were more likely to abuse substances. According to further work by the Mental Health Foundation (2006), although there is evidence that young homeless people may suffer from mental health issues in conjunction with substance abuse, a dual diagnosis can be problematic in obtaining adequate support. Services do not often cater for both issues and as a result, confusion can occur along with a merry-go-round effect whereby services may advise the young person to contact a separate service to assist with their other issues as they cannot help, only for the young person to be sent back to the first service by the second and so on, leaving a vulnerable young person without the support that they require. One possible benefit of young people residing in supported accommodation is that they may have more opportunities to access these services as the staff can be the intermediary to ensure that support is provided, something that a young person may not have the confidence to do independently.

Unemployment is perceived to be a problem among young homeless people; however, while the literature provides an abundance of statistics on this matter, namely that as many as 95% of hostel residents are unemployed (Blake 2008), there is little research that fully explores the reasons behind unemployment and the lasting social effects that it may have on homeless youth. Importantly, it should be noted that if a young person living in a hostel were to gain employment, any income that they acquired would be deducted from their Housing Benefit entitlement, leaving them in a difficult financial predicament. Similar notions were found amongst participants in research by Stone (2010), who highlighted how employed residents quickly found themselves in rental arrears with the hostel. Even with an income, they could not afford the high rental costs,

which are typically significantly higher than average rented accommodation. Furthermore, research by key homeless charities such as Crisis (2012), highlights that an estimated 17% of young homeless people are illiterate (Crisis 2012), which directly impacts their ability to gain sustainable employment or enter higher education. In a similar vein, Beasley (2005), argues that as many as two-thirds of young homeless people leave school with no qualifications, and crucially, young residents in some studies have expressed a desire to return to education but have found living in supported accommodation a distinct and complex barrier to meeting their goals (Utting 2009).

Summary

Chapter Two provided some key background information surrounding homelessness as a concept along with the historical and contemporary legislation underpinning the issue, which aims to prevent and alleviate the phenomenon as well as control and regulate those experiencing it. The tracing of the history of homelessness highlighted many of the historic negative aspects of policy and societal attitudes towards homelessness that still exist in the modern day. Rural homelessness, with an emphasis on Wales, was explored through the available literature concluding that rural homelessness is not only under-researched but can present significant barriers to homeless people. Similarly, this section identified the critical developmental periods of adolescence and youth and their linkage to the ability to form healthy social relationships, further emphasising the need to gain an in-depth understanding of the experiences of young homeless people. The causes and effects of homelessness centring on mental health issues, substance abuse and unemployment rates were discussed for background in this chapter; however, notably are not key research areas in the current study. Now that we have addressed the literature available on homelessness in a broad sense, the following section presents a narrower focus on the literature pertaining to homeless hostels as an option to house those experiencing homelessness, its design features, rules, and policies.

Chapter Three: Homeless Hostels

The rising levels of homelessness in the 1980s and 1990s as described in Chapter Two, led to an increase both in their usage and the related academic research, an area of enquiry that researchers had once neglected. This era produced several key in-depth studies that have provided an excellent platform for subsequent robust studies on the homeless hostel and the social dynamics within (Garside 1990; Stark 1994; Neale 1995; McGrath and Pistrang 2007). However, despite the heightened academic interest in homeless hostels, a closer look at the literature reveals several gaps in knowledge, particularly in comparison to the literature available on street homelessness. Having examined the history of homelessness and the policy approach to tackling the issue, this chapter aims to delve deeper into the literature which explores the hostel as an

institution and details the current understanding of some of the complexities and barriers encompassing institutional living, including power relations and socio-spatial restrictions. Exploring through the context of hostels and other institutional settings, the chapter discusses the tensions between the seemingly contradictory concepts of power and control and care and welfare and how they present themselves in the environment.

The chapter begins by providing a brief history and a discussion on the role of the homeless hostel which helps to provide some general contextual background information. Following this, the literature available on the design and use of space in the hostel and other institutions is explored along with the experiences of residents and service users within those establishments. Finally, the chapter examines how power is imposed in different institutional settings to secure and maintain order and establish control, which inevitably feeds the inequality embedded in the relationship between service users and staff members. It explores the different strategies of control employed by staff and describes how these often conflict with ideas of advancing the empowerment, autonomy and wellbeing of residents to enable them to become self-sufficient. By exploring the literature concerning power in institutional settings and how it manifests and influences aspects of institutional life, we can begin to contextualise the changing power dynamics in the case study hostel when exploring the findings in Part Three of this thesis.

A History of Hostels and Emergence of the Supported Accommodation

Homeless hostels have been an integral element of society for many years yet have changed dramatically over time due to the changing needs of homeless people and the various Acts and initiatives that have subsequently been introduced. In their basic form, hostels serve the purpose of providing society with a safety net (Golten 2015) and are thought to be one of the oldest methods of housing the homeless yet are still pervasive in the modern day. As noted within the introduction chapter of this thesis, although each

are designed to offer a short-term solution to an immediate housing problem, the term 'hostel' does not have a specific definition and therefore encompasses a wide variety of temporary housing solutions for people experiencing homelessness (Homeless UK 2014). Due to the contrasting definitions of what constitutes as a hostel, the overarching objectives and experiences can vary significantly.

For supported accommodation, the objective is to provide a holistic package of shelter alongside support for its service users to learn to live independently, before assisting them to find suitable permanent accommodation. Consequently, these types of hostels would house their inhabitants for longer than say, for example, night shelters. In conjunction with the varying functions of homeless hostels, their clientele or prospective residents also differ; they can exclusively cater for homeless adults, young people, males, females, domestic violence victims or families, and are designed to meet the needs of each group, although, they generally tend to have similar provisions and rules and policies, which if broken, will result in an eviction.

Until the late 1970s, single homeless people were widely ignored by legislation and the government, with a focus on assisting families experiencing homelessness, rather than the 'undeserving' single homeless population (May et al., 2006). During this time, the government aimed to tackle homelessness by providing large hostels to house homeless people, which could sleep hundreds at a time (Warnes et al., 2013); however, the purpose of the hostel was to deal with the immediate problem of relieving the lack of shelter and thus they characteristically offered little support for transition to independent living. These large hostels were similar in design to the workhouses prominent in Victorian times and would typically consist entirely of communal space, offering individuals no privacy or ownership. Most problematically, these hostels were basic, poorly maintained, and due to the number of individuals using the space, were often unhygienic and at times, dangerous, with little government regulation (Garside et al., 1990). The late 1970s and early 1980s marked a rise in youth homelessness (May et

al., 2006), which provided the incentive for the government to introduce the 'Hostels Initiative' in 1980, a scheme whose objective was to either fully close or modify the larger hostels and begin to establish smaller ones, which were better equipped and fit for purpose (Garside et al., 1990). These changes also introduced a shift in the hostel workforce, as organisations moved from depending on volunteers, to employing trained and paid staff members (May et al., 2006).

During the 1980s, the government introduced the concept of using bed and breakfasts to temporarily house those experiencing homelessness. The use of bed and breakfasts to house homeless people temporarily has been heavily criticised (Local Government Ombudsman 2013) as being high cost (Neale, 1995) and not adequately equipped to house a person for an extended period. In particular, Bed and Breakfasts were considered unsuitable environments for families and young people. For example, in Wales, there were reports of teenagers being approached in bed and breakfast establishments by others attempting to sell them illegal substances (Golten 2015). Conversely, the government advocated the use of bed and breakfasts for emergency housing, as they were easily accessible and provided an immediate, if not superficial solution to tackling homelessness (Neale, 1995). However, in response to the criticism of using bed and breakfasts to tackle homelessness, the government shifted their focus to expanding smaller hostels that provided support to their residents as part of its ethos (Neale 1995).

'Foyers' were first introduced in 1991 (Robinson 2008; Anderson and Quilgars 1997), adapted by the homeless charity Shelter from an idea that originated in France. Having searched Europe for answers to tackle the rising youth homeless problem facing the UK, Shelter realised that the foyers used in France were proving successful and that French levels of youth homelessness had decreased (Anderson and Quilgars 1997). The first foyers were converted from what were once YMCAs but were initially only found in England as the original plans did not include the introduction of any foyers in Wales. The

purpose of the foyer is to offer support and accommodation for young homeless people under one roof (Robinson 2008) and has been adapted over the years to respond to rising youth homelessness. While living in a foyer, a young person is relieved from homelessness by having a roof over their heads whilst simultaneously accessing support from staff to develop invaluable independent living skills to prepare for independent living.

By 2005, the government had acknowledged the benefits of the shift from larger hostels to smaller tailored hostels and recognised their role in reducing homelessness and providing support to transition to independent living. Thus, The Hostels Capital Improvement Programme, providing 90 million pounds in funding to rebuild and modernise hostels was introduced, allowing hostels to improve their dwellings and offer better support to service users (Homeless Link 2018). Further changes were brought in through The Homelessness Change and Platform for Life Funds which were introduced in 2015, and operating until 2017, to assist young homeless people to remain in education, employment or training while living in supported accommodation (Homeless Link 2018).

The Hostel Role and Function

As previously discussed, the role of the hostel can be complex and ambiguous, due to its diverse nature and varied targeted service users. Busch-Geertsema (2007), who researched the role of hostels and temporary accommodations across Europe, found that the role and purpose of the homeless hostel have changed over time, highlighting how some researchers believe that the hostel is becoming increasingly institutionalised, despite the emphasis on smaller dwellings with individual bedrooms and the option of added support. The role of the hostel has been further explored in a recent study, which highlighted how as well as functioning as environments of support, hostels have the objective of acting as an environment of security and safety (Homeless Link 2018). In terms of the hostel provision, particularly those aimed at young people, supported

accommodations are often seen to apply a 'Continuum of Care' approach (Homeless Link 2018), whereby residents move through various supportive accommodations developing and honing necessary skills before eventually transitioning to independent living.

It is recognised in the literature that there are no unified methods of evaluating the outcomes of homeless hostels (Homeless Link 2018), but there is a considerable body of literature that seeks to evaluate the role of the hostel. First, several authors have recognised that the use of a homeless hostel has some key benefits. For instance, Busch-Geertsema (2007), noted that hostels provide an opportunity for insecurely housed individuals to be a part of a community, which could act as a protective factor to combat loneliness and isolation. Subsequent studies by Buchanan et al., (2010), support these findings and report that young hostel residents value the emotional and practical support that they receive from staff members together with the structural support that they received by way of shelter and warmth. Comparable results were reported in a study by Homeless Link (2013), which argued that there is evidence that living in supported accommodation reduces the risk of young homeless people developing mental health problems, committing crimes, and abusing substances. A key study by Peled et al., (2005), captured the evaluations from young hostel residents two months after they had left supported accommodation. The results of these findings were overwhelmingly positive, 75% of respondents described their time in the hostel as a happy period, 16% described themselves as moderately happy during their stay and only 9% had been unhappy with the experience. However, while these findings indicate that the young people viewed their time in the hostel as beneficial, a little over 30% of previous residents were unable to be traced to participate in the study as hostel staff had no follow-on information, which should be understood in the wider context of the findings. A recent in-depth analysis of homeless hostels by Homeless Link (2018), offered further advantages through their evaluations by stating that homeless hostels achieved positive outcomes for their residents and played an integral role in supporting service users to live independently.

In contrast to the literature outlining the strengths of homeless hostels, several pieces of research have provided evidence of the shortcomings of hostel life. Saunders (1986) argues that whilst hostels are suitable as short-term provisions for homeless individuals, there is evidence that residents exit the hostel system with more problems than when they entered. More recent studies have claimed that living in a homeless hostel may act as a barrier to finding permanent accommodation with private landlords, as hostels are often portrayed as having a negative image (Busch-Geertsema 2007), and with landlords already reluctant to rent to young people, young homeless people could find private accommodation even more challenging to obtain (Crisis 2012). With these effects in mind, it is unsurprising that some recent authors have labelled hostel accommodation 'damaging' and suggested that they are associated with a variety of complex issues that can impact the service user both short and long-term (Rose and Davies 2014), affecting them physically, emotionally and socially.

Institutional Design and Use of Space

The design and use of space in institutional settings that house young people is a further area that is often overlooked by researchers (Docherty et al., 2006). However, it is widely recognised that individuals behave differently depending on the environment they are in at the time (Docherty et al., 2006), for example, a young person's behaviour or norms may differ in school in comparison to how they conduct themselves at home. Similarly, there is clear evidence that the design of an environment can not only affect a person's social relationships but can shape and influence their overall behaviour (Docherty et al., 2006). As noted, the domesticated homeless hostel that we see today is a relatively new concept. In the past, homeless people were housed in large institutions which aimed to merely accommodate a person, rather than support them to transition to independent living (Garside et al., 1990). In 1974, funding became available to build more domestic hostels that were smaller and more contemporary, to create a more family-like

environment. These domestic hostels were characterised as having more private space, with twelve bedrooms or fewer, moving away from the institutional feel of large hostels (Garside et al., 1990).

General institutional design has received some scholarly attention, one key piece of research by Docherty et al., (2006) highlights the implications of design in a residential home for children. The research argued that typically, the design of residential homes is based on cost, health, safety, durability and reliability with comfort and aesthetics being secondary in comparison. Accordingly, these fit-for-purpose designs can often lead to an institutional appearance and feel (Docherty et al., 2006). Similar findings were reported in research by Garside et al., (1990), who articulated that common features of hostels such as notice boards and fire alarms, can significantly compound the institutional feel and should thus be avoided or hidden where possible. In terms of the degree to which institutional aesthetics impact residents, Docherty et al., (2006) emphasised that institutional, poor, and cold surroundings created the impression of a lack of care and respect towards residents from staff members, which sometimes generated conflict and resentment.

Avoiding an institutional feel in homeless hostels can be difficult due to its nature and relatively high turnover of residents, which often means the soft furnishings and homely features tend to become worn quickly, taking away the 'domestic' feel that is strived for (Garside et al., 1990). There is evidence in the available literature that young people are more likely to be respectful of their environment if the hostel provided a high standard of accommodation (Saunders 1986). For example, if the hostel remained clean and tidy, the young people were less likely to cause damage and graffiti (Saunders 1986).

Moreover, there is at least some evidence that having cosmetically appealing communal areas mean that young people are more likely to invite guests, including family members over to visit (Saunders 1986), which would allow the residents to maintain social relationships with those outside of their experience of homelessness.

A seminal contribution surrounding the use of space in the hostel has been offered by Garside et al., (1990), through their in-depth analysis of the homeless hostel and its function. Emphasis was placed on the importance for residents to have private areas in the hostel, as otherwise they could face losing control over their lives and identity, thus contributing towards any feelings of institutionalisation. In a similar vein, Rutledge (2015) noted how having private spaces for residents is essential for identity formation and establishing a sense of home, where a person can take ownership and personalise their space to reflect their unique personality and taste. Berens (2015), who conducted a review of research concerning the built environment and facilities for those who are recovering from trauma, noted that having an element of privacy, particularly gender privacy was crucial for promoting feelings of safety and self-preservation and for providing an individual with an element of personal control over their surroundings. In terms of spatial control, Green (2018), who studied the spatial autonomy of children, noted that despite being constrained by adults, children used covert methods to establish a sense of control over their environment and achieve autonomy by taking ownership of micro spaces free from adult authority and gaze. Other work offers some similar findings such as that by Green and Turner (2017) who found that young children relate spatial autonomy to the level of their bond with the respective environment.

Within the hostel context, it can be considered that providing residents with a private bedroom to exercise spatial autonomy and enable placemaking practices is crucial for positive wellbeing and creating a sense of home. While most contemporary supported accommodations for young people now provide private bedrooms for individuals, Katuna and Glasberg (2014) note that this space is not wholly private, as hostel practices mean staff members have access to all areas in the hostel at any time and can access resident bedrooms without advanced notice and the resident present. The authority staff members have infringed on the private space of residents overlooking their right to privacy and emphasises the imbalance and disparity in the concentration of power

between residents and staff. Although staff in theory require a justifiable reason to enter resident bedrooms, in reality, they have the power and freedom to carry out unannounced searches for paraphernalia which deviate from the hostel rules and undertake routine searching or 'checks' of the private bedrooms each week to ensure rooms are clean and no obvious signs of rule deviations are present, creating further violations to the privacy of residents and creating a feeling of distrust.

Aside from staff, the research identifies other residents also pose a significant risk of the violation of privacy (Stone 2010). For example, Stone (2010), found that during the night residents knock or 'bang' on the private doors of others, in an attempt to coerce that person into taking part in drink and drug 'parties' (Stone 2010). Further research exploring the use of private space in hostels by Busch-Geertsema (2007), notes that due to visiting policies depicting that visitors are only permitted in communal areas and are prohibited from private bedrooms, many residents refrain from inviting guests as they are forced to socialise in the presence of other residents in the communal areas.

Conflict among residents in communal areas has been reported by academics, for example, Busch-Geertsema (2007) notes that shared communal space increases the risk of conflict among residents. Consistent with these findings, Neale (1995), stated that to avoid an awkward atmosphere and tension, some residents would avoid using the communal kitchen, opting to remain hungry. Similarly, Garside et al., (1990), argued that 60% of their participants reported some form of conflict in the kitchen area, while Golten (2015) concluded that the conflict that occurs in shared spaces over something small such as time spent using leisure facilities or cleaning rotas could escalate very quickly, resulting in residents living in fear when using communal spaces, and they noted that this could lead to violence and threatening behaviour.

Exploration of staff space is relatively neglected in the literature and consequently, we are not well-informed on its influence on the wider environment; however, key research

by Garside et al., (1990) described how the inclusion of staff space in supported accommodation is typically regarded as intrusive and counteracts the fundamental aims of creating a 'domestic' homely space. It was found that staff space, primarily comprised of offices, tends to reflect and emphasise that staff have a higher social standing within the institution. Conversely, it was also noted that staff areas should be somewhat separated from the residential space to maintain an aspect of authority, although the areas should not be so enclosed that residents feel disconnected from the staff (Garside et al., 1990). In the following three decades since Garside's contribution, few studies have attempted to examine the composition of hostel office space and its architectural structure in further detail, with some notable exceptions from broader qualitative research drawing the consensus that the office can reinforce the social hierarchy and subsequent inequality between residents and staff. Recent research by Glenn and Goodman (2015) on shelters for victims of domestic violence substantiates these findings, as participants reported feeling physically isolated from staff members due to offices being physically closed off. This closing of physical space resulted in the participants feeling disrespected by staff and believing that they considered them to be of lower social standing. Unsurprisingly, these feelings of inequality resulted in the residents not approaching staff for assistance, as they believed that they were made to feel that such communication was not wanted. These sentiments offer support to prior research by Stone (2010), who, while evaluating homeless hostels, argued that the physical positioning of staff space played a crucial role in the group dynamics of the residents.

Home and Place-Making in the Hostel Environment

From a conceptual perspective, much like homelessness itself, the meaning of home is often said to be complex, multidimensional, and ambiguous (Somerville 1992), leading to practical and theoretical difficulties involving quantifiability and definitions (Fox 2002). Consequently, the concept of 'home' to homeless individuals has in recent

decades received an abundance of interest from researchers attempting to examine how individuals create a sense of 'home,' given their status as 'homeless person' by its very nature suggests an absence of home (Somerville 1992; Hoolachan 2015; Moore 2007). Despite this interest, primarily due to its subjective nature, there are high levels of uncertainty and discrepancies pertaining to what the ideological term 'home' truly means both in the wider sense (Fox 2002) and to marginalised groups such as a homeless person, which raises its own dilemma in coining a definition due to homeless people being a heterogeneous and thus a diverse population with varied desires, values, and expectations. Of central importance, however, is the consensus that having a 'home' is paramount to emotional and physical wellbeing (Moore 2007) and that the notion represents more than the physical fixed dwelling or the simple place to lay one's head (Mallet 2004), as it is a source of self-identity and family connection (Fox 2002). Furthermore, researchers routinely assert that establishing a sense of home is of particular importance to young homeless people (Hoolachan 2015), many of whom have never experienced a true sense of home or belonging (Durrant 2014) and subsequently lack security and the crucial family support of their housed peers as they transition to adulthood. However, there is some evidence that homeless people can establish a sense of home and associated spatial attachment in other ways in the absence of a permanent physical structure. For example, according to Hoolachan (2015), homeless youth in hostels undertake practices of placemaking which involve both those within the parameters of hostel rules such as personalising space and those outside, such as minor acts of rule-breaking and forms of resistance. Similarly, Durrant (2014) concludes that homeless people can create a sense of home in homeless hostels by emerging themselves in a family-like environment and having therapeutic encounters with staff and other residents.

Social Activities in Institutions

A key aspect of institutional life is the incorporation of social activities into its

inhabitants' lives, which have been shown to help maintain a sense of self and were found to be an essential component of a good quality of life (Murphy et al., 2007). According to Murphy et al., (2007), who conducted research in a residential home for elderly individuals, it was paramount for residents that social activities selected took account of their individualities and particular interests. Similar notions can be found across other settings, such as prisons Brosens et al., (2014), where it was noted that prisoners engaged in social activities to reap the emotional support benefits associated with group activities and pointed to improving social networks, which in turn boosted their quality of life whilst in the penal system, as a fundamental motivator for consenting to participation. In the Homeless sector, Iveson and Cornish (2016) offer further support to the benefits associated with social activities, noting that recreational and group activities help overcome the barriers of homelessness by re-establishing a sense of self and social reconnection to society through encouraging interpersonal interactions, support networks and life skill development. Further support can be found in a later study by Homeless Link (2018) which asserted that activities could help avoid social isolation, which can be a detrimental effect of homelessness, by bringing individuals together to help establish relationships.

Understanding Institutional Rules, Policies, and Social Control

As will be discussed within the findings of this thesis, studies of power and control in institutional settings have generally reported similar conclusions; that there exists an inherent power imbalance between staff and service users (or prisoners) and the degree of such imbalance can influence how individuals respond and adapt to exertions of power (Crewe 2011). Before proceeding with this section which examines the available literature in terms of power and control, it is first important to provide some definitions for context. 'Social control' has been defined by Johnsen et al., (2018), as being the organised way that measures are implemented to shape the behaviour of individuals. Under this definition, Johnsen et al., (2018), propose that social control can either be

formal (legal) or informal (social), direct (sanctions) or indirect (relationships).

The concept of rules and their implications in institutions have been researched extensively (Reeves 2016; DeWard and Moe 2010; Goffman 1961; Glenn and Goodman 2015). Within a hostel context, Busch-Geertsema (2007), highlighted that residents are often subject to strictly regimented governance and impermeable rules, leading to a loss of independence. It was noted that these coercive rules and regulations are over-zealous and restrictive compared to a regular rental tenancy, yet residents are expected to pay high costs to maintain their place in the hostel which are often far higher than average private rental costs (Busch-Geertsema 2007). These rules and regulations are typically listed in a tenancy-like contract that residents are made to sign before they are permitted to move into a supported accommodation project. Although specific rules will differ between hostels depending on their provision and whether it is specialised, generally rules include set curfews, locked external doors overnight, the prohibition of alcohol or illegal substances on the premises and regular room checks carried out by staff members. Additionally, given its organisational aims, young people who enter supported accommodation must agree to accept the 'support' element of their tenancy, meaning they must attend mandatory support sessions and liaise frequently with a designated key worker.

Research relating to attitudes towards the support aspect of the package is mixed. While some research does stipulate that residents value this support, others note how this intensive level of care can be problematic and somewhat invasive for some young people, particularly if they are expected, but are not willing to reveal sensitive information about their personal lives, past experiences and trauma (Busch-Geertsema 2007). To ensure that the house rules are adhered to and that residents are compliant, a key aspect of the staff role is to monitor resident behaviour and administer punishments and sanctions for deviations, which can range from removing privileges to eviction from the premises (Busch-Geertsema 2007). Crewe (2009; 2011) described how staff

members' approach to rule enforcement in institutional environments can vary significantly, with what happens in practice often differing from the expectations of the institution. Staff approach to rule enforcement is therefore often varied depending on their own norms, values and experiences, with some adopting a no-tolerance stance and others willing to be more flexible (Crewe 2009; 2011)

Research on the enforcement of rules and policies in homeless hostels illustrates that those who operate on a more controlled, repressive and strict basis are often compared to prisons by the residents within (Homeless Link 2018; Heineman 2010; Stone 2010). According to Johnsen et al., (2005), this comparison is unsurprising as the punitive rules and policies that attempt to coerce homeless people often blur the thin line between developing a comfortable and secure environment and creating an environment that resembles a prison. Prisons, where individuals are forcibly held and are deprived of their freedoms can be considered to possess the typical characteristics of a wholly enclosed 'total institution' (Goffman 1961), as described later in this chapter. To achieve order and maintain the security and safety of inmates and staff in prisons, various mechanisms of social control are used to assert power and regulation in a similar vein to how power is applied in homeless hostels. However, contrary to prisoners, young people living in homeless hostels are not imprisoned, nor have they been convicted of a crime, yet irrespective of this, they must relinquish some of their independence and submit to the authority of the hostel. For example, both institutions rely heavily on the hard power technique of formal surveillance to produce conformity. A key study by Dandeker (1990) relating to surveillance and power, defined surveillance as having some or all the following characteristics:

1. Collection and storage of information about people or objects.
2. Supervision of the activities of people or objects through issuing of instructions or the physical design of the natural built environment.
3. Application of information activities to the business of monitoring the behaviour of those under supervision and their compliance with institutions.

Surveillance is a pervasive feature of hostel life and is typically implemented through a variety of informal and formal techniques to ensure that rules are followed, and social order is maintained. It is consequently considered to be a major mechanism of social control (Foucault 1977; Dandeker 1990) and is a common, yet coercive and governmental (Crewe 2007; Foucault 1977) method of achieving compliance. Closed Circuit Television Systems (CCTV) are often implemented in hostels in an attempt to reduce the potential for rule-breaking, as residents perceive themselves to constantly be under the 'gaze' (Foucault 1977) of staff, in the sense that the CCTV is always present and residents are never aware of when they are being watched, so are manipulated to adjust and modify their behaviour to avoid being caught or seen as doing wrong (Foucault 1977). According to Crewe (2009) CCTV however, functions as more than a mechanism of formal control. Instead, he explains, the primary purpose of CCTV is to demonstrate the psychological penal power (Foucault 1977) and the "institutional dominance and impossibility of escape" (p.85), although simultaneously cautions against viewing modern-day prisons as a dystopian institution. In the context of the hostel, it has been noted that the presence of surveillance reinforces the view that homeless individuals are a 'problem' (Williams 1996) or a 'threat' (Durrant 2014) for which surveillance is necessary to curb unwanted behaviour, thus reinforcing the othering of homeless people (Durrant 2014).

Williams (1996) argues that stringent surveillance and observation are used in homeless hostels as a mechanism of controlling residents under the guise that homeless individuals are a problem presumed to need correcting and thus are a representation of the power disparity between residents and staff. According to Williams (1996), who conducted an ethnographic study across several shelters, staff members intrude and encroach on the private lives of residents and monitor their everyday behaviour by recording information concerning their movements and whereabouts in case files that are accessible to all staff, allowing for constant observation. In terms of more informal methods of surveillance, there are conflicting reports on the relationship between staff

visibility and resident rule adherence. For example, Saunders (1986) argues that residents of homeless hostels are more likely to conform to rules overnight when the hostel is not staffed, concluding that without staff present, tensions in the atmosphere were alleviated and conflict and friction between the residents diminished. On the other hand, this notion was directly refuted in a more recent study in 2018, where it was found that conflict between residents was more likely to occur when there was less informal surveillance through staff presence, such as overnight periods (Homeless Link 2018).

A recent shift towards homeless services developing a Psychologically Informed Environment (PIEs), has raised questions surrounding the use of intrusive surveillance (Keats 2012). As will be discussed in the upcoming chapter, PIEs are considered an effective framework in which to support the needs of service users, particularly those with exposure to trauma and who may display challenging behaviours as a result. Key components of developing a PIE are the notions of flexibility, adaptability and avoiding exerting control over service users with stringent rules that are designed to restrict movements. In particular, within Keats (2012) Good Practice Guide for Psychologically Informed Environments, it is highlighted that hostels should be designed without invasive surveillance methods which reinforce negative stereotypes and the oppression of homeless people and hinders the development of positive staff-resident relationships. It would therefore seem that excessive formal surveillance methods in homeless hostels are becoming outdated and perhaps damaging, as academic researchers begin to understand more about the behaviours and needs of trauma-exposed individuals.

A further method of surveillance utilised is the enforcement of curfews, which prohibit an individual from accessing or leaving the hostel after a stated time of night, at which point the exterior doors are locked until morning. Research investigating the implications of curfews in young person's hostels, such as that by Heineman (2010), emphasise how these regulations can result in a young person becoming upset and distressed, as the threat of being locked out of their 'home' can re-traumatise them as they are forced to

re-live their experience of being turned away from their family home. Likewise, there is some evidence that locking external doors overnight can make a young person feel trapped in an environment that resembles a prison rather than a safe home (Heineman 2010). Another method of surveillance reported by scholars is the practice of 'room checks,' which involves staff members routinely entering the residents' private bedrooms at set times of the week to check for any signs of wrongdoing or general uncleanliness. Participants in research studies have described these checks to be intrusive on personal space by denying privacy and autonomy (Homeless Link 2018). However, researchers are not entirely critical of the use of surveillance, as Reeves (2011, 2016) noted in her analysis of probation hostels that surveillance is considered paramount by staff as a mechanism of rehabilitation. In addition, further recent research by Glenn and Goodman (2015), focusing on the rules and their implications on residents of a domestic violence shelter, asserted how the women accepted rules and surveillance were necessary to ensure their safety.

It is established that a breakdown in rule compliance can lead to the weakening of social order (Katuna and Glasberg 2014), and because of this, several researchers have attempted to analyse adherence to rules and resistance in institutional settings (DeWard and Moe 2010; Foucault 1977; Tyler 2006; Wooldredge and Steiner 2016). Crewe (2009) asserts that compliance motivations can be traced back to a positive staff-resident relationship. DeWard and Moe (2010) note a typology of strategies individuals employ to adapt to rules in a shelter by either *submitting* to the institution without challenge, *adapting* by modifying and reframing the perspective of self within the social hierarchy of residents and finally *resisting* the authority and the institution by rejecting the rules. Reppond and Bullock (2019) who researched mothers' resistance in family homeless shelters, noted that the participants in their study also adopted resistance strategies to cope with the negativities associated with shelter life and preserve their self-image. For these women, living in the shelter meant a loss of power and control over not only their own lives, but that of their children and therefore, they would engage in resistance to

maintain parental authority, and economic independence and regain control. For example, some would covertly resist, by appearing compliant on the surface but subtly breaking hostel rules that they felt did not align with their responsibilities as a mother and which often went unnoticed by staff, meaning they were often unpunished and thus were commonly used (Reppond and Bullock 2019). In contrast, overt resistance was more of a power play, where residents would use more coercive resistance such as confrontation to challenge their position in the social hierarchy (Reppond and Bullock 2019). Similarly, Bogard (1998) who also conducted research into displays of resistance in a women's shelter noted how residents exercise their subtle strategic power by manipulating their presented identity to help enhance resources, secure fundamental personal goals, and protect themselves and their children.

Tyler (2006) wrote that all rules require four characteristics to be effective. The first, he argues, is stability, whereby the administration of rules must either be rigid or flexible and not interchangeable. Second, there must be consistency between the rules and the values of a person, third is the formality in which the rules are portrayed to an individual. Finally, there must be legitimacy, which equates to the necessity of a belief by an individual that the rules are fair and that the institution or individual governing the rules is an appropriate authority (Jackson et al., 2010). Jackson et al., (2010) and Tyler (2003, 2006) argue that if an authority is perceived to be fair and possess high levels of legitimacy, individuals will accept their authority and adjust their behaviour to conform to the rules, regardless of whether they believe in the rules themselves, meaning legitimacy is a greater influence over compliance than sanctions and punishments (Jackson et al., 2010). This is especially important in institutions such as prisons, where forced compliance through surveillance may be possible but unlikely to be maintainable and is thus an ineffective method of control and can weaken legitimacy, which in turn breeds resistance (Jackson et al., 2010).

Key research by Crewe (2009), within a prison setting argued that rule adherence could

successfully be achieved depending on how power and control are practised and applied by staff. It was discovered that if prisoners believed that the rules being administered were fair and they were being treated with respect, they were more likely to conform (Crewe 2009). However, he noted that for this conformity to prevail, a compromise must take place between rulers and those being ruled; in essence, this would mean prison officers being prepared to overlook acts of minor deviance, to prevent major deviance (Crewe 2009). Power in institutions is complex in nature, with Crewe and Liebling (2017) pointing out that there can be negative consequences both when power is distributed too harshly and when it is exerted too lightly. Notably, drawing on the work of Sparks (1996), Crewe and Liebling (2017) discussed how power manifests in a variety of ways within institutions (penal power in this instance) and there is no universally 'preferred' method of power or use of authority. Rather, individuals respond to power differently, with some preferring having flexibility and autonomy in less punitive prisons and others respecting a more strictly regimented consistent routine and rule structure, which created stability amongst prisoners. The latter prisoners preferred staff to create an environment which had clear boundaries, expectations and care and which could protect them not only from other prisoners but other aspects of prison life such as illegal substances. In contrast, 'light' approaches to rules were typically only preferred when there was a high staff presence as low levels of confident authority combined with a gentle rule system had the potential to create undesirable effects including insecurity and a chaotic and dangerous environment.

In terms of how staff implement rules, as Tyler (2006) notes, if staff are inconsistent with their administration, they run the risk of undermining their legitimacy (Katuna and Glasberg 2014). Glenn and Goodman (2015) found that staff members were inconsistent with their policing of rules, with some residents being able to 'get away', with their actions, compared to others who were disciplined more regularly for their breaches. According to Glenn and Goodman (2015), this inconsistent application and disparity between residents led to suggestions that staff members had 'favourite' residents for

whom they would 'bend' the rules, thus creating a marked inequality among residents. Similar inconsistencies have been noted by Reeves (2016), who described how too much flexibility surrounding rule enforcement led to instability and confusion among residents who were unsure how they were expected to conduct themselves.

Similar ideas have been seen in work such as that by Armaline (2005), who concluded in his study of emergency youth shelters, that the implementation of rules must be flexible to remain effective. In contrast to most of the literature, which criticises rules in hostels, it was argued that rules and discipline are required for young people, whether from parents or the institution. Without this discipline, Armaline (2005) argues, young people would not learn social boundaries and their lives would remain lacking in consistency. However, these conclusions should be considered carefully as although the relevant shelter in Armaline's study was temporary accommodation for young people, it was not a 'typical' young person's homeless hostel, in that it housed a slightly younger population between the ages of 13 and 19, therefore it would be expected that some of the participants under the age of 16 require more structure, supervision and boundaries, which may create more of an emphasis on rules. Nevertheless, as noted (Tyler 2006), there is a consensus in the literature surrounding the importance of flexibility in the approach to rules. Homeless Link (2018) asserted in their evaluation of ten hostels that residents valued flexibility within rules and hostel provisions, likening hostels that were strict and functioned as 'zero tolerance' environments, to prisons. Similarly, Hoffman and Coffey (2008), reported that homeless residents preferred a flexible approach to rules and considered this to be a mark of respect from staff members.

Despite the understanding that rules must remain flexible to achieve compliance, the idea of residents feeling infantilised by the rules and regulations of the homeless hostel is a recurring theme in the literature (Hoffman and Coffey 2008; DeWard and Moe 2010; Heineman 2010). Evidence presented that staff members in hostels take a role like a parent by enforcing rules resulting in the dynamics of the relationship between residents

and staff being one of control and unequal power (Hoffman and Coffey 2008). Research on residents' reactions to these feelings of being infantilised suggests that being made to feel this way can result in resistance, as residents feel they are losing autonomy (Heineman 2010). Stark (1994), who was fundamentally critical of the hostel as an institution, argues that rules can have profound effects on hostel residents, including feelings of lost dignity and lost empowerment. Stark further argues how residents struggle to maintain their identity during their time in the shelter, and that their role as a resident often overrides their role in the outside world, such as that of friend or lover, adding to the institutional effect reported by other researchers (Busch-Geertsema 2007). Furthermore, while it is argued that one of the objectives of rules is to prevent deviant behaviour and teach socially acceptable boundaries, research depicts that there is no clear evidence that a person who deviates from the rules in a hostel environment will behave in a deviant manner outside of the hostel (Busch-Geertsema 2007).

It has been argued that social control is sought in institutions by administering punishments to those that deviate from the rules. However, while this may be one method to achieve compliance, there is evidence that softer control methods (Nye 1990) such as strong social relationships between staff members and residents can also act as a deterrence to deviation from rules (Katuna and Glasberg 2014; Freeman 2003). Research by Crewe (2011), concerning prisons and how power operates within, found that prisons have changed considerably from what they once were, with the exponential growth in the use of 'soft power' and the formation of an effective social relationship between prisoners and staff to achieve compliance, order, and eventual self-regulation. According to Crewe (2011) 'soft power' (also see Nye 1990), which whilst still intrusive in nature, is a technique used to gain compliance through shaping resident behaviour without the need for excessive force or coercive 'hard power' methods. However, whilst this may then seem like a superior option of control, it can lead to confusion due to its ambiguous nature (Crewe 2011) and as such, can create more obstacles to maintaining order as prisoners become frustrated and perceive prison staff to be deceitful (Maitra 2019).

Freeman (2003), who researched minor and major rule violations and their recordings in institutions, stated prisoners were more likely to adhere to rules if they had a good relationship with staff, as they feared that the relationship would be affected if there was an opposition to rules. Moreover, it was found that the prison officers' attitude towards the prisoner had an impact on how they interpreted minor rule violations and whether that violation was recorded, meaning that the social relationship between prisoners and officers was bidirectional in terms of the rules. Fundamentally, if a prisoner had a good relationship with staff, they would be more likely to comply with rules, and staff would be less likely to record minor rule violations and be more willing to approach rules flexibly. Evidence was presented that staff members who did not develop any social relationships with the prisoners were more likely to enforce, sometimes over-enforcing, strict and rigid rules, as they viewed their relationships with inmates as more authoritative and impersonal. The notion of staff-prisoner relationships playing a key role in compliance is also noted by Sparks et al., (1996) who in their study relating to a comparison of control models in two prisons, contended that this relationship dynamic is a key factor in preventing deviation and violence in prisons.

An essential aspect of this research to be discussed later in the findings and discussion chapters is the relationship between the findings and Hirschi's (1969) Social Control Theory and therefore, this chapter will provide a brief overview of this theory for context and background. According to Hirschi (1969), who studied individual-level offending, Merton's Strain Theory (1938) was misleading as it overestimated crime and relied too heavily on the belief that every individual has high aspirations. Instead, Hirschi (1969) contended that the strong social bonds consisting of attachment, involvement, commitment, and belief tie an individual to society and other social institutions such as family and reduces the probability of an individual engaging in deviant or delinquent behaviour. He argued that if these attachments are weakened or they break down entirely, a person may feel less constrained to conform, which may manifest in criminal

behaviour. Primarily used to explain criminal behaviour, Social Control Theory can be applied to a range of settings and is therefore applicable to the current research, as it may provide insight and help to explain why some residents choose to conform to hostel rules and regulations, and why others choose to resist. Despite its significant prominence and influence in Criminology, Social Control Theory is not without its critics, with some academics arguing that this contemporary theory relies too heavily on the developmental and background circumstances of an individual, with little consideration given to situational factors which may influence deviation (McCathy and Hagan 1992). Similarly, Krohn and Massey (1980), who in general, support some of the major elements of social control theory, argue that there has been a minimal examination of the effectiveness of each of the four elements of social control and fails to take into account of how they relate to diverse types of criminal behaviour. Further, they posit that Hirschi's theory simply explains how a weakening of social bonds 'allows for' deviance (p.536) rather than produce it, with some evidence presented that this theory is best suited to explain less serious deviant behaviour rather than major types of crime. However, notably, some authors assert that the breath of criticism social control theory continues to experience is evidence of the continued significance of the theory and strengthens its place as a lasting influence and fundamental explanation of conformity and criminal behaviour (Costello and Laub 2020).

Hard power strategies focus on the use of coercive methods to exert control and influence behaviour which may include threats or force (Wilson 2008). Formal surveillance, threats of punishment and stringent sanctions are also considered to be hard power techniques, and whilst they may be efficient in obtaining immediate and cost-effective results, they are not believed to be the most optimum method of control long-term (Crewe 2009, 2011). In contrast, soft power techniques are "less raw" (Crewe 2011 p.465) and differ from 'harder' methods in that they rely on influence and attraction rather than force and coercion to alter the behaviour of others (Nye 1990). Attraction in this sense relates primarily to the use of social relationships to control, with

some researchers believing that this may be an effective method to not only influence behaviour but increase the probability of self-regulation (Crewe 2011). Wilson (2008), called for better definitions of hard and soft power and asserted a need for a conceptual combination of modes of power to establish a more effective means of control in an institutional context, entitled *smart power*. Smart Power, according to Wilson (2008) can be defined as the “capacity of an actor to combine elements of hard power and soft power in ways that are mutually reinforcing such that the actor’s purposes are advanced effectively and efficiently” (p.115).

The Hostel as a Total Institution

Goffman’s pioneering work on total institutions has garnered widespread attention from researchers aiming to compare the theory of a total institution to homeless hostels (Stark 1994; Marcus 2003; DeWard and Moe 2010). Total institutions are described as institutions that dissolve the barriers that normally separate our lives, such as work, sleep, and play, congregating all these aspects of life under one roof and one ‘authority.’ According to Goffman (1961), for a setting to be considered a ‘total institution’, it must have the following four characteristics:

1. All aspects of the individual’s life will be conducted under the same roof with a single authority.
2. Everyone will carry out their daily activities in the presence of a large group of other individuals who will also be carrying out the same activity.
3. The activities for the day are tightly scheduled, with one activity leading on to another, within a tight time frame, with the whole process being monitored by a person of authority.
4. Each activity is designed to fulfil the aims of the institution.

Under the above framework, Goffman noted five types of total institutions, first, those

that were in place to care for those who are incapable of caring for themselves but who present no risk to others, such as homes for older people or orphanages. Second, institutions that house those unable to care for themselves and may present a danger to themselves or society, such as residents of psychiatric institutions. Third, an institution is designed to protect society from the individuals that mean them harm, such as a prison. Fourth, institutions exist for work-like tasks such as army camps and boarding schools. The final type of institution is described as a retreat, whereby individuals choose to live separately from society, in institutions such as monasteries (Goffman 1961). While Goffman's original framework of total institutions does not include homeless hostels, he does depict in his writings that his list is not exhaustive and thus his work has been expanded in recent years to cover those living in homeless hostels or shelters (Stark 1994). Stark's (1994), key study based on the concept of emergency shelters as a total institution argued that while Goffman's work is paramount to understanding institutions, at the time his work was published, there was little homelessness, or at least, little understanding of homelessness and therefore, the shelter was not included in any of his categories of institutions. According to Stark, the homeless shelter shares several characteristics of a total institution, including using the enforcement of strict rules and regulations to control its residents, making running the establishment an easier process for management at the expense of a homeless individual's freedom.

Further research such as that by Dordick (1996), offers similar findings, suggesting that emergency shelters can produce an enclosed social world for its residents, while DeWard and Moe (2010), in their study of shelters, provide further emphasis on the relationship between total institutions and shelters. In this latter study, it was argued that total institutions are characterised by a clear divide between workers with authority, or the 'rulers' and those who reside in the institution, or in another word, those who are 'ruled.' This divide is discussed by Goffman (1961) in his writings, where he highlights the 'split' or the differences between the larger group of residents and the smaller group of staff members resulting in residents having little integration into the outside world. In

comparison, staff members, who typically work eight hours shifts, remain integrated within society, further emphasising the inequality of social standing and power between residents and staff. Further discussion on the shelter as a total institution is offered by Katuna and Glasberg (2014), who argue that homeless hostels meet the criteria outlined by Goffman (1961). According to this rationale, it is not just 'closed' institutions (prisons, mental institutions), that are considered total institutions, as Goffman also included institutions such as boarding schools and army barracks in his criteria, which are examples of environments where individuals are not held forcibly yet are still exposed to rules, regulations, and routine.

Although not under the framework of a total institution by Goffman (1961), supported accommodations share some of the characteristics of a total institution, namely the strict governing of rules and constant surveillance, and as a result the idea of the hostel functioning as a 'quasi-institution' has been put forth by several authors, and this would seem to be a fair argument (Stark 1994; Stone 2010; DeWard and Moe 2010). Like the fundamental rationale of a total institution, quasi-institutions will practice and serve as a mechanism of social control. Of course, as previously noted, as each hostel's basic nature and provision may differ, the extent to which a hostel takes the form of a quasi-institution will vary. One of the main concerns illustrated by researchers is the notion that after an extended period, a person may no longer wish to leave the hostel and may become 'shelterized' (Stark 1994). At this stage, Stark believes that the individual surrenders their efforts to gain autonomy or become economically self-sufficient due to the intense regulation and strict rules that have taken away their identity and sense of self. In other words, it is thought that the longer a person spends living under conditions like a 'total institution,' the weaker their bonds to society, their ability to live independently and the more likely they are to rely on the institution to meet their needs, ultimately affecting their chances of reintegration into society. Similar findings have been reported by Crewe (2009), a key researcher on power in prisons. He identified that maintaining bonds to society was paramount as prisoners that were less isolated from

the outside world in Category C prisons, were more likely to maintain bonds and social ties with the rest of society, resulting in less reliance on the prison system and reduced desire to build social relationships with other prisoners (Crewe 2009).

However, the application of the theory of total institutions to homeless shelters is not without criticism. Marcus (2003) investigated the effect of the shelterized theory that emerged in the early 1990s on policy and practice and challenged this idea. He argued that the underpinning studies of 'Shelterization' were flawed and over-emphasised the impact of the shelter on the behaviour of the individuals who lived there. Marcus attempted to challenge the theory that shelters were closed communities and claimed that shelter stays were too short to have any significant impact on residents, referring to them as a space that residents used for sleep purposes and little else. What is more, while it was recognised that deviant behaviour can occur in shelters, it was rejected that this deviance was the effect of shelter life, concluding that this deviance was the result of issues that already encompassed the residents before they became a shelter resident.

Although the concepts of the hostel as a total or quasi-institution and the development of 'Shelterization' have developed mainly concerning emergency shelters - environments that accommodate homeless people for a short period, there is scope to apply this theory to other settings, including medium to long-term stay hostels, and supported accommodations. In these environments, homeless people live and access mandatory 'support' from staff, with the objective being for staff to rehabilitate or 'fix' the residents (Durrant 2014; Williams 1996) before they transition to independent living. Ideologies have been put forth that argue that probation hostels (Reeves 2011, 2016), and emergency shelters (Stark 1994), fall under the framework of total institutions and can consequently be referred to as either hybrid or quasi-institutions (DeWard and Moe 2010). However, in contrast to scholars' assertions that the hostel can strip an individual of their identity, some researchers argue that these organisations can conversely help protect it. According to Durrant (2014), homeless individuals often experience

stigmatisation from society, which can lead to them being shunned or 'othered'. Durrant (2014) argues homeless hostels can guard against the effects of stereotyping and homelessness, as it is a site that embodies acceptance and support without judgement from staff motivated by empathy for residents, regardless of whether an individual is unconventional or displays stereotypical homeless bodily aesthetics. Therefore, the hostel may provide a unique space for residents to fully express their true selves without the fear of being othered or ostracised (Durrant 2014).

Summary

Chapter Three has provided an in-depth examination of the literature surrounding the homeless hostel. It has been argued that the hostel has both advantages and disadvantages, yet it is well established as becoming increasingly institutional, despite attempts to create a 'domestic' atmosphere (Busch Geertsema and Sahlin 2007). The use of space in the hostel has been explored to gain a better understanding of the effects of private and communal space on the young people who are residents there. It was found that there is a consensus that staff space, in particular the office, is of significant importance when studying the experiences of homeless people. A large section of this review was dedicated to examining the literature surrounding rules and regulations in institutional settings, interesting research on the dynamics and use of control mechanisms in other institutions such as prisons have been used to draw comparisons and gain a better understanding of the adherence to rules in institutional settings. The hostel has frequently been compared to Goffman's idea of a total institution, although this idea has received some criticism (Marcus 2003), nevertheless, it is established that the time spent living in a homeless hostel is crucial in the development of the lives of young people and as such, more research is required to address the hostel from a social perspective. The key finding of this chapter is that there is evidence to support the comparison by residents of homeless hostels and prisons, as it appears as though the strict methods that are used to control criminals are also used to control homeless

people. However, there are key notions and questions concerning the use of rules and space in supported accommodation for homeless youth that remain unexplored and neglected by researchers, with even fewer studies addressing the impact of rules and the use of space on social relationships and group dynamics in the hostel. The closing section of this review will examine the literature available on the social relationships of homeless young people, in the context of their experiences of living in a homeless hostel.

Chapter Four:

Social Relationships in Hostels

As social relationships and interactions are core themes which underpin the findings of this study, this final chapter aims to provide an overview of the current knowledge and understanding of the social relationships and dynamics within the institutional sphere.

Many authors agree that social relationships have important behavioural consequences (Ennett et al., 1999; Bantchevska 2008; Roos 2014; Gasior, 2015), and are viewed as a crucial aspect of a person's life and development (Mitchell 2012). Research by McKellar and Kendrick (2013), advocates that positive and consistent social relationships play an integral role in resistance from offending; however, a lack of social capital is linked to a host of problem behaviours (Bantchevska 2008). Data from studies on social

relationships in institutional settings emphasise the importance of stability in these relationships. Docherty et al., (2006) study investigating residential care homes found that stronger relationships lead to higher levels of success and overall happiness among residents. Similar views were presented by Roos (2014), who illustrated that strong support networks allow young people to maintain a happier and more comfortable life, with evidence that these healthy social relationships could help combat loneliness and depression, in contrast, those with poorer social relationships were found to be more likely to perceive themselves as distanced from society. Seminal contributions by McKellar and Kendrick (2013) acknowledge that social networks built into care settings are vital as they could impact the young person's ability to form healthy relationships in adulthood. Further support has been provided in other studies based in institutional settings, including recent research by Shah and Parker (2016), who support the notion of the importance of healthy social relationships within institutions. Despite this observation and general acceptance of the importance of social relationships, academics note that there is a lack of research on social relationships in institutional settings (Roos 2014; Meade and Slesnick 2002; Eyrich et al., 2003, Wenzel et al., 2012). Chapter Four aims to examine the literature available on the social relationships in homeless hostels and other similar institutional settings, exploring our understanding of social relationships and what areas require further research to eliminate gaps in knowledge.

Social Relationships and Networks of Homeless People

Contemporary research contributions surrounding the social support and social networks of the general homeless population have developed in recent years, yet authors highlight how research focusing on the social support and networks of homeless youths is still lacking (Eyrich et al., 2003; Fitzpatrick 2000; Wenzel

et al., 2012). Social relationships are often viewed as vital to human development (Mitchell 2012). However, homelessness is quite often considered to be a significant factor and a barrier to building positive relationships, and the experience of

homelessness in general is thought to alienate young people from the rest of society (Buchanan et al., 2010). Fundamentally, as young homeless people often report becoming homeless due to family breakdown, it is plausible that previous experiences of negative relationships with family and bad childhood experiences could significantly impact a young person's ability to form new positive friendships later in life (Blake et al., 2008). Studies such as those by Tavecchio and Thomeer (1997), Monfort (2009) and Heineman (2010), indicate that young people that become homeless, often experience attachment issues due to early negative relationships with their caregivers, therefore it may be challenging for a young person to build new social relationships and maintain existing ones during periods of homelessness.

The attachment framework, whilst arguably dated, can be applied when discussing the relationships between social relationships and youth homelessness. Unsurprisingly, young homeless people often develop insecure attachments with their parents or caregivers due to their unstable childhood, which heavily features elements of abuse or neglect. Studies offering an application of Bowlby's (1969) attachment theory to youth homelessness conclude that the phenomenon of youth homelessness can be a result of an insecure attachment to the primary caregiver (Tavecchio and Thomeer 1999; Heineman 2010). It may well be the case that once a young person develops an insecure attachment, simply removing them from the environment of that attachment (in this case the family home), is not sufficient to eradicate the adverse effects that the insecure attachment may have caused (Tavecchio and Thomeer 1999). Being unable to develop an attachment to a parent in early life can lead to a variety of consequences, including, but not limited to, an unhappy and unfulfilled adulthood (Heineman 2010), lack of confidence in oneself and others and the inability to form healthy, lasting social relationships (Tavecchio and Thomeer 1999). In the context of youth homelessness, it is clear to see how an insecurely attached young person may face difficulties once becoming homeless; however, there is evidence that if a young person can develop a secure attachment during adolescence and youth, this relationship can act as a

protective factor against the negative effects outlined above (Tavecchio and Thomeer 1999), suggesting that the development of social relationships and strong support network while homeless is paramount for a young person. Examples of this 'secondary' attachment have been seen in other institutional studies, including one that investigated the effects of teachers taking the role of attachment figures for students with insecure attachments, with the measurable outcomes reporting better educational achievements and overall prospects (Bath University 2014).

Whilst there are possibilities for attachments with staff members to develop and help mitigate any existing attachment issues, researchers routinely warn about the importance of maintaining professional boundaries in the client-worker relationship due to the intrinsic inequality in terms of power relations and are essential for not only empowering the service user and developing a safe and supportive relationship but ensuring there is no confusion in the nature of the relationship and a professional detachment is retained (Cooper 2012). O'Leary et al., (2013), who suggests an alternative model for professional boundaries, reinforce the importance of boundaries further, by emphasising the power imbalance in the dynamic and noting the potential for exploitation if adequate safeguarding measures are not in place to prevent boundary violations. According to O'Leary et al., (2013), consideration should be given to the uniqueness of the social worker-client relationship and professional boundaries should be reflective of that. Therefore, rather than the boundary separating the worker and client, he proposes the boundary "surrounds and connects the social work and client" (p.143). This reconceptualization, they argue is necessary as the relationship dynamic has similar characteristics to a normal friendship yet must remain separate. Therefore, by the client and worker being in the centre of the boundary, they can be flexible and negotiate to suit the individual dynamic.

There is robust literature focusing on the importance of social support and relationships to homeless people, indeed, there is evidence that just by becoming homeless, a young

person will experience weaker bonds to society as they become estranged from their family, peers, and their school, leaving them isolated (Johnson et al., 2005). It is well documented that positive social relationships are beneficial to an individual; however, in the case of relationships during homelessness, research has found that supportive relationships have the added effect of building resilience, and confidence, promoting self-worth, reducing stress, helping to construct identity and can motivate a person to become more productive (Gasior 2015; Blake et al., 2008). Likewise, research highlights the point that a lack of confidence and self-esteem are usually amplified if a strong social network is absent (Blake et al., 2008). Contemporary research has described how strong social networks could prevent social exclusion for a young person experiencing homelessness, as there is evidence that young homeless people often feel isolated from their housed peers (Farrugia 2011). A study on street homelessness by Eyrich et al., (2003) supports these findings, and Eyrich notes how the decline in the extent and stability of support networks when an individual enters homelessness can lead to the alienation and social exclusion of the young person. Notably, this study observed that there is a link between the stability of social relationships and the length of time spent homeless, with those that spent longer periods as a homeless person having weaker and more unstable social relationships. Further research by Farrugia (2011), concerning young people that were street homeless, identified that having a strong support network during homelessness is essential to survive the experience, although it should be noted that young street homeless people may be more reliant on their social networks for necessities, which staff members can provide in supported accommodation.

Numerous studies have explored the adverse effects of the absence of a social network and social support on a homeless individual both in the short and long term. While it is established that young homeless people frequently abuse substances, it is argued that this abuse may be aggravated if the isolation of the individual experience due to not receiving adequate social support or having weak social relationships (Gasior 2015; Ennett 1999; Bantchevska et al., 2008). Other studies that capture the effects of poor

social relationships have argued that having weak social relationships is a significant risk factor for higher levels of delinquency (Bantchevska et al., 2008). As explored in Part One of this review, mental health problems are pervasive among the young homeless community. However, contemporary research illustrates that positive social relationships can act as a protective factor for an individual experiencing mental health problems (Gasior 2015; Johnstone et al., 2015; Roos 2014; Hwang 2009), and can not only help a person experiencing depression but can contribute to preventing an individual from becoming depressed during periods of homelessness (Cruwys et al., 2013; Hwang 2009).

Regarding the experiences of social relationships in homeless hostels, literature becomes more challenging to find. The existing literature does, however, demonstrate that there is unambiguous evidence that young people living in homeless hostels often have poor social networks (Blake et al., 2008), yet developing or maintaining existing social relationships in hostel settings is especially important (Burrows et al., 1997). It has been argued that constructing supportive relationships with adults can assist a young person in building resilience, self-worth, and the formation of identity and can help motivate the young person to become more productive in life (Gasior 2015). Likewise, a supportive relationship with an adult can act as a protective factor for vulnerable young homeless people and can help combat depression (Gasior 2015). In contrast, it has been argued that not having a supportive relationship with an adult can lead to the young homeless person abusing substances and is also linked to poor psychosocial adjustment (Gasior 2015). In terms of the transition from homelessness to independent living, the literature suggests that for the transition to be successful, an individual will be required to have a good support network (Lemos et al., 2002).

It has been previously noted that family breakdown is one of the root causes of youth homelessness; however, there is also research that suggests that social relationships between young people and their families often improve once the young person has left home (Monfort 2009), with females finding it easier to develop these relationships

(Smith et al., 1998). However, there is evidence that when residents do not have good social relationships with their families, they are more likely to rely on their peers for companionship and support (Monfort 2009). This implies that if a young person has a weak social relationship with their family and does not have any social networks outside of the hostel, they are more likely to become reliant on the social relationships they develop inside the hostel. Research suggests that having a strong support network can help build resilience and improve the wellbeing of individuals experiencing homelessness (Tabner 2013). Existing work by Tabner (2013) also attests that those who have weaker social networks with their peers and families are more likely to require and rely on support from support services. It was noted, that supported accommodation projects can exacerbate feelings of isolation by weakening the social networks outside of the homeless sphere, thus leading to an individual becoming caught in a cycle of long-lasting homelessness (Tabner 2013). However, research by Homeless Link (2018), argues that there is some evidence that social relationships and social networks can be maintained with those outside of the hostel if there is some flexibility regarding rules, for example, if curfews were extended or visitor policies relaxed. As described in Chapter Three, according to Busch-Geertsema (2007) residents are reluctant to invite their outside social networks to the hostel as most hostels prohibit visitors from entering private bedrooms, meaning that the socialising between the resident and their visitors would have to take place in the communal area, given other residents and under the surveillance of CCTV. Despite this, it has been suggested that there are clear benefits to homeless people maintaining bonds and social relationships with outside social networks (Ennett et al., 1999). Aside from reducing the risk of 'Shelterization' (Stark 1994), it has been found that maintaining contact with social networks outside of homelessness can act as a protective factor and help to prevent an individual from abusing substances (Ennett et al., 1999) and can guard against alienation and isolation (Eyrich et al., 2003). Nevertheless, there is a consensus that young homeless people tend to have an absence of a social network with those outside of the homeless hostel sphere (Neale 1995).

In terms of the methods a young person utilises to develop social networks, key research by Oliver and Cheff (2012) notes how young homeless people are no longer limited to building social networks in face-to-face environments due to changing times and advancing technology. It is recognised that social capital is paramount, yet it is thought that when a young person cannot develop social relationships in traditional ways, other methods can be attempted, in this case, the use of social media and other internet platforms can present themselves as useful when a young homeless person is attempting to build and expand their social networks, dissolving the barriers homelessness creates in social relationships (Homeless Link 2018). Similar findings were reported in a study examining the use of social media by young homeless people, whereby it was discovered that 75% of young homeless adults use social media to stay connected with social networks (Guadango et al., 2013). Other work such as that by Rice and Barman-Adhikari (2014) notes that despite their limited social and personal resources, homeless youth utilise social media for entertainment and social communication, often writing emails to forge connections with potential employers and social media to interact with peers. In addition, it was found that young people were using the internet as a resource of information, to improve their knowledge and look for sexual and health advice (Rice and Barman-Adhikari 2014). These findings provide something to consider, as they suggest that young homeless people can build and maintain social networks with those outside of homelessness by using social media. However, as the use of social media has amplified in recent years, research investigating the use of the internet to maintain social relationships while living in supported accommodation is understandably severely lacking but is beginning to emerge, including one very recent study in May 2018, that analysed the use of social media by young people living in a youth shelter (VonHoltz et al., 2018). In this study it was found that young homeless people frequently use the internet for entertainment and resource purposes; however, the use of the internet to maintain social relationships to combat isolation was insufficiently explored.

Social Dynamics Among Residents

Debates among authors concerning the importance of social relationships between residents in hostel settings have been a long-standing feature of homelessness research (Neale 2015; Busch-Geertsema 2007; Stone 2010). Key literature provides evidence that resident social relationships are weak and unstable (Utting 2009), arguing that whilst residents will socialise with one another, they are unlikely to build strong bonds, findings that support Busch-Geertsema (2007), who claim that there is no suggestion that residents will build close relationships with one another just because they live nearby; however, findings by Neale and Stevenson (2015) argue that some residents will build social relationships with other residents. It remains an open question as to whether residents will seek emotional support from other residents as there are conflicting findings in the literature, Lemos et al., (2002) argue that residents are more likely to seek emotional support from those outside of the hostel rather than other residents, in contrast, Farrugia (2011), argues that residents will attempt to gain emotional support from other homeless people as they value being able to discuss their problems with an individual who has similar experiences. Further conflicting arguments have been put forth by Maitland (2015), who stated that the social relationships built between residents are important as they offer more stability than those with family and outside friends, even so, while it was identified that resident relationships are vital for providing emotional support, it is recognised that these relationships are transient in nature and unlikely to be long-term due to the provisions of hostel life.

A key piece of literature that provides excellent insight into the social relationships between residents in homeless hostels is that of Stone (2010), on behalf of the charity Barnardo's. This exemplary research is one of the very few to provide detailed insight into the social experiences of young homeless people living in supported accommodation. The conclusions of this research were almost entirely critical of the

hostel's way of life and structure, pointing out that social relationships between residents were not advantageous, with residents often beginning to abuse alcohol and illegal substances to impress their peers in the hostel. It was noted that those with weaker social support outside of the hostel were more likely to build strong relationships with and become dependent on their fellow residents. Worryingly, the study also found older residents would give younger residents alcohol and drugs to sexually exploit them, support for this was provided through residents' accounts, one of whom conveyed that, despite acknowledging that they had not by a legal definition been raped by another resident, they did feel pressured or coerced into sexual activity.

Several researchers highlight the negative effects of social relationships in institutional settings. Authors such as McKellar and Kendrick (2013) supported by observations made by Maitland (2015), noting that relationships in institutional settings tend to be transient in nature due to the constant influx of people. Consequently, it would be fair to state that the social relationships between hostel residents do not offer the potential for stability. In terms of substance abuse, it is argued that befriending a resident with substance abuse problems is a significant risk factor for that person developing substance abuse issues (Neale 2015). In addition, it was discovered in a study of night shelters for homeless people, that service users found great difficulty avoiding other residents with substance abuse issues due to lack of private space (Neale 2015), and these findings are like those found in Stone's (2010) study outlined in Chapter Three. According to this research, although residents did have private bedrooms, they would still struggle to maintain physical space as during the night other residents would use the opportunity of not being supervised by staff, to continuously knock on their bedroom door to coax them into taking illegal substances. The theme of young people conforming to their peers is displayed across the literature, Allen, and Land (1999), depict that young people may deviate from the norm to impress their peers and gain acceptance, and approval and strengthen their social relationship with the group. Importantly, evidence suggests that if young person has past experiences of abuse, they are more likely to turn

to peers for social support, which in turn can encourage deviant behaviour (Bao 2000). Similar findings have also been presented by other researchers, who note that young people with role models displaying deviant behaviour were more likely to be deviant themselves (Ennett et al., 1999, Neale 1995). Interestingly, research by Buenhler et al., (1966) stated that the likelihood of deviant or positive behaviour reoccurring in an individual is based on how the environment deals with that behaviour when it occurs for the first time, meaning that staff members can prevent deviant behaviour if they deal with it effectively the first time it is displayed. Buenhler et al., (1996) further point out that when a person displays delinquent behaviour, they may be rewarded by members of their peer group, and in contrast, those that conform to the rules and avoid being deviant may be punished by others in their groups. Aside from the issues of young people being, in a sense, 'led astray,' by their peers during homelessness, there is also evidence that links social relationships between residents to unsuccessful transitions to independent living (Blake et al., 2008).

Studies tend to illustrate that residents of institutions develop a social hierarchy between each other (Johnsen et al 2005). It is thought that hierarchies or 'pecking orders' are developed in environments that cater for large groups of people that live near each other, therefore it is unsurprising that they are a feature of homeless hostels. Whereas previous scholarly articles have argued that homeless people are frequently victims of social stigma and othering (Durrant 2014), a growing body of research suggests that homeless people often stigmatize each other (Martijn and Sharpe 2005; Johnsen et al., 2005). Those who have higher support needs or more complex issues such as substance or alcohol dependency or mental health problems are generally the individuals' other people in hostels stigmatize, and as a result, are usually placed at the bottom of the hierarchy and considered of lower social standing. It was found that those with lesser needs, who are considered as having greater social standing in the dynamic of the hostel, would refuse to form relationships with those of lower social standing, likewise, it was found that stereotypical homeless people, perhaps with personal hygiene

issues or poor-quality clothing, would be regarded as having lower social status than the others, findings that are parallel to those displayed in studies of social relationships among prisoners (Crewe 2009). Furthermore, it was reported that those that were not of high social standing would often become afraid of those with more status, creating a fearful environment (Johnsen et al., 2005).

While it is established that hierarchies are a feature of hostel life, the extent of this divide has been explored in a key piece of literature by Dordick (1996), who conducted an in-depth study in a male homeless shelter. It was found that when rules and regulations were absent, residents would form a hierarchy among themselves and would begin to create their own sets of rules and regulations, these powers included but were not limited to, the distribution of food and the regulation of social space. Although this is an extreme example of the formation of hierarchy, as the study took place in a dangerous homeless hostel where those that were no longer allowed in other shelters due to rule breaking were accommodated, it does provide valuable insight and improves our understanding of the relationship between resident social relationships and hierarchy, when there is an absence of clear authority and rules from staff members. As Dordick (1996) explains, when there is a lack of authority or authority that cannot be relied on, there is a gap that needs to be filled as a 'rule maker', a gap that is left open to be filled by residents.

Staff-Resident Social Relationships and Everyday Interactions

It is well documented in research across a wide range of settings that social relationships and dynamics between residents and workers are an important aspect of institutional life and are closely associated with an individual's experiences whilst living in the establishment. However, due to their nature and the intrinsic power imbalance in terms of authority and status, these social relationships can be difficult for both residents and staff members to navigate and successfully balance (McGrath and Pistrang 2007). As

discussed earlier in Chapter Three, one of the primary roles of a staff member is to ensure that rules and regulations are adhered to, and individuals conform to the expectations of the organisation (Stark 1994), a seemingly contradictory concept when compared to the general philosophy of hostels to empower a young person and promote autonomy. However, despite the inequality and ambiguity embedded in this relationship dynamic, it is generally reported that there are many positive effects once a social relationship is developed, including enhancing social support which is particularly important for homeless youth who may have limited other social resources or opportunities (McGrath and Pistrang 2007).

According to Collins and Barker (2009), during a time of need, housed young people can rely on their family members for social and practical support. In comparison, homeless young people are characterised as having weak social networks and are thus significantly less likely to have access to a key support network. The opportunities to develop and maintain healthy social relationships with adult staff members can therefore be considered vital and instrumental in the wellbeing of a young homeless person. Altena et al., (2017) explored the 'working alliance' between residents and staff members and advocated that this relationship dynamic helps build resilience, promotes self-determination, and improves the general quality of life. Likewise, according to McGrath and Pistrang (2007), strong social relationships with staff members have the potential to boost the confidence and self-esteem of a young person by providing a stable influence who can negotiate and advocate different systems on their behalf. Bland (1997) and Easton (2001), add further weight to the importance of the relationship, stating that this specific relationship can support and empower a young person. McKellar and Kendrick (2013), highlight that key workers often become a crucial feature in the support network of the service users and the degree of the relationship can be associated with the effectiveness of the support as residents are more likely to engage and trust a staff member with whom they share a bond. Within the context of other social relationships within the hostel sphere, studies have shown that the staff-resident relationship can

offer more security, stability and structure than the relationships between the residents themselves (Neale 1995). When compared to wider social networks outside of the hostel, Stevenson (2014), advocates staff-resident relationships as typically more stable than a young homeless person's social relationship with their family.

The impact of the staff-resident social relationship was further explored by Homeless Link (2018), which evaluated a mixture of ten homeless hostels in England. Residents overwhelmingly reported how they valued the emotional support that they received from non-judgemental staff members and described how this particular relationship dynamic was central to their experience of homelessness. In addition, it was found informal interactions were paramount to the development and maintenance of the relationship, rather than the structured mandatory key worker meetings. It was during informal interactions and spontaneous encounters in the relaxed communal areas, that residents were more likely to 'open-up' to staff members and disclose any worries or trauma. These opportunities played a key role in improving resident engagement, enhancing reciprocal trust and increasing motivation from the residents. The study identified that the staff-resident relationship can also positively impact those with substance abuse issues, as these residents stated that a positive relationship with staff played an integral role in their ability to look to the future when managing their substance issues (Homeless Link 2018). These findings are consistent with that already noted earlier in this thesis by Ennett et al., (1999), who observed that maintaining social relationships with those outside of homelessness can act as a protective factor against substance abuse. Further studies that support the notion of the benefits of client-worker relationships include that of Cahill et al., (2016), who examined staff-resident relationships in residential care homes for young people and discovered that developing and maintaining a strong relationship and rapport with the young people was essential when developing effective interventions. Furthermore, they found that a good relationship with care staff directly affected the young person's experiences in the care home. In a similar view McKellar and Kendrick (2013), who also conducted research in a

care setting noted how healthy social relationships with staff members could provide young people with a secure base to build healthy future relationships.

Although the personal benefits of social relationships with staff are well-documented within the established research, studies also highlight that having positive interpersonal relationships with staff can intertwine with the wider socio-spatial environment and how it is perceived and experienced by service users (Conradson 2003). Conradson (2003), who researched the social relations in a drop-in centre, described how person-centred support services which focus on the care and wellbeing of service users, can function as a space of refuge and security for those who are often marginalised from society. It was found that rather than presenting as figures of authority in a space embodying power and control (Stark 1994) staff members were largely led in their motivations to help by genuine empathy and warmth towards service users. Caring relations were rooted in positive everyday social interactions and encounters with the service users beyond what was formally and professionally expected. However, whilst the spaces of care were found to be established through support and assistance from staff, it was recognised that the caring aspect can be fragile, namely due to conflict that could quickly arise and escalate between staff and service users, causing tensions and disrupting the social harmony, however temporary. Given that the ethos of supported accommodation projects is to empower and support, operating as a place of care through positive social relations with staff may enhance wellbeing and shift the experiences of power within the environment.

Psychologically Informed Environments and Trauma-Informed Environments

Psychologically informed environments (PIEs) is an evidence-informed approach to service delivery which aims to provide staff members in institutional settings with the necessary tools, skills and training to increase their psychological understanding of their work and the needs of those they support (Turley, Payne and Webster 2013). Within a

homeless context, developing a PIE environment can aid staff in gaining a better grasp of the seemingly challenging behaviours displayed by homeless people stemming from earlier trauma, learning how to work innovatively and creatively to help create positive lasting change in the lives of those whom they support. PIEs often operate to improve the experiences of service users with complex trauma, enabling them to become autonomous, and self-efficient and develop positive social interpersonal relations by rebuilding damaged family relationships (Centrepoint 2019). A key element underpinning PIEs is therefore the concept of social relationships, with several studies across a variety of settings including prisons (Turley, Payne and Webster 2013), homeless hostels (Phipps 2016) and probation hostels (Kuester et al., 2022) each reporting that the development and maintenance of supportive relationships and connections between staff and service users/prisoners are essential for effective PIE delivery.

According to Centrepoint (2019), of particular relevance when considering homeless youth within the PIE approach is the concept of attachment theory (Bowlby 1969) and the pivotal role staff can play in creating a secure base for residents. As noted earlier in this chapter, the relationship between a resident and their key worker in homeless hostels can be critical to reversing the damaging effects of insecure attachments developed from an early age and as such, the use of Bowlby's 1969 attachment framework has been used as a basis to deliver PIE training to hostel workers and ensure that they understand how insecure and disrupted attachments can present themselves in what appear to be negative or avoidant behaviours (Centrepoint 2019).

However, managing relationships is not the only component of creating an effective PIE. Keats (2012), who developed a good practice guide for psychologically informed services for homeless people, explains that there are five key elements necessary to developing a PIE, including:

- Managing relationships
- Developing a psychological framework

- Designing the physical environment and social spaces
- Training and supporting staff
- Evaluating outcomes

Therefore, to create an effective PIE, services must consider the environment holistically and not be confined solely to managing their one-to-one interactions with residents. Instead, they should adapt the way the entire service operates, ensuring both service users and staff members are adequately supported and informed, with transparency being key (Centrepont 2019). Given this, the design of the physical environment and social spaces should be carefully considered, ensuring effectiveness in facilitating positive social relationships and establishing a safe and secure setting (Centrepont 2019; Keats 2012). Through designing a physical environment with the aims of PIE in mind and preferably with the input of service users, behaviour change can be achieved and how residents interact with staff and one another can be improved (Keats 2012). For example, not having any wholly restricted areas and having multiple rooms with different functions allows residents to control their movements, level of privacy and social activities. Next, Keats (2012) highlights that a psychological framework on which the service operates (for example, the attachment framework as above) should be selected based on the organisational aims and staff should be informed on how they should be working with the individuals that they support as well as with others in their team to create sustainable change (Keats 2012).

Staff training and support is a further essential element of creating a PIE (Keats 2012). Staff in all services should adapt how they work and communicate with their service users, ensuring they are psychologically consistent in their approach. Alongside their interactions with service users, staff should regularly evaluate their performance and approach, which will enable them to highlight areas of their work which are effective and areas which require change (Keats 2012). This continuous learning encourages the development of soft skills and critical thinking skills in staff members which in turn strengthens how they respond to the needs and behaviours of their service users. This

reflective practice also provides staff members with an opportunity to relieve the emotional burdens and stressors associated with the role which can lead to burnout, as they can reflect on their outwardly and inner experiences and gain peer support, where necessary (Keats 2012).

The final key area of a PIE is the evaluation and monitoring of outcomes. Several researchers (Keats 2012; Centrepont 2019; Phipps 2016) have reported that in order to develop an effective PIE, services need to be evaluated, lessons need to be learned and changes made, where applicable. Service providers should continuously review all components of their delivery and note any progress made, including behavioural change in the service users. These lessons can then be used as a framework as part of the continuous professional development of staff members to ensure the needs of the organisation, service users and the staff themselves are being met.

Closely linked with the concept of Psychologically Informed Environments is the notion of trauma-informed practice, a type of service delivery aimed at those exposed to trauma and who have complex emotional and psychological needs as a result. Research concerning trauma-informed care as a framework for good practice when working within the homeless sector has garnered increased interest in recent years as we begin to understand more about the early experiences of homeless people and how this can influence their behaviour and thinking (Homeless Link 2022). In their research, Hopper, Bassuk & Olivet (2010) provide recommendations for designing trauma-informed interventions for homeless street youth which centres around educating and training staff to improve their understanding of trauma and the associated effects and outcomes. Hopper, Bassuk & Olivet (2010) also highlight the importance of respecting and treating homeless youth with dignity alongside establishing an emotionally safe caregiving environment which offers stability and support.

The prevalence of high levels of trauma in homeless youth from their experiences during

childhood, the period leading up to homelessness and during homelessness itself (Gasior 2015; McGrath and Pistrang 2007; Heineman 2010), can however, be difficult for staff members to manage, with studies reporting that staff often feel poorly equipped in the skills and strategies to respond to such wide-ranging and complex needs, especially when repeated exposure to trauma culminates in serious mental health issues in the young person (Hopper, Bassuk & Olivet 2010). Hopper, Bassuk & Olivet (2010) who studied trauma-informed services for homeless street youth, noted that staff who lacked sufficient training to recognise and deal with complex trauma often misinterpret the behaviour and trauma symptoms of a young person as “hostile”, “manipulative” or unwilling to engage with the service (pg 47). Further, previous negative experiences with adults and other services can lead to additional barriers in the staff-resident relationship (Heineman 2010). Collectively, the inability or resistance of trauma-exposed homeless youth to trust adults can hinder the development of social interpersonal relationships, especially as many young homeless people have adapted to be self-reliant from an early age (Heineman 2010). As young people can only access support from the hostel service for a specified period, the development of the relationship is further challenged by time constraints, which adds further pressure on staff members.

The inherent challenges with creating trauma-informed practices are not limited to the homeless sector. Auty et al., (2022) discussed the recent recognition and embedding of the practice within prison settings, highlighting the clear association between levels of trauma and degree of marginalisation in society, a risk factor that is prevalent in both prison populations as well as those experiencing homelessness. Auty et al., (2022) emphasise the importance for staff to effectively manage trauma-exposed individuals to enhance feelings of safety and security whilst reducing the risk of inadvertently re-traumatising an individual and creating further adverse effects. However, despite an increasing amount of prisons declaring themselves as ‘trauma-informed,’ Auty et al., (2022) note that daily practices and policies such as strip searches, the control of space and the use of authority, can compound traumatic experiences.

In a similar vein, Auty et al., (2022) describe how underlying tensions between the contradictory notions of care and punishment can hinder attempts at framing prisons as trauma-informed environments. The rules and restrictions which embody these establishments and other institutional settings can therefore be considered to directly contradict the fundamental principles of trauma-informed practices, and the effectiveness of such environments may be limited as a result. Likewise, although the recent shift towards creating PIEs and trauma-informed environments is proving to be effective in their outcomes, the underlying principles which focus on choice, flexibility and person-centred delivery contrast the practices of many hostels that have stringent rules, policies and restrictions to control the behaviour and movements of their residents, alongside 'warning processes' and punishments to force compliance. In this sense, it may be considered that institutional rules, particularly those which attempt to control the use of space or impose punishments to curb unwanted behaviour, are counterintuitive and directly undermine attempts at creating a PIE or trauma-informed environment, and instead could lead to re-traumatisation of the individuals in the settings.

Challenges Embedded in the Staff-Resident Relationship

Despite the staff-resident relationship (and similar dynamics) being regarded as pivotal in institutional environments (McGrath and Pistrang 2007; Crewe 2011; Heineman 2010; Durrant 2014), the development of the relationship is not straightforward, often leading to excess stress, frustration and pressure on staff members, particularly if they are under-resourced (Johnsen et al., 2005). Consistent findings across studies identify that building and maintaining the staff-resident or staff-service user social relationship may be challenging due to a variety of issues (Gasior 2015; McGrath and Pistrang 2007; McKellar and Kendrick 2013; Heineman 2010). For example, McGrath and Pistrang (2007), highlighted how intrinsic difficulties in building a rapport are further exacerbated

when staff struggle to balance the contrasting roles of a caregiver with that of a rule enforcer and authority figure. Similar conclusions were drawn in research by Karabanow (1999), who described the struggles staff experience when the seemingly contradictory roles of a staff member and 'friend' of the young people impede the development of an effective working relationship. Expectations from higher management further increased stressors by encouraging workers to be consistently transparent about their personal lives when interacting with the young people, disclosing private information which inevitably resulted in the blurring of the lines between 'professional' and 'friend' (Karabanow 1999). Such confusion in understanding the staff role was reportedly also experienced by the residents, who described feeling conflicted and frustrated when attempting to shape their relationship with staff, who at times acted as 'agents of control' and other times as a friend and confidant (Karabanow 1999). Similar difficulties in balancing the staff role have been reported and explored in other institutional settings, such as Crewe's (2007; 2011; 2015) work studying relationships and power techniques in prisons. Much like the hostel environment, the role of the staff members in prisons is two-fold, with prison officers often being pressured to mix and engage socially with the prisoners whilst maintaining a degree of authority and control. These two contrasting responsibilities of prison officers created a layer of precarity and instability in the staff-prisoner relationship, with prisoners describing feelings of frustration and resentment towards staff members who would quickly switch their demeanour from friendly and social, to an authority figure.

Research across other institutional settings has demonstrated that social relationships between staff and residents can sometimes be problematic. Williams (1996), who researched women in adult shelters, asserted how residents had little control over the social relationship with their designated key worker and were expected to reveal their personal history and secrets to staff, which some individuals found uncomfortable. This discomfort was amplified when personal information that had been disclosed was recorded in case files and shared with other staff. However, conflicting arguments are

seen in more recent research by Homeless Link (2018), which suggests that residents were happy for their personal information to be shared between staff as this meant that they were able to discuss their problems with staff members other than their keyworker, something that they found particularly useful if their keyworker was not accessible at the time. When discussing their problems and experiences with staff, Williams (1996) highlighted how residents valued the counselling and therapeutic encounters they would experience with staff members. However, there was a reluctance to reveal too much information regarding their day-to-day activities during these sessions as they feared that revealing their substance issues or rule-breaking could impact their tenancy.

Within the context of hostels for homeless youth, McKellar and Kendrick (2013), argue that changing key workers often enhances feelings of instability for young people who may feel as though they have no sense of control over their lives or are unsure of what to expect. This lack of predictability according to Hopper, Bassuk & Olivet (2010) hinders the development of a stable caregiving environment and can exacerbate existing trauma. Consequently, a clear structure and routine in the lives of homeless youth should be strived for where possible, including clear guidelines and transparency in decision-making processes. In terms of rule-enforcement, Hopper, Bassuk & Olivet (2010) note that they should be consistent to ensure stability, but flexible and adaptable to meet the needs of the traumatised young person. To further increase the effectiveness of trauma-informed practice, Hopper, Bassuk & Olivet (2010) argue that punishments should be avoided and replaced with predictable processes based on communication and designed to shape behaviour rather than control the young person.

Whilst a vast amount of research indicates that most homeless hostel residents are at least somewhat happy with their experiences with staff members, one study by Stevenson (2014), revealed that residents often felt that they were unheard by the hostel staff and that staff members were not interested in helping them resolve their problems. Moreover, according to Jackson (2015), residents believe that hostel staff can

be over-bearing due to constant surveillance, with staff demanding to know where they were going, what they were doing and how they were feeling, something that they argued would not occur in their private tenancies. It was suggested that staff sometimes stigmatize individuals for becoming homeless and treat them poorly consequently. Residents expressed resentment due to frequently being accused of deviant behaviour, with the staff adopting a 'guilty until proven innocent' approach when dealing with rule breaking in the hostel, this sometimes led to residents abandoning the accommodation out of frustration and thus becoming 'intentionally homeless' (Stevenson 2014).

While a key objective for supported accommodation is working with residents to improve their independent living skills to prepare them for transition, the research is conflicted as to what extent staff can successfully achieve this goal, some research (Joseph Rowntree Foundation 1995), acknowledges that many young homeless people lack day-to-day living skills such as money management, cooking and paying bills, yet present evidence that staff in supported accommodation do not provide adequate support in these areas; however, this is disputed by Buchanan et al., (2010), who concluded that the teaching of living skills in homeless hostels is effective, with positive outcomes.

Staff Experiences and Working Culture

Research concerning staff experiences when working within the homeless sector is somewhat neglected in the established literature, which is surprising given the instrumental role staff members play in shaping the experiences of homeless people and the high level of support they must offer (McGrath and Pistrang 2007; Durrant 2014; Johnsen et al., 2005). However, research concerning support-based occupations and institutional settings has demonstrated that this type of role can be a stressful experience, with workers often reporting high levels of job dissatisfaction and exposure to chronic work-related stress (Bickle 2021; Pasupuleti et al., 2009; Karabanow 1999).

Studies have shown that such high levels of stress can have a significant negative impact on staff morale, life satisfaction (Pasupuleti et al., 2009), wellbeing (Ravalier 2019) and can lead to emotional harm (Bickle 2021), burnout (Karabanow 1999) and even anxiety and depression (Mutkins, Brown & Thorsteinsson 2011).

Johnsen et al., (2005), explored the complex internal dynamics within a day centre for homeless people and identified that staff can often feel intimidated and fearful when attempting to engage with individuals who have severe mental health or substance abuse issues, due to their unpredictable behaviour. Likewise, staff reported feeling fearful working in a volatile and fragile environment containing service users who are often stressed and frustrated and where physical conflict could suddenly arise and escalate (Johnsen et al., 2005). Taken together, the stressors associated with the role and managing the challenging behaviour were shown to reduce the levels of sympathy and empathy that staff had towards service users, thus negatively impacting the staff-service user social relationship (Johnsen et al., 2005). Challenges associated with working with individuals who are presenting challenging behaviours were also explored by Bickle (2021) in their study of a residential treatment facility. Bickle (2021) found that workers in these types of fields are routinely exposed to dangerous situations and conflict, which in turn can impact physical staff safety along with their internal perception of their safety.

Another important stressor considered to impact workers and lead to job strain in institutional establishments is a lack of adequate training. McGrath and Pistrang (2007), reported how many staff in homeless hostels believe that this lack of training means they are unable to manage the sensitive and emotional issues that young people experience and as such, fail to meet expectations from management. Insufficient training is a recurrent theme seen in other studies, for example, one study noted that staff members struggled, in particular, to meet the needs of those suffering from mental health issues as they did not have adequate advanced training or tools to manage such

high support needs (Homeless Link 2018). Another study highlighted how staff members are often aware of adverse issues both in the hostel environment and impacting the residents personally but were unsure how to manage the situation effectively (Stone 2010). Likewise, Olivet et al., (2010) described how staff members can experience burnout due to the multiple stress factors associated with their role and the limited professional training in place to successfully cope with such challenges. Finally, Bickle (2021) reported how staff in a youth residential home reported a distinct lack of training to meet the trauma needs of the children in their care, which directly interfered with their ability to perform their role effectively.

Research has shown that management can play a central role in shaping staff work stress (Karabanow 1999; Neale 1995; Bhui et al., 2016). For example, Karabanow (1999), described how staff often feel pressured to go 'above and beyond' their duties by management to be considered a 'good' worker. Moreover, it was found that the young people's needs were often considered more important than their own and consequently, left them feeling tired, stressed, and frustrated. The relationship between management and staff was explored further by Neale (1995), who stated staff in hostels often experience conflict with management, with participants reporting that this relationship dynamic was the most hostile and volatile out of all the social relationships in the hostel environment. Similar findings have been found across other institutional settings where staff work with individuals with high support needs and who present challenging behaviours, including research by Bickle (2021) who explored staff experiences working in a residential treatment facility for youth. Bickle (2021), found that management practices, long shifts, conflicting or ambiguous roles and a lack of support can be common causes of work stress and can result in emotional harm to staff members. In particular, Bickle (2021) found that unrealistic expectations from management for staff to complete a wide variety of tasks alongside constant supervision of the residents were stressful and harmed job satisfaction and quality of care. Similarly, Ravalier (2019), who conducted research into the work stressors experienced by social workers, reported that

high expectations and a lack of managerial support are key factors in inducing and increasing stress in staff.

The ability of staff working in support-based sectors and institutional settings to undertake their role is also hindered by being chronically under-staffed and under-resourced (Johnsen et al., 2005), matters which are typically compounded by funding constraints and can lead to additional stress. Stone (2010), argues that staffing issues are widespread, particularly within the homeless sector and act as a barrier when delivering support to residents. Similar findings were reported by Homeless Link (2018), which outlined how staff struggled under staffing pressures and consequently, were unable to offer stable support to hostel residents as they were too busy with a multitude of other tasks. Moreover, it has been argued that as well as impacting the relationships between residents and staff members, mental health affects the social relationships between residents (Stone 2010). Under-staffing, poor working conditions and pay cuts ultimately lead to staff experiencing high levels of stress and accelerated burnout, resulting in rapid staff turnover and retention challenges. The high staff turnover then compounds matters further, as remaining staff experience greater workloads, increased working hours and higher levels of stress.

Work teams are defined by Reis and Palacois (2018) as “specific kind of groups that can be described as a set of three or more people who undertake complementarily have shared work goals, maintain interdependent relationships and, mainly, identify and are identified as members of one single team” (p.6). Research emphasises the importance of individuals within a work team having a strong sense of group identity and suggests that these identities can influence behaviour, attitudes, and overall effectiveness in the role (Reid and Palacios 2018). Boudreau (2014) examined the construction of group identity in a slightly different setting of a digital workplace yet drew similar conclusions and described how an individual’s group identity within a work setting greatly influences how they interpret the working environment and work practices. Ledain (2015) note similar

findings, stating that employees who have a social identity within their work group are fundamentally more engaged with the working environment, with a degree of autonomy and control being key factors relating to an individual's sense of belonging. In a similar view, Ellemers et al., (2013) describe how respect is instrumental in a team and can establish a sense of inclusivity. What is more, they note that respect within the team has two functions, first, how the worker feels about the team, and second, their value as a member and their willingness to undertake tasks for the team (Ellemers et al., 2013).

However, despite the importance of having a strong team culture, research has shown that challenges such as limited resources, elevated rates of staff turnover and low pay, which are often associated with the homeless sector, can diminish the ability to build a team (Olivet et al., 2010). In addition, Schiff and Lane (2019) note how working with traumatised individuals such as homeless people can lead to a variety of issues for staff members, including burnout and vicarious trauma, but importantly, concluded how individuals may attempt to hide the extent of their struggles to avoid being deemed weak or incapable of fulfilling their role.

According to Hochschild (1983), whose seminal contributions helped to improve our understanding of emotional labour, the concept of emotional labour relates to workers suppressing, or to some extent, falsifying their true emotions to present themselves in a manner expected of certain professions. She discussed the concept of surface acting, wherein an individual creates a false sense of self by regulating and managing their outward emotions, expressions, and interactions to shape their outer self into a manner that is socially acceptable in the setting, regardless of the feelings of the inner self at that time. To elucidate the concept, she provided the example of a Flight Attendant, who must be seen to be happy and smiling to create a positive experience for customers, disregarding whether their inner self mirrors those feelings. To then ascertain whether their performance acceptably fits within the societal norms, Hochschild (1983) explains that an individual will look for cues that the interaction has been convincing, hoping that

their performance was effective, and the other party considered it meaningful, resulting in their true feelings remaining suppressed. She then described deep acting, a similar concept with the distinct difference being that the individual attempts to convince themselves of their emotional presentations of self, and those around them. Hochschild concludes that after some time, organisations or employers begin to control the emotional work of the employees and the situation becomes exploitative. Given the concepts underpinning this theory, some researchers have applied its premise to hostel staff (Karabanow 1999) as due to the working environment and inherent poor working conditions, they must manage and regulate their behaviour, body language and facial expressions to meet the needs of the organisation.

Research tells us that figures of authority require a certain level of self-legitimacy to effectively carry out their role (Bradford and Quinton 2014). Self-legitimacy can be defined as the belief and confidence in oneself as a just authority. However, despite being instrumental in job performance, several factors can negatively impact an individual's sense of self-legitimacy. Researchers of note include Bradford and Quinton (2014) who explored the influences of police officers' self-legitimacy and discovered a strong association between an individual's degree of self-legitimacy and whether the public support them in their role. In addition, they noted how possessing low levels may result in a change in values, behaviour, and relationship with those whom they police whilst conversely, those with higher levels of self-legitimacy were more likely to respect a person's rights and use less force on potential suspects (Bradford and Quinton 2014). Similarly, Bottoms and Tankebe (2012) note the crucial role validation from superiors can have in an individual's self-legitimacy, and Bradford and Quinton (2014) argue that self-legitimacy is tied to organisational identity. A lack of a strong sense of self-legitimacy can bring about potential negative consequences, according to Bradford and Quinton (2014), which can include a shift in a police officer's attitude, values and importantly, their behaviour in their role. Conversely, those with a stronger sense of self-legitimacy were found to behave calmer and more rationally, meaning they found it easier to make

complex decisions in stressful situations. Tankebe (2018) later expanded these findings by identifying recognition from peers, typically in the form of respect between partners as a significant influencing factor in a police officer's self-legitimacy.

A series of contemporary studies have provided insight into residents' expectations of staff members, Stone (2010), described how residents found it imperative that staff members were good listeners and dependable as this offered them the stability that they were lacking. Further studies such as that by McGrath and Pistrang (2007) and Buchanan et al., (2010) address residents' expectations from their key workers and have produced similar findings, emphasising that staff must have practical listening communication skills to be able to build good social relationships with residents. A theme that is recurrent in the literature is the notion that the most important aspect of the resident-staff relationship is mutual respect, as young people do not want to be infantilised by staff members and feel that for them to fully respect their keyworker, their keyworker must respect them and not treat them like children (McGrath and Pistrang 2007). Similarly, the key features of resident-staff relationships were discussed by McKellar and Kendrick (2013), who found that young people believed that mutual trust between themselves and the staff members was paramount in developing the social relationship and engaging with the project. However, these findings are not a new concept, as similar conclusions have been drawn in earlier studies by Neale (1995), who noted that for strong relationships to be built, there must be mutual trust between residents and staff. In terms of what the young people wish to obtain from their relationship with their keyworker, young people expressed the importance of feeling special and valued (McGrath and Pistrang 2007), an aspect that many young homeless people do not experience during their childhood. While key workers do not usually hold qualifications (Stevenson 2014), research acknowledges that residents prefer their key workers to have life experiences rather than qualifications, notably, some research has argued that residents place greater value on key workers who have previous experience of homelessness themselves, believing that they would be more relatable and

understanding of their needs (Buchanan et al., 2010).

Summary

The last chapter of Part One explored the available literature concerning the social relationships of young people living in supported accommodation. The section noted how research tells us young people experiencing homelessness often lack social networks and the social networks they do have may diminish once they become homeless. Literature relating to the different relationship dynamics within the hostel's social world was explored, including those that explore relationships between residents and those that focus on the staff-resident relationship. The chapter closed with an examination of the role of the staff members in the hostel and some of the inherent challenges that they experience within these roles.

Part Two:

Researching a Hostel for Young Homeless People

The objectives of Part Two of this study are threefold. First, Part Two describes the methods used to gather and analyse the data, along with brief explanations as to why the research methods selected were determined to be the most suitable. Second, it aims to provide an account of the positioning of the researcher in the research setting and how this stance helped shape the research. Finally, Part Two provides information about the case study hostel and introduces the participants of this study through pen portraits and basic demographics.

Part Two is divided into three chapters to meet its objectives. The first chapter begins

with a broad overview of Ethnographic qualitative research and provides a rationale for why it was selected as the most appropriate method of data collection. The chapter then turns to a more specific examination of the nature of case studies, their purpose and theoretical backing, together with a consideration as to why this method is a useful tool for fully exploring the depths and nature of hostel life. The remaining part of the chapter explores researcher positionality and ethical issues, both when undertaking this study and when studying homeless youth. Finally, Chapter Five includes a discussion on the methods used to analyse the data to ensure the findings presented are reliable and credible. The participants of the study and some of their characteristics which are mainly for informational purposes are described briefly in Chapter Seven, with a closer examination of the more pertinent characteristics provided in the following chapter, where the findings are presented.

Chapter Five:

Methodology

As noted, the purpose of this chapter is to provide an outline of the methodology used in this study to gather data for analysis to be explored in Chapters Eight, Nine and Ten. An ethnographic approach was adopted to allow for a detailed examination of the hostel environment, including the residents, staff and hostel culture. Due to the nature of the study and the need to closely examine and explore the everyday interactions and experiences of the participants, a qualitative ethnographic case-study approach was necessary to gain a holistic understanding of the dynamics within the setting and the interactions with other aspects of hostel living. This chapter focuses on the selected research methods, discussing the fundamental advantages and limitations of each

element. The chapter also provides more nuanced detail of how data were collected including a description of the interview and participant observation methods.

Ethnography in Bank Hostel

Ethnography, an anthropological inductive research method, is considered to be a detailed type of holistic research designed to study societies and cultures (McQueen and Knussen 2002). Due to the variety of research techniques that it encompasses, ethnography is widely regarded as an advantageous method to both systematically explore the behaviours and actions of individuals or groups in a social setting and place meaning on those behaviours by gaining a better understanding of how and why the participants operate in the way that they do (McQueen and Knussen 2002). In a homelessness research context, ethnography is advocated as a valuable research tool, due to its ability to capture rich and detailed data that is difficult to replicate with other methods (Hoolachan 2015). Despite the advantages associated with ethnography, it is relatively neglected in homelessness research compared to quantitative methods (Hoolachan 2015), meaning that research surrounding homelessness often focuses on statistical measures rather than attempting to understand feelings, behaviours and actions which shape, and are shaped by, the social environment. Due to ethnography typically focusing on two or more qualitative research methods, the data emerging for analysis is typically more accurate, and reliable and adds further layers of complexity than if a researcher were solely to conduct interviews with participants (Hoolachan 2015). By focusing on collecting ethnographic data, we are therefore able to be immersed within the research setting for an extended period, asking questions, making observations, interpreting interactions and applying the detailed findings to wider settings and official policies.

A Case Study Approach

A qualitative-based case study approach was adopted to capture a more targeted and nuanced view of the complexities of supported living, allowing deeper insight into the lives of the young people experiencing homelessness together with their responses to their built environment and living conditions (Pable 2013). Often advocated as an effective method for investigating marginalised individuals whose experiences are not always accurately encapsulated with other research strategies, particularly those tending to focus on demographic characteristics and statistical data (Snow and Anderson 1991), case studies offer means for researchers to elucidate and extensively explore the 'how', 'why' and underlying behaviours within the group, organisational and social contemporary phenomena (Yin 2009). Cronin (2014) who is in favour of case studies, noted that this method of data collection is a versatile and legitimate means of collecting qualitative and quantitative data and helps to understand the complex issues that arise in a wider social context. Similar notions have been argued by Snow and Anderson (1991), who drawing on the work of Douglas (1976) broadly described how such methods enable researchers to capture not only the experiences and voices of the targeted group but also the perspectives and interaction of the other individuals who move among them. Thus, a longitudinal method helped to holistically explore the selected hostel over a period enabling complex patterns, interpersonal interactions, and social changes to be better understood and interpreted and relationships and links identified. This ability for case study research to be inductive and establish a contemporaneous hypothesis due to the vast amount of information and natural findings which emerge has been highlighted by researchers who note its key role in creating points of note for future research studies (Merriam 2009).

Despite its strengths, case study research as with other methods, is not without its disadvantages and methodological criticism, with some researchers maintaining the belief that this strategy lacks rigour and is consequently undesirable for finer data collection, instead only useful as far as the preliminary exploratory phase of research (Abercrombie et al., 1984). However, this notion is rejected by Yin (2009) who argues

against general hierarchical stereotypes of research methods and highlights the importance of considering the overarching research questions and purpose of the study when selecting appropriate methods of data collection. Nevertheless, the features and characteristics of case studies and their tendency to focus on a single-unit and small samples, have led to critics arguing that this method can present issues such as non-replicability and inability to form generalisations from findings, and in turn, subjective discussions, and conclusions (Idowu 2016). Conversely, case studies focusing on a single unit, whether that be an individual, group or organisation (Krusenvik 2016) can be considered advantageous, as it allows the researcher to gather significant amounts of highly specific data and apply meaning and insight into behaviour. In addition, in terms of difficulty with using the findings of case studies to make generalisations and establish causality; given the homeless population is comprised of individuals with such a vast range of characteristics and demographics, generalisations sweeping the overall homeless population are best avoided, regardless of the research method used (Pable 2013).

According to Idowu (2016), unconscious researcher confirmation bias is a further disadvantage within case study research, as bias creates an opportunity for individual interpretations to reinforce the researchers' preconceived beliefs and when coupled with a poor following of systematic procedures, can invalidate findings and relevant discussion (Yin 2009). However, Yin (2009) noted that while case study research was not without disadvantages, researcher bias can be found in many methods of data collection and is not isolated to case studies. Other researchers have criticised the labour intensiveness and length of time necessary to fully conduct case study research (Yin 2009) given the vast amounts of information collected and in need of analysis (Miles 1979). However, the lengthy time taken to conduct case study research has been advocated by others to be an important component of this method as an extended period is thought to be necessary when studying some research populations and where a simple 'snapshot' of a situation at one point in time, as is often popular in social

science research (Cohen and Manion 1980) is not adequate to fully understand the dynamics, context, change and behaviours of those individuals (Reeves 2016; Yin 1989).

Recognising that a single method of collecting data is not without its limitations and given the complex and multifaceted nature of this study's research population, a variety of data were collected to alleviate some of the fundamental drawbacks of the selected social research methods, by complementing and supplementing those used (Yin 2009; Pable 2013; Cohen and Manion 1980). These methods included semi-structured interviews, participant observation and analysis of hostel documents which outlined the rules, regulations and warning process. By drawing on all three sources of data, I learned more about the hostel as an institution and gained a deeper understanding of its politics and dynamics by witnessing first-hand the impact of social change in the environment on resident behaviour towards one another, and towards staff members. The combination of findings through multiple sources of collection techniques creates a more robust, accurate and comprehensive picture that tests the reliability of the data and assists in preventing researcher bias (Heale and Forbes 2013).

Validity of Qualitative Research

Patton (2002) describes how qualitative data is gathered through three types of data collection "1) in-depth, open-ended interviews 2) direct observation and 3) written documents" (Patton 2002 p.4). Hoffman and Coffey (2008) argue that qualitative research methods which capture the experiences and realities of people experiencing homelessness are an invaluable instrument for identifying and separating the structural and systematic issues inherent in-service provision from the 'problem' of an individual's homelessness itself. They note that it is through such qualitative research that homeless individuals can find practical solutions to many of the issues arising in their day-to-day lives and can therefore bring about social change. According to Merriam (2009), qualitative data is strongly associated with the notion that individuals giving meaning to

their interactions in their social world is a social process and is thus not able to be accurately measured using quantitative research. It is for this reason that qualitative research has long been used by researchers striving to understand the experiences and opinions of participants by collecting non-numerical data through methods and techniques such as interviews, focus groups and observation, which each focus on gathering opinions, stories and experiences allowing the researcher to place context on their meaning (Bricki and Green 2007). By its nature, qualitative data is in-depth, and a 'richly descriptive' (Merriam 2009 p.5) naturalistic approach (Goffman 1979) which enables the researcher to understand and interpret the 'what', 'why' and 'how' of the whole situation rather than the rigorous quantitative and scientific 'how many' (Ormston et al., 2014). Atieno (2009) highlighting the strengths of qualitative research and its ability to allow the researcher to learn how participants in a certain setting process and respond to their environment and experiences, described how this method is essential to understand phenomena and uncover vital themes and concerns while simultaneously simplifying data without diminishing its context. Therefore, qualitative strategies were determined as the most suitable method and vehicle to gather data for this study as they offer an effective and flexible way to capture the detailed descriptions of life in supported accommodation and allow opportunities to place intersubjective meaning on these experiences (Reeves 2016; Merriam 2009).

Qualitative research however has been subject to criticism due to its limitations, including the difficulties associated with replicating a study due to a lack of numerical or scientific methods (Reeves 2016) and the researcher being the primary instrument of the research and analysis (Atieno 2009). Similarly, Choy (2014), states that qualitative research approaches may provide an understanding of the behaviours, values, and beliefs of both homogenous and heterogeneous groups, but offers no objectively verifiable result and can be intensive and time-consuming. While the primary focus of this approach is to place meaning on behaviours, some pivotal issues may be unnoticed and overlooked by a researcher, thus distorting the findings of the study (Choy 2014).

Atieno (2014) suggested further weaknesses of qualitative research, noting the ambiguities which can emanate from the data due to the linguistic ambiguity involving words and phrases having multiple meanings and fundamentally hampers interpretations.

The Research Participants

To gain a representative sample of participants, all residents and staff of the case study hostel were asked to participate, which was an advantageous sampling technique due to limited resources, time constraints and cost-efficacy. In total, twenty-three individuals were approached to take part in this study including five staff members, two managers, and sixteen residents. Of those who were approached, fifteen individuals agreed to participate; therefore, the final participants consisted of three staff members, two managers, and ten residents. Reasons to not take part varied; however, those staff who did not participate did initially consent but vacated their positions shortly before the commencement of the interviews. For residents who opted not to participate their reasons included 'not wanting people to know their business', 'not having time' and 'being busy'. Prior to data collection in both interview phases, two meetings two weeks apart were organised with residents as a group to build a rapport and ensure transparency by providing a detailed explanation as to what the study and their participation would entail. All residents were invited to these sessions, although not all attended. Every resident who attended the initial meetings consented to their participation and in a similar vein, the residents who did not attend the meetings were those who opted out of participation in the research. Participants were provided with opportunities to ask questions relating to the study and were given a factsheet with a basic outline of the research, which will be discussed later in this chapter. Participants were then asked to provide informed written consent before interviews were undertaken.

For this study, from here on, when referring to a specific cohort they will be referred to as:

- Group A – Those who were interviewed in 2015
- Group B – Those who were interviewed in 2016
- Staff – All staff interviewed
- Hostel Manager – Will be referred to specifically by respective pseudonym for clarity and context

The above overview is kept brief for the context of this chapter as the following chapter introduces the participants and the case study hostel and provides more detailed information.

Analysis of Hostel Documents

Bank Hostel provided three handbooks to peruse, dissect and write notes whilst on the premises consisting of a rules and policies document, a health and safety document and a risk document, which outlined the associated risk and safeguarding processes when working with the young people. Unfortunately, due to confidentiality and sensitivity issues, these handbooks could not be removed from the site. The handbook of central focus was that pertaining to hostel rules and policies, which listed all the in-house rules and described the warning procedure to be followed if residents did not comply. Whilst certainly not a stand-alone method of obtaining rich data, the analysis of the documents triangulated findings gathered from other methods (Cohen et al., 2007) and provided information used as a reference point in the interviews and helped to contextualise, corroborate, expand, and support the participants' comments surrounding control methods employed in the hostel, which in turn helped to validate the findings and protect against bias (Cohen et al., 2007). Although an important and relevant tool in the research process, this documentary analysis was consequently largely used as a source of informing the researcher of the extent of rules and policies, rather than a source used

to formulate arguments directly and as such, it was not coded into themes in the same manner as the other research methods used in this study.

Conducting Participant Observation

As noted, to enhance the credibility, validity, and reliability of the findings of the study, qualitative data were gathered from a variety of sources, one of which included overt participant observation. According to Ellingson (2017), participant observation is a research methodology which encompasses “accompanying research participants as they move through the normal activities of their day, asking questions and observing processes” (p.95). McQueen and Knussen (2002) note that this method is a way to gather data, without manipulation from the researcher, who merely observes the participants in their native environment. By undertaking observation, the researcher can *view* how the participants behave and interact, rather than being *told* during interviews (Baker 2006). Baker (2006) discusses the complexities of participant observation, noting that given its holistic nature, the researcher may be required to incorporate all five senses to understand the environment in which they are immersed. She also notes the importance of the researcher adopting a flexible role for the maximum efficacy of the data collection process. However, as with other research methods, participant observation is not without its limitations. Cohen et al., (2007) note several issues with participant observation, which can have implications for the validity of the findings. First, they argue, is the potential for the participants to modify their behaviour as they are in the presence of the researcher, meaning the behaviours they are displaying are not necessarily reflective of their true selves. Second, they suggest that as the researcher is studying a specific moment in time, they may not be equipped with sufficient information about the events leading up to a situation, thus creating the potential for misinterpretation.

Several months of active participant observation were spent within the hostel setting,

allowing for a better understanding of the effects of the changes occurring within the hostel and the changing dynamics between residents and staff. Prior to conducting the research in 2015, I introduced myself to the residents in a formal 'introduction' meeting, where I explained the purposes and intentions of the study, my position as a researcher and attempted to begin building a rapport. The 2015 introduction meeting was not, however, my first visit to Bank Hostel within the capacity of a researcher, as prior to meeting the residents formally, I visited the site on two occasions to meet the hostel manager and discuss the study in more detail. This meant that although I did not explain my position to the residents until the official meeting, a few of them had seen me in the office and in the vicinity of the building in the weeks leading up to our formal introduction and appeared curious about my presence.

Following the first introduction meeting in 2016, I attempted to immerse myself within the environment to develop relationships further and encourage the residents to feel more relaxed in my presence. I visited the hostel two to three times a week in the first few weeks for approximately four hours at a time. During these visits, I would informally converse with residents and staff and observe their own interactions and behaviours in practice, which helped to both establish my presence and understand and contextualise the environment and internal dynamics following the interviews. I also spent several hours with the hostel manager during these initial weeks as she was keen to discuss the work that the hostel do as an organisation and show me leaflets and photographs of residents participating in hostel activities, such as creating a vegetable patch in the garden and painting on canvases in the living areas. It became clear that the manager was eager for me to capture 'life' in Bank Hostel and would regularly ask the young people to recall to me prior experiences, funny stories and in-jokes during their time as a resident. Although the young people seemed to share these stories enthusiastically and it often led to laughter and further stories, it demonstrated that my presence as a researcher influenced some of the conversations in the environment which were often focused on 'good' times.

Due to other commitments, my visits to Bank Hostel were isolated to weekdays, typically beginning from approximately midday into the late afternoon. Although there were more staff present during the daytime which maximised opportunities to capture staff observation, these time constraints naturally meant I was only able to observe residents for certain parts of the day. I learned from staff members that these times were typically quieter in the hostel, as some residents would not be awake until the late afternoon and others had commitments such as education, employment or appointments, meaning they would often not return to the hostel until the evenings. Despite this, the residents who had agreed to participate in the study were generally those who were present during my visits, either in the communal areas watching television and socialising, or in the office talking to staff. Therefore, whilst I was unable to experience the busier times of Bank Hostel in the evenings and weekends, the 'missing' residents were mostly those young people who had not shown any interest in taking part in the study and who had declined to attend the introduction meeting. As such, it could be argued that my lack of presence in the evenings and weekends was less intrusive, as I minimally interrupted the lives of those residents who did not want to participate in the study and who may have been less inclined to socialise and relax in the communal areas if I was there.

In these early weeks, I also had an opportunity to attend formal structured staff meetings and observe the interactions between staff and management and the staff members themselves. This was later helpful in contextualising the social relationships between staff members and their general staff culture. After the initial few weeks, participant observation slowed and mainly occurred in-between interviews, which were sometimes scheduled several hours apart. Again, the interviews occurred on weekdays in the early afternoon, meaning any observations recorded typically occurred between 11am and 5pm. Participant observation continued in the communal areas and staff office during this period and on occasion, in the communal garden when the weather allowed.

Due to the pause in data collection midway through the fieldwork, a further introduction meeting was necessary with the new residents in 2016, upon my return to the research site. However, in contrast to the earlier period of fieldwork, there were less opportunities to observe the young people, as new regulations meant the communal areas were mostly closed during the daytime. The later participant observation data was therefore primarily collected in the staff office, either noting interactions between the staff themselves, or between residents and staff when they entered the space. Although the circumstances did not allow me to spend a period immersing myself in the environment with the new residents, due to several factors which impacted the scheduled interviews to be discussed later in this chapter, I was still present in the hostel approximately one day a week for a period of up to five hours. These later stages of participant observation engagement can therefore be considered to have been more opportunistic. This was beneficial in some ways since it fitted with my role as a researcher who became part of the everyday life of the hostel. It also contributed to the maintenance of more natural social interactions among hostel residents and staff, without an overly intrusive research presence. The periods spent in participant observation were thus quite extensive in terms of total hours spent in the hostel throughout the fieldwork.

Brief field notes were taken during participant observation, which were then immediately expanded to incorporate more detail into my fieldwork diary on the journey back to my home. As the notes were contemporaneously written in an abbreviated format, it was imperative to complete and reflect on the notes at the earliest opportunity to ensure the documents were an accurate representation of my thoughts and the situation in context and to avoid forgetting important details. I mainly avoided taking extensive notes whilst in the presence of the young people as I was keen to capture their natural conversations and actions and felt my writing notes in their presence was likely to influence behaviours or at least make them less comfortable in

the environment.

Like Reeves (2016), my role as a researcher was a combination of Observer as Participant and Participant as Observer, rather than Complete Observer (Baker 2006; Adler and Adler 1994). Observer as Participant refers to the researcher having little direct participation during the overt observation and similarly, Participant as Observer places more emphasis on the researcher having an active role in the social interactions in the setting and undertakes the dual role of participant and observer (Reeves 2016; Blake 2006; Adler and Adler 1994). Conversely, a Complete Observer refers to the process of the researcher observing participants with no involvement in social interaction (Reeves 2016; Baker 2006). Although this latter method may have produced more organic findings, given the complete removal of the researcher from the interactions and the increased probability of participants interacting as they would in their regular day-to-day activities, allowing for social interactions not only helped maintain a rapport with the participants but, as questions could be asked to learn more about situations and the background of any events, the probability of misinterpretation was diminished (Cohen et al., 2007).

Semi-Structured Interviews

Interviews were selected as a flexible technique to gather data due to their ability to enable participants to discuss and interpret their experiences and express their views from their perspective (Cohen and Marion 1980). Semi-structured qualitative interviews were chosen as the most appropriate method to gather perceptions and experiences of the complexities surrounding life in supported accommodation as a young person and the challenges staff members face working with a notoriously hard-to-reach social group (McGrath and Pistrang 2007). Questions were formulated to cover a broad range of exploratory topics, thus providing a structure while allowing scope for participant spontaneity, and space for an element of probing when focusing on more pertinent

topics to limit the need for researcher interpretation during the analysis process and overcome any language ambiguity or vagueness. Strategies were employed to reduce any potential bias infiltrating the data including framing questions in a non-leading and purposely open-ended manner to avoid any predetermination of participant experiences (Patton 2002), adding an element of flexibility and invitation to potentially unexpected concepts to naturally emerge and evolve from responses (Cohen and Manion 1980). Significantly, it was by using this method and identifying key themes emerging from the responses, that the study shifted its focus from its initial aims of studying the importance of social relationships in the hostel setting, to a more concentrated look at the use of power and control within the hostel sphere and its relationship with social interactions and interpersonal relationships.

All interviews were conducted on the premises of the supported accommodation within the smallest of the resident communal living areas, often used as the formal meeting space. Interviews were digitally tape-recorded for a variety of practical and pragmatic reasons. Firstly, as the interviews considered sensitive topics, I felt it would be more personal and remove a layer of authority in the interviewer-interviewee relationship by providing the participant with my full attention during the interview, rather than limiting eye-contact by being distracted writing notes. Secondly, due to the detailed nature of the interviews, it would be difficult to fully capture verbatim in notes all the participants' responses and experiences, meaning valuable parts of the interview could be forgotten (Tessier 2012) or misinterpreted during the analysis leading to the potential for interviewer bias to compromise the data (Bricki and Green 2007). Finally, tape recording the interviews guarded against loss of data and add a degree of "replayability" which aids the analysis process by providing an opportunity for the interviewer to re-experience the interview and re-examine any unclear or ambiguous moments through repeated scrutiny (Tessier 2012 p.449). That said, whilst not without its strengths, the validity of tape recordings as a vehicle to capture interviews received criticism from Ellingson (2017), who argued that the recording itself may inorganically emphasise

certain features of the conversation due to background noises, which may lead to a distortion of key points leading to different meanings and different results. She argued that due to the recordings' 'replayability,' researchers change their understanding and interpretation each time they listen to the recording, as they crucially fail to capture the pivotal non-verbal cues, body language and facial expressions and thus become disembodied (Ellingson 2017). To avoid any potential for fundamental misinterpretation of the data, the recordings were only listened to twice once interviews were completed; once quickly as a straight run-through for clarification and to capture any themes or valuable points missed, and once more to create a written transcription of the interview. Participants were informed of the intention to digitally record the session simultaneously when being briefed on the aims of the study and were asked to sign a consent form to be recorded. The interviews ranged from twenty to forty-five minutes in length and in all cases, the resident interviews were longer than those with staff and managers. Data collection began in February-April 2015, paused and then recommenced in March 2016, for approximately 16 weeks. The initial stage included interviews with five residents and the hostel manger, and the second consisted of interviews with a further five residents, a newly appointed hostel manger and three staff members.

Ethical Considerations When Undertaking Fieldwork

Prior to approaching Bank Hostel to obtain consent for conducting the study on the premises, a written research proposal which presented and addressed the risks of the research both on the participants and to the researcher was submitted and later approved by the Ethics Committee at Bangor University. Details of ethical approval together with contact details of the university were included in the factsheets provided to participants as part of their introduction to the research study, who were informed that they could contact the university with any questions or comments at any point before, during or following their participation. Bank hostel requested that I examined their risk handbook before meeting residents and asked for evidence of a valid

Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) check, which I already possessed due to undertaking voluntary work with vulnerable people through the university around the time of interviews.

Researchers have noted during ethical discourse the challenges which can be encountered when researching homeless youth, many of whom may be vulnerable or disadvantaged (Draucker et al., 2009; Koller et al., 2008). Of particular concern is the notion of researching individuals where many of the pertinent topics for discussion are typically highly sensitive and involve divulging traumatic and highly distressing experiences. Such research with homeless youth has been described by Draucker et al., (2009) as having the potential to exacerbate or even induce anxiety, distress, and other psychological stress reactions by forcing the young people to re-live past incidents. Therefore, it has been noted that the interviewer must remain vigilant throughout the data collection process for signs or risks of emotional harm or adverse reactions of the individual (Draucker et al., 2009). To avoid placing significant stress on the young people, questions about family and experiences leading up to homelessness were kept deliberately vague, to allow residents to disclose as much or as little surrounding their personal circumstances as they were comfortable with. While some light probing was used in this section of the interview for the sole purpose of maintaining structure, this was minimal, and residents were not pushed for any specific or further details surrounding past experiences and childhoods.

Participant bias, as noted earlier, is a recognised problematic issue that can arise in interviews. Where individuals through fear of being reprimanded or cast out by the service, modify their responses to satisfy what they believe the interviewer wants to hear (Pable 2013; Bryman 2008). This was a particularly fundamental matter for consideration when approaching data collection, as residents were aware of my relationship and connection with staff members, which inevitably impacted their responses personally as an individual and potentially their responses to me as an

interviewer. To avoid any inaccurate notions of my intentions, residents were reminded of my position as an impartial interviewer and were reassured their responses and comments would remain confidential to the extent that their privacy would be respected unless they disclosed a desire to harm themselves or others, in which case safeguarding processes would be necessary. It was hoped by adopting this approach and building a rapport and trusting relationship with residents, participant bias would be minimised, and the data would not be tainted.

As noted, drawing on guidance from Wiles and Boddy (2013) regarding informed consent, which he states is essential to performing ethical research, participants were provided with factsheets containing detailed information relating to the research and their role within it. The information was communicated in a user-friendly manner that was clear, coherent, and easy to understand, the information also described how sensitive topics may be discussed and provided a brief warning of the potential distress which may arise, which was sufficient to highlight the issue but not so detailed as to potentially put off any potential participants (Wiles and Boddy 2013). Residents were asked several times if they had any questions prior to written and verbal consent being obtained and were encouraged to ask questions at any point during or following the interview. As further advised by Wiles and Boddy (2013), the study operated on an ongoing consent basis, meaning the participants were informed of their right to withdraw from the study at any point, with no reason necessary. In a similar vein, participants were informed they could stop the interview at any point and if desired, their relevant recording and any information held would be deleted. To encourage further confidence in the proceedings, it was explained to all of those participating in the study the length to which their information and identity would be protected and kept anonymous. Tape recordings were kept in a secure location and all transcriptions and information produced digitally via a computer were stored in a protected password-encrypted file. Following the transcript of the research interview being written, recordings were deleted. Pseudonyms were assigned to distinguish between residents,

meaning their real names were never attached to any recording, transcription, or other pieces of information.

By its nature, participant observation can be intrusive on the lives of the participants, particularly as the length of time a researcher spends observing the study subjects is likely to be considerably longer than the length of time of an interview (Bryman 2008). Discussions surrounding the ethical issues associated with participant observation focus on the use of covert participant observation, where the research subjects are unaware they are being observed and studied and consequently cannot give their consent (McQueen and Knussen 2013). Although this study used Observer as Participant and Participant as Observer perspectives, which are not considered to be as ethically contentious (Bryman 2008), ongoing informed consent was a major factor in data collection. Participants were fully informed of the nature of the research, what the process entailed, their place within it and their rights to withdraw participation at any time, without any repercussions. Most of the residents who did not consent to participation were either absent from the hostel during the daytime, which was when my visits occurred, or they confined themselves to their bedrooms and were rarely present in any of the shared spaces. Thus, potential contact with non-consenting residents was highly limited. Any such contact which did take place went unrecorded in my field notes and thus did not form part of the research.

The right to privacy is an issue inherent within participant observation, more so than interviews, due to participants' ability to refuse to answer interview questions they feel uncomfortable with, without needing to provide a reason (Bryman 2008). In this sense, participants who are engaged in an interview have more control over the situation and the responses recorded by the researcher. Conversely, a participant has less control over the environment and interactions during participant observation due to the presence of other individuals who may reveal or comment on a matter that the participant preferred to keep private. To combat the potential intrusion on privacy, again, participants were

informed that they were free to withdraw from the study at any time and could ask for any comments, or their whole contribution, to be erased from the data.

As with the interview transcripts and notes discussed above, the participant observation field notes and associated data were stored in a secure location and treated as sensitive information. Pseudonyms were used in the notes to protect the identity of the participants and ensure confidentiality within the wider context of the study setting. In line with Bryman's (2008) discussion surrounding ethics in social research, for the purposes of safeguarding, when incorporating field notes into the findings chapters care was taken to ensure that neither the participants nor the hostel could be identified.

There has been much debate as to using 'rewards' as an incentive to encourage individuals and influence their decision to consent to their participation in social research (Wiles and Boddy 2013). Of particular concern is the use of incentives such as money or food when the participants in question are considered to be a vulnerable group or those who are experiencing financial deprivation (Koller et al., 2017). Indeed, it has been argued that any material reward could pressure and coerce homeless youth to succumb to participate, many of whom may not have consented if their living situation and financial circumstances were different (Wiles and Boddy 2013). That said, a fine line exists between incentives being viewed as a coercive strategy to engage vulnerable youth and exploiting the young people by not compensating them for their time and effort (Cohen et al., 2007). It is imperative, therefore, that the researcher endeavours to assess the ethical considerations of providing rewards and compensation in exchange for participation and ensure the individuals are not being manipulated or psychologically harmed. To combat such issues in the current study, rather than informing residents that their reward was contingent on the full completion of their participation in the research (see Cohen et al., 2007), the young people in Group A were informed in their information sheets that if they chose to withdraw from the study either during or following their interview, they would still receive the offered incentive and their personal

records would be deleted. None of the residents withdrew from the study; however, due to the loss of contact with the hostel during data collection and their lack of contact details for the residents who had departed, the planned incentive of a £5 gift card for each participant was never provided. To account for the inherent risks in offering incentives, when interviewing re-commenced with Group B, the decision was made to substitute a gift card with a large hamper filled with a wide variety of food, treats, drinks, baked goods, and a Now TV voucher for three-month access to the subscription service, to be used in the communal areas. All residents of Bank Hostel, including those who did not participate in the research were invited to share the items of the hamper, meaning participants were able to be compensated for their time, but their access to the shared goods was not contingent on their involvement. It was hoped by introducing a 'reward' in this manner, any engagement was voluntary. In contrast to residents, staff members were not offered an incentive, although notably, their interviews were conducted during paid worktime, meaning they in effect did not 'lose out' by consenting to participate.

Data Analysis

Data from interviews and fieldnotes were transcribed immediately, to ensure any non-visual cues and word emphasis remained fresh in the memory. This was important in maximising both the amount and the accuracy of the data. As noted above, the original aim of the study was to broadly explore social relationships within the institution; however, as the transcription tasks were completed, the documents were read and notes were made concerning any prominent common patterns of meaning emerging from the data, helping to explore more pertinent topics in more depth as interviews progressed. It was through this method that critical points and themes began to emerge, which shifted the focus of the study to more detailed topics. This method of identifying themes as they occur rather than having a predetermined framework is considered an inductive and deductive approach and is referred to as systematic thematic content analysis (Gibbs 2007; Boyatzis 1998), a method often used across research settings due

to its flexible and adaptable nature and descriptive qualities (Boyatzis 1998). Thematic content analysis is described by Anderson (1997) as the “most foundational of qualitative analytical procedures which in some way informs all qualitative methods” (p.1) where the data determines the themes rather than any preconceived notions derived from an examination of the literature. Although both inductive and deductive methods were used in this study, as often found when utilising semi-structured interviews as a method of data collection (Braun and Clark 2006), the research methods underpinning this current study more closely aligned with inductive methods, where similar studies and theoretical frameworks were explored in the wake of themes emerging from the data, rather than as a backdrop to the interviews themselves.

Braun and Clarke’s (2006) six steps of performing thematic analysis were then followed when approaching data analysis to include a) familiarisation; b) coding; c) generating themes; d) reviewing themes; e) defining and naming themes and f) writing up. Therefore, prior to transcription, the data were familiarised with by listening to the audio recordings and making notes, helping to generate first impressions and highlighting any preliminary themes emerging. Following the familiarisation process, the data were then coded carefully to enhance reliability and avoid inadvertently invalidating the findings by being selective or using the data unrepresentatively to overly underline the positive responses and ignoring the negative, and vice versa (Cohen et al., 2017). Coding involves systematically categorising or highlighting sections of the transcriptions and establishing ‘codes’ to label and organise the prominent and key themes and relationships (Muckleston 2019), each code then provides a more succinct description of the themes within the text and allows for ease in collating data in later stages. As key concepts surrounding power and control began to emanate from the data, the method diverted from being deductive in searching for specific themes surrounding relationships to being inductive by being more data-driven (Braun and Clarke 2006) and performing a more flexible line-by-line coding (Maguire and Delahunt 2017) to fully capture and extract the new prevalent themes emerging. 94 coding labels were created from the

research data in total, which were then later organised into 7 themes for analysis. A framework of the primary coding categories to which the data were sorted can be found in Appendix 4 of this thesis.

The third step of Braun and Clarke's (2006) framework for performing thematic analysis is generating themes, where the initial codes created in step 3 are collated and begin to focus the analysis into more condensed themes. Whilst all data were coded to some degree, much of the general information extracted from the data were combined, labelled and sorted into a 'general' code, allowing for the more common themes to be assigned more specific labels for greater analysis. By combining and comparing the codes created we can uncover any relationships and patterns in the data and the most central and pervasive themes are identified and noted in preparation for the fourth stage of analysis – reviewing themes (Braun and Clarke 2006). By reviewing, developing, and redefining the themes identified to ensure they cohere while remaining “clear and identifiably distinct” (Braun and Clarke 2006 p.91), we can gain a deeper understanding and meaning of the data and essentially discard any themes which lack substance or sufficient evidence to form conclusions, while simultaneously re-coding and calibrating to ensure the themes extracted to provide an accurate representation of the story (Braun and Clarke 2006). The fifth step included the final refinement of themes through defining and applying naming conventions to further explore their meaning (Braun and Clarke 2006). More sub-themes emerged and when combined with the overarching themes informed the analysis and provided a structure to the data in preparation for the presentation of the findings. The final stage as per Braun and Clarke's (2006) framework is the writing up, where the product of the five steps is brought together to produce a narrative of the data in a manner which is concise, coherent and presents sufficient evidence to support any claims or arguments. Evidence for this study takes the form of quotes from the participants which have been extracted from the data and help elucidate pertinent and pivotal points. It must be noted that an extensive number of quotations are embedded in the findings and discussion chapters of this study, to

provide participants with a voice to tell their story, thus mitigating the possibility of researcher misinterpretation. According to Braun and Clarke (2006), this significant step needs to be more than merely descriptive, in that the researcher's argument must be presented and framed analytically and logically which answers the research questions.

Summary

Researching young people experiencing homelessness can be a complicated process due to the inherent issues in homelessness itself. The overarching objective of this chapter was to explain the research methods used in this qualitative study and expand on why such methods were selected as the most suitable and appropriate for gathering data. To fully argue why qualitative research in the form of a case study was adopted, the chapter highlighted some of the risks with these methods of research, including those associated with participant and researcher bias. Attempts were made during the data gathering to mitigate these risks and these were explained in depth in this chapter. The chapter explained that one of the most effective methods to guard against bias and validate findings is triangulation (Cohen and Manion 1980), which is the term used to describe the use of multiple methods to gather data to compare and cross-check findings (Cohen and Manion 1980). The chapter then provided an account of the finer details of how data were gathered including participant observation, document analysis and semi-structured interviews, the latter of which was the primary method for obtaining data. Following this, the ethical issues surrounding researching a potentially vulnerable and hard to reach population were considered, with some discussion surrounding the personal difficulties accessing the research site due to a re-structuring of the hostel as an organisation and consequential staffing issues. Finally, the methods used to analyse data were described, centred around Braun and Clarke's (2006) six steps to thematic analysis framework and how these were utilised to organise, structure, and scrutinise the data to further protect against bias and produce clear and coherent findings.

Chapter Six:

Researcher Reflections

This chapter aims to supplement the methodology described in Chapter Five by providing an account of the researcher's reflections during the research process. The chapter begins by discussing researcher positionality and is an important section when considering the findings and interactions between the researcher and participants as presented in the analysis within Chapters Eight, Nine and Ten. Following an overview of the researcher's role within the study, the chapter explores the gap in the fieldwork, briefly referred to in the preceding chapter, including the reasons behind the pause in data collection, the associated challenges with re-establishing access to the research site and finally, the key changes that were taking place in the environment and altering hostel provision, policies and dynamics during my absence.

Researcher Positionality

The decision to study homeless youth within the context of their experiences living in supported accommodation, was largely influenced by my personal experiences of homelessness during my mid to late teenage years. During my period of homelessness, I was housed and supported in Bank Hostel and later accessed their Floating Support service once I had transitioned to independent living. Having spent almost two years in Bank Hostel alone, I encountered a variety of different residents, some of whom stayed briefly and others who remained longer, each with different ultimate outcomes to their homeless journey. Witnessing the social and cultural dynamics at play in the environment along with the instrumental role of keyworker-resident social relationship and the potential influence on outcomes sparked an interest even at that young age. Therefore, several years later when in the preliminary stages of my PhD thesis and choosing a research topic, I did not doubt that I wanted to learn and understand more about the experiences of homeless youth in supported accommodation and the drivers behind their behaviours.

Upon initially approaching Bank Hostel to enquire about conducting a research study, it transpired that some staff members employed during my youth were still occupying their keyworker roles. This meant that despite the length of time passing since my departure (in the region of seven years) I had several pre-existing social relationships with not only the hostel as an organisation but some of the staff themselves. As I had lost touch with the staff in Bank Hostel in the years since my absence, I was not aware which staff, if any, remained in position when selecting my research site. Staff appeared excited to see me again and were eager to learn more about my life and experiences since exiting homelessness. I was introduced enthusiastically to the newer staff members as a previous resident and the warmth and fondness they expressed appeared to help quickly foster a comfortable social relationship with the new staff, preventing any

initial awkwardness or barriers.

As described in Chapter Five, given the nature of this research and the need to explore participants' experiences in sufficient depth, a case study approach was selected as the most appropriate research method. Despite my knowledge of Bank Hostel, I did not select the site without considering other options and assessing their suitability first. Given the rural location of my personal address, options were limited and within a 40-mile radius, there were only two other hostels which catered for homeless youth. The first was excluded as a possibility as it was Welsh language based. My ability to speak and understand Welsh is poor and I felt it was inappropriate to request participants to be interviewed in a language of my preference. Similarly, it was likely to make participant observation difficult, as the natural conversation would likely be in residents' first language of Welsh, which I would not be able to follow or fully understand. The second hostel was within the same organisation as Bank Hostel but accepted young people with higher support needs and was deemed to be a medium-high risk. After considering the impact the interviews could have on the young people and the stress and potential emotional harm sensitive questions may cause, this second option was also decided against. This left Bank Hostel as the most suitable case study site. It was within a reasonable travelling distance, housed young people with low-medium support needs and I was familiar with the layout and structure of the building, which helped to inform my descriptions and understanding of the use of space.

The pre-existing relationships with staff were beneficial in many ways; however, that is not to say that there were no drawbacks or vulnerability to criticism in respect of participant and researcher bias. For example, it seemed staff were willing to divulge their personal feelings towards the hostel, changes and management in detail during informal conversations, as they perhaps viewed me more as a trusted friend or confidant than a detached interviewer. Similarly, despite my intention to keep my past experiences as a homeless person hidden from residents to position myself as neutral, it quickly

circulated that I was an ex-resident and consequently, I did not appear to have the impediments and barriers when developing relationships and rapport that have been reported by other researchers (DeVerteuil 2004; Hoolachan 2015). The early acceptance and willingness to engage from the residents was useful in terms of the data collection, as the sense of familiarity allowed for instant access to their social world. The reasons behind this acceptance were however unclear; whilst their knowledge of my previous experience of homelessness may have meant I was viewed as 'one of them,' rather than a stranger or an 'outsider', it is also possible that as with the newer staff, the enthusiasm towards my presence from the older staff who appeared to 'vouch' for me, may have encouraged trust and acceptance from the young people. Historically, many researchers have faced difficulties when engaging with the homeless community, with some deciding to voluntarily experience homelessness and immerse themselves in the environment temporarily to counter these challenges. By doing so, they attempted to gain a better understanding of the psychological and physical impact of homelessness and enhance the qualitative data they had gathered (Wardhaugh 2000). Such examples include Harper (1979), who believed that living within the homeless community was the most effective method to ensure the collection of rich qualitative data, which mitigated the inherent ethical and moral dilemmas. For example, researchers 'passing' as homeless people has been criticised as a superficial perspective (Wardhaugh 2000).

Although the revelation of my past was unintended, McQueen and Knussen (2002) argue that self-disclosure of personal information to research participants has both strengths and limitations. For example, although self-disclosure may allow a participant to be comfortable in the presence of the interviewer and more likely to 'open up,' it may also impede the flow of the interview, particularly if the interviewer and interviewee do not share similar sentiments and values. In order to ensure a balance between transparency and privacy, when asked by the young people if it was 'true' that I used to be a resident, I remained open and honest, confirming this was accurate but steering away from divulging any of my own experiences or life within Bank Hostel, to ensure I did not derail

the interview, influence responses, or diminish any interviewer-interviewee professional boundaries. Notably, it was clear by residents' body language and questions that they appeared interested in and respected my past status, at least to some degree. It was also clear that they valued that I had 'been where they were,' and appeared to be undertaking the study from a place of care.

However, although it seemed residents were receptive to my presence, it cannot be ignored that my pre-existing relationships with staff may have influenced resident behaviours and interactions during interviews and participant observation, especially if they believed that I was an ally or associate of staff or feared I would repeat their stories, experiences or rule infringements to the staff and management. Power relations and tensions within qualitative research have been explored and debated by researchers who argue that excessively unequal power relationships in the researcher-researched relationship can lead to impediments and difficulties in obtaining information from the participants (DeVerteuil 2004). Due to the ambiguity surrounding my role, in terms of power relations between the researcher and participants, it was unclear whether my position as an ex-resident weakened or strengthened my power in the researcher-participant relationship, or indeed whether I was viewed as a 'resident,' a 'staff member' or simply a researcher. Despite encountering many residents whilst I was informally conversing with staff in the office, I equally encountered and interacted with them, at least during the early stages of the fieldwork, in the communal areas. My movement between staff and resident space therefore likely compounded any ambiguity surrounding my role and intentions. My complex status and positionality somewhere in the realms of both 'one of us' and 'one of them' was a potential dilemma, and thus should be considered when understanding the comments and responses of participants within the findings presented in this research.

The Pause in Fieldwork

As noted, initially, the research design included interviewing residents and staff, conducting a period of participant observation and then re-interviewing participants to gain more detailed perspectives and narratives at a different point in time. However, shortly after completing interviews with five residents in 2015, the hostel experienced a series of significant changes which led to a temporary loss of contact with the research site. I attempted to re-establish contact and continue fieldwork on several occasions, but telephone calls were often not returned, and emails remained unanswered. It is likely although not definitive, that contact became difficult due to the rapid changes in the environment and the challenges staff were experiencing both in terms of managing resident behaviour and the less favourable working conditions. Ultimately, it is likely that these substantial stressors and constraints meant that the research was not a priority for staff compared to the wider changes emerging in the environment.

Based on the experiences shared by residents and staff, it appears that during this pause in data collection, financial cuts brought about significant changes to the working conditions of staff members. These changes meant several experienced staff members departed, including the hostel manager. Whilst it was confirmed by remaining staff that those in a key working role departed directly due to the effects of financial constraints, the reasons surrounding the departure of the hostel manager were never detailed. Nevertheless, a new hostel manager was appointed, who implemented a variety of control strategies and restrictions designed to exert authority, curb rule-breaking and encourage more of what was perceived to be more acceptable behaviour in residents. Likewise, new staff were employed to replace those who had departed. During this period of instability, it appears several residents did not have a specified key worker and would often float amongst existing or available staff. When taken together, these changes brought about significant changes in the physical and emotional environment both in respect of how the hostel operated and how residents responded to it. The process and the effects of the above changes are therefore instrumental themes in this research and will be examined within the context of the findings in Chapter Nine.

After several months, I was able to reinitiate contact through a remaining staff member that I was familiar with due to my own experience of homelessness. The staff member discussed the study with the manager, who subsequently invited me to the hostel for a meeting. Although entirely speculative, I believe that without the existence of this pre-existing relationship with the staff member in question, it would have been unlikely that contact would have been re-established with the organisation or that data collection would have been able to continue. I attended the requested meeting with the new manager and provided an overview of the research study and the type of data collected to date. The manager was initially hesitant to allow me to re-commence interviews, noting that she was concerned about what would be reported by residents. It later transpired that the residents were not responding positively to the changes implemented in the environment and were being openly critical and resistant to the new policies. After further discussion, the new manager agreed that the interviews could recommence and invited me to attend an upcoming staff meeting, which would provide an opportunity to explain to some of the newer staff what the research study entailed, and my role within it and possibly gather further participants. It was also at this point that I was informed all the residents who were originally interviewed, except one individual, had departed from the establishment and no contact details were held. With no forwarding details, the original study design was no longer viable. This issue was problematic in terms of study design although perhaps should have been protected against at the outset, due to the realities of homelessness and the difficulty in tracking those who are experiencing the phenomenon over a length of time (Gerlitz et al., 2017). However, the unique change in circumstances and the social changes encompassing the environment meant that a new opportunity presented itself, one where it was possible to study the hostel, cultures, relationships and behaviours prior to and following the changes.

I attended the staff meeting as requested and outlined the aims of my research to those

who were present. All staff in attendance verbally consented to interviews beginning approximately eight weeks later, shortly following the final interview planned with the residents. Of the seven staff members who expressed a desire to participate, only four remained working when the interviews commenced. One individual had resigned from their position, another had commenced maternity leave and one further staff member had been dismissed. Some new staff had joined the organisation to replace those who had left; however, given their limited time in Bank Hostel and their lack of experience working in other similar roles, these staff were not recruited to participate.

Although the departure of several staff meant that there were few staff remaining to interview, it also meant that those staff who were still employed by the organisation had limited availability to participate in the research. On several occasions, I arrived at the hostel to undertake interviews with staff to find that they would not be possible due to a variety of reasons. For example, on some occasions staffing issues meant the individual being interviewed was the only person in the office, which they could not leave unstaffed. Other times staff had forgotten they were due to be interviewed and had scheduled meetings or taken annual leave. Whilst these visits were not wholly unproductive, as they allowed opportunities for participant observation and informal conversations with residents, it took several attempts before I was able to interview the remaining staff. Although grateful for the opportunity to conduct interviews with staff in light of the instability and above issues, in hindsight, due to their limited availability, the interviews with staff were rushed and lacked sufficient detail and elaboration in some areas.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to provide an overview of the researcher's position within the research and provide more detail and clarity surrounding the pause in fieldwork. The information contained within this chapter is instrumental to

understanding the findings presented in upcoming Chapters Eight, Nine and Ten as it not only explores the social relationship between the researcher, staff and residents, it also helps to explain how the study setting changed significantly during fieldwork. These changes are a core aspect of this research and led to a fundamental change in hostel dynamics.

Chapter Seven:

Context of the Hostel

As outlined in the preceding chapter, it has been acknowledged that the social dynamics of homeless hostels, particularly those which are used to house young people, are often critically neglected within homeless research (Farrugia 2011; Bantchevska 2008; Lemos and Darkacz 2002; Meade and Slesnick 2002; Eyrich et al., 2003; Wenzel et al., 2012). In response to this gap, this study primarily aims to contribute to the literature by considering and focusing on some of the more distinct aspects of daily hostel life, including themes such as social interactions, management practices, and the relationship between power, control, and resistance. Firstly, however, to establish a more detailed understanding of the experiences and attitudes of the participants as explored later in

this study, it is important to consider the characteristics of both the residents and staff members and the case study hostel itself. Therefore, the central objective of this chapter is to introduce those who participated in this study and provide a description and overview of the environment in which they lived. For illustrative purposes, where possible, authentic photographic images have been captured to provide an accurate representation of the hostel; however, in some instances, where photographs were unable to be obtained, illustrations of floorplans are included to highlight fundamental aspects of the layout and built environment. Although these floorplans aim to be as accurate as possible for the purpose of creating a visualisation of the hostel's design, placement of furniture and use of space, these images should be taken as a general guide rather than an exact representation, as more specific factors such as room measurements have not been accounted for.

The information and descriptions discussed in this chapter reflect a combination of observations gathered during data collection and accounts provided by residents and staff. Due to the nature of the organisation and the degree of sensitive information disclosed in interviews, every effort has been made to anonymise the hostel and ensure confidentiality is maintained for those who participated in this study. To achieve this, the hostel has been given the pseudonym 'Bank Hostel,' which will be used henceforth. Likewise, in the interest of confidentiality and anonymity, pseudonyms have been created for the participants of this research. Finally, it is worth noting that the information provided in this chapter is based on Bank Hostel, its funding, and its policies during the time of the two periods of data collection. As such, whilst it is important to include this information as it is a portrayal of the physical environment in which the participants based their responses, the information contained in this chapter may not be an accurate reflection of the hostel in its current form.

Characteristics of Bank Hostel

Bank Hostel is a 24-hour staffed not-for-profit supported housing project used to temporarily house young people between the ages of 16 and 24, who are experiencing homelessness. As with other supported accommodation schemes, Bank Hostel has a holistic ethos, whereby residents who access the service are provided with both housing and 'wrap-around' practical and emotional support, which aims to prepare them for independent living. Due to its dual purpose, the support element of the package, which is based on a tailored support plan created when a young person becomes a resident, is compulsory and is linked to the provision of their housing. For that reason, a resident must be seen as actively engaging with staff members during their period of homelessness and show a willingness to work through targeted issues to retain their accommodation.

When a young person first arrives at Bank Hostel, they are asked to sign a contract which enters them into a formal agreement to accept the support offered by staff in exchange for shelter. A young person will be prohibited from accessing the service if they do not sign this document, meaning young people tend to have few options other than to agree to the terms outlined, without challenge. Alongside confirming their understanding that their accommodation could be revoked if they do not engage with staff, the contract details other rules and regulations which residents must adhere to, and the progressive warning system followed if they are violated. As the package offered to young people had two individual components, the total weekly rental costs of £250 was the sum of the cost of the accommodation itself and a charge for the support provided. Whilst the housing element of the rental costs is paid by the Local Authority through Housing Benefit, the support element was funded by Supporting People, meaning Bank Hostel was a service subject to funding regulations. Although it is quite unusual for residents to pay their rental costs without the assistance of Housing Benefits due to having a low income, they are liable to pay the hostel an additional fixed £11 per week as a contribution towards utilities which is paid from any income they receive. If residents fall into arrears with this cost, they can in theory be issued an eviction notice; however, the

staff informed me that in practice, residents who are in arrears are given sanctions and only in extreme cases would a young person be evicted for this matter alone.

Bank Hostel was established in 1998 and is situated in a rural Market town of approximately 14,000 residents. Recent statistics have suggested that the town is considered the most deprived area in its County (Welsh Gov 2019), with the County itself being one of the poorest performing parts of the UK in respect of economic activity (ONS 2019). Due to its location, resources are limited, and employment prospects are generally quite poor, with little investment in the area and low economic growth. Combined, these factors often leave young homeless people caught in a net of unemployment, unsuitable housing, and low income, with poor transport links exacerbating the issue further by restricting access to opportunities to gain employment further afield. From a health and social perspective, a lack of adequate transport and limited activities and services available in the area can have a detrimental impact on the mental health of young people experiencing homelessness and can make maintaining social relationships with family and peers difficult whilst living in Bank Hostel.

An Overview of the Design Features of Bank Hostel

Bank Hostel is a large, detached grey building, with a large entrance door overlooked by a Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) system. Clearly distinguished from the other dwellings in the surrounding estate, the building is well-known to the locals as an accommodation for people experiencing homelessness. As can be seen in the below photograph, the hostel is situated towards the rear of a large open car park, with no visual obstructions to the nearby houses or road, meaning residents and visitors entering and leaving the premises are offered little privacy and anonymity.

Situated beside the main entrance are security features such as an intercom system and a doorbell. Upon arriving at the front door of Bank Hostel, the intercom works on the

basic principle of enabling staff to communicate with residents or visitors to confirm their identity prior to gaining access to the building. Other visible security methods include a CCTV system pointed towards the main door, which permits staff to monitor who is entering and leaving the building. When the front door is opened, staff are alerted by a bell in the office, making it easier to check the transmissions of the CCTV systems which are also located in the office.

To the right of the main building, there are two bungalows which form part of Bank Hostel's partial follow-on accommodation. Each bungalow has two bedrooms, a shared living room, a kitchen, bathroom, and small garden. The purpose of these bungalows is to allow residents to experience independent living and hone their skills whilst remaining within the vicinity of the hostel. In a sense, the bungalows provide a 'taster' of independent living and an opportunity for staff members to assess how residents cope with more responsibility and fewer regulations.

In terms of the bungalow rules, although there are still some which must be adhered to, bungalow residents achieve considerably more autonomy than hostel residents, as they are not subjected to curfew restrictions, internal formal surveillance using CCTV apparatus, nor are the windows and doors alarmed to secure entry or exit points. Due to its level of 'freedom' and limited control mechanisms individuals who transition to the bungalows are either deemed by staff to be 'almost' ready to live independently or are considered ready for independent living but are waiting for permanent housing to become available. Despite the flexibility regarding rules, some key aspects of hostel policies still apply to bungalow residents. For instance, the mandatory support element that hostel residents receive continues once a young person moves to a bungalow, meaning they must continue to engage with the service by attending regular key worker meetings and working towards agreed goals in line with their support plan. In addition, bungalow residents are not immune from eviction, warnings, or sanctions, and if staff feel they are not displaying adequate independent living skills, they may be moved back to the main building as a hostel resident. Interestingly, informal discussions with staff

and residents during the data collection period suggested that there was sometimes friction between residents of the main hostel and the bungalow residents as the latter would often still attempt to use the hostel shared facilities, which was a source of tension as hostel residents no longer believed they had a right to use them.

Turning back to the main building, beyond the entrance there is a large hallway with high ceilings, tiled flooring, neutral walls, and a notice board, which displays informational posters concerning upcoming activities, alongside older activity posters which have not yet been removed. The noticeboard has been subjected to graffitiing by residents, most commonly their names and other two- or three-word messages. Staff members explained that graffiti in the hostel is not tolerated and is a sanctionable act, yet this does not deter residents, despite being in a highly visible location. Further CCTV systems are scattered throughout the hallway, leading up to the staircase and pointing towards the outside of the resident bedrooms. The positioning of lighting in the hallway of this floor, as well as the other landings on the first and second floor, are overhead and unlike the living areas, are kept on 24 hours a day. The reason these lights remain on is for health and safety reasons and to ensure there is sufficient light for staff to be able to monitor the CCTV footage from the office at any time.

To the immediate right of the entrance, there is a small table holding a 'sign in' book, which is used to record which residents, visitors and staff are in the building at any one time. Following the table is the opening to the staff space, which includes the general staff office, the manager's office, and the staff kitchen. The remaining rooms on the ground floor consist of three communal living areas, a communal kitchen, a communal laundry room and two resident bedrooms, one of which has facilities to accommodate residents with disabilities. A floorplan of the ground floor can be found below which includes the addition of 'Bedroom 9' - a new bedroom added during the pause in data collection. Its previous purpose was a staff bedroom which staff members would use when working night shifts. 2016 brought about a host of changes, one of which included

staff now being required to work 'waking nights', involving remaining in the office overnight and as such, the staff bedroom was redundant and replaced with a ninth resident bedroom to maximise space.

Figure 1: Ground floor of Bank Hostel



The three communal living areas vary slightly in design and function. Living area 1 is the smallest of the three lounge spaces and according to staff is typically the space utilised least often by residents. The room contains a small television, a two-seater couch, two lounge chairs and a variety of books that span several shelves. Below the shelves, is a small table, which holds a rack of leaflets offering information on various services such as sexual health, mental health, and substance abuse. Although this space is not often used by residents to socialise or relax, it is often used as a location for both informal and formal resident meetings. On this basis, this room was the space where interviews for this study were conducted. Staff were unable to explain why this room was predominately ignored by residents; however, it would be feasible that given the space is used for meetings, residents prefer to separate the area from the areas in which they relax and socialise.

Living area 2 operates as a general living area and could be described as resembling a

typical 'domestic' living room, with a dining table for optional communal dining, a television, a couch, a chair, and a sealed fireplace. The adjacent 'games room,' is an extension built in 2010 containing another television, a games console, a couch, and a pool table. The walls of this newest addition to the hostel space are decorated with large graffiti, which in contrast to the sanctionable graffiti displayed in the hallway of the building, is considered artwork, and stems from a social activity organised for residents. The games room is the only living space with direct access to the outside of the property, with external doors leading into the enclosed garden. As with all external doors around the property, these doors are locked and alarmed by staff after the curfew has passed as a security feature to prevent any unauthorised entries or exits. Since 2007, smoking in public buildings has been prohibited in Wales along with the rest of the UK, therefore, in line with this, Bank Hostel have a designated smoking area for residents at the end of the enclosed garden, along with a policy stating it is the only area where smoking is allowed on the premises. Despite this, residents were regularly seen smoking around the building and most predominantly outside the main entrance, a contentious issue between residents and staff.

Figure 2: Living Area 2



Figure 3: Games Room



The furniture in all living areas has the same design and appears to have been selected due to durability and cost-effectiveness but due to their age, is showing signs of general wear and tear. Lighting levels in each room cannot be manually controlled by residents as the light switch is a simple on/off device, meaning the rooms are either brightly lit by the overhead lights or are completely dark. Similarly, residents have no control over temperature regulation as the heating is regulated by staff from the office space. The walls are neutrally decorated in all living spaces; however, the decor varies slightly in each room, adding an element of individuality and character. Living area 1 features pale yellow walls, decorated with a canvas on one wall and a notice board on another. Living area 2 has magnolia and dark brown walls, with various pieces of wall art, creating a softer and less stark environment. As aforementioned, the aesthetical design of this space appears to be the most apparent attempt at constructing a typical domestic environment, with the inclusion of photograph frames, curtains, and other typical features one would expect of a normal home. However, as with the other communal areas, living area 2 has a distinct lack of any personal belongings of the residents, which highlights the limited ownership of the young people and distracts from the construction of the 'homely' environment sought. There is a distinct absence of any plants or flowers in any of the communal areas, items that are general attributed to enhancing the overall

space and boosting mood and productivity in domestic households. Until the games room extension was built, living area 2 was the communal space that residents used most often to socialize; however, since the extension was finished, both rooms are generally equally as popular. The games room décor includes magnolia walls, with the inclusion of the graffiti art previously mentioned.

There are several internal doors in the living communal spaces (as illustrated in fig. 3). Each of these doors feature large window panels, meaning that others can look into the communal areas and observe the surroundings without needing to make their presence known by opening the door. This feature proved particularly problematic when interviews were being conducted for this study, as other residents would approach the glass panel and attempt to distract the participants by waving or trying to make them laugh. When using the communal areas, these 'windows' offer residents little privacy, particularly in respect of living area 1 used as the primary meeting space and thus an environment where confidential information was routinely shared.

In terms of catering arrangements, the residents of Bank Hostel are required to purchase, store, and prepare all their meals and consequently, the cost of food is not inclusive in their 'rent' or payment for 'utilities' to the hostel. The kitchen not unlike other areas of the hostel appears to attempt to balance the aesthetics of a homely space with institutional-like health and safety regulations, with warning signs attached to the walls, and a fire extinguisher and fire blanket within view. In contrast to the other communal areas, however, this attempt appears futile, with the balance markedly tilted towards an institutional space rather than a domestic kitchen. In this sense, it is perhaps arguably the most institutional appearing room in the building which is exclusively 'resident space,' due to its well-worn condition and broken cupboards and equipment. The light blue walls exemplify a 'cold,' neglected, and impersonal feeling and appears almost clinical. Residents are often warned not to store personal food in this room due to the risk of theft, therefore the food cupboards are usually empty, with residents

opting to store their food in their private bedrooms, where they have their own refrigerator. An image of the kitchen can be seen below.

Figure 4: The Kitchen



Adjacent to the kitchen, to the left of the sink in the image above, is the communal laundry area, which contains two washing machines and a large tumble dryer, for residents to wash and dry their clothing. The final three rooms on the ground floor include two resident bedrooms, which generally consist of a single bed, a wardrobe, a chest of drawers, a bedside table, a chair, and an en-suite bathroom, which has a shower, a toilet, and a washbasin, offering significantly more privacy to residents than many other homeless hostels with shared facilities. Finally, there is a bathroom for visitors and staff that residents are not permitted to use.

Although the size and design of the bedrooms vary, they are all neutrally decorated and contain the same hard-wearing blue carpet that is featured in the communal living areas. Residents are permitted to decorate their bedrooms with noticeboards and picture frames to personalise their space; however, residents are not permitted to paint their bedrooms or make any permanent changes to the room, limiting the extent of creating a sense of ownership. Although televisions are not supplied for bedrooms by staff, in theory, residents can bring or buy their own, in practice however, this is a rare

occurrence due to a combination of factors and issues with acquiring a Television Licence. While residents have sole control of the lighting in their bedroom, they have no control over the light that enters their space from the hallway, where the overhead lights remain turned on permanently, flooding light into the bedroom, meaning resident rooms are never completely dark. In the past, the windows were fitted with small alarms, meaning if the window was opened beyond a certain point, the staff would be notified; however, this process was replaced shortly before data collection with a small bar installed across each window physically preventing residents from opening them more than one inch, meaning very little fresh air could circulate, restricting residents ability to regulate the temperature of their bedroom. An image of a typical resident bedroom can be seen below.

Figure 5: Typical Resident Bedroom



Comparable with the rationale behind the locking and alarming of doors overnight, the objective of the window bars was to prevent residents or any other individual from

leaving or entering the building secretly. Resident bedrooms (and the communal bathroom) are the only resident spaces that do not contain CCTV providing an element of privacy and sanctuary for the young people. Each bedroom door can be locked for security and protection purposes and residents are provided with a key. Staff members have master keys to all bedrooms which enables them to enter the room in an emergency or during weekly room inspections.

The first floor of the hostel contains two resident bedrooms, with the second floor incorporating the final five bedrooms. In addition, the second floor has a communal bathroom, which is the only bathroom in the hostel to contain a bath. This room remains locked when not in use and if residents wish to use this space, they must seek permission from staff to unlock the room, although it is seldom used. Floorplans illustrating the positioning of the bedrooms on the second and third floor can be seen below.

Figure 6: 1st Floor of the Hostel



Figure 7: 2nd Floor of the Hostel



Design of Staff Space

Typically, the main door separating the staff areas from the rest of the hostel is kept open, with the door to the central office itself kept closed to maintain an element of privacy. When first entering the staff space, there is a small waiting area, where residents or other guests stand and wait to be greeted. To the right, is the general office, where staff members conduct their day-to-day work and activities. The office contains four desks, a variety of filing cabinets and several monitors which transmit live CCTV footage around the hostel. The positioning of the desks leaves a large open space in the centre of the office, which maximises visibility of those who enter and mean that staff members can engage with them without having to move from their seat. Towards the rear of the staff office is the staff kitchen, which is significantly smaller that of the residents, but considerably more modern, due to the extension being a relatively new feature. A more detailed floorplan of the staff office illustrating the above descriptions can be seen below.

Figure 8: Staff Office



As shown above, the only real change of significance between the two interview phrases, was the re-location of the manager's office. In 2015, the office was adjacent to the waiting area and the general staff office, with a large transparent internal window and door, maintaining a high degree of two-way visibility. Affixed to the outside of the door was a poster, which highlighted set drop-in times of the week, where the manager operated an open-door policy and residents were invited to engage in general conversation or raise grievances if necessary.

Upon her appointment, the 2016 manager relocated her office to the rear of the general staff office, where residents were prohibited from entering. What was once the 2015 manager's office was then transformed into an office for the floating support worker, a member of staff tasked with supporting the young people after they transition to independent living. This member of staff had previously been based in another office, amongst general administrators of the project and other workers.

Funding Cuts to the Organisation

As noted, the organisation that manages the hostel oversees several other housing-

related projects. Although Bank Hostel specifically caters for those aged between 16 and 24, the diverse range of other projects provides homeless prevention services to both young people and older adults. The total income for the organization is derived from a combination of sources. The Supporting People funding makes up roughly 40% of the organisation's financial income, with The Government's 108 funding stream (specifically for mediation and Night Stop) making up 38%. The remainder of the income comes from grants and one-off donations (Bank Hostel Website 2018). At the time of the 2015 interview phase, the organisation, like many others, was experiencing financial constraints as they had been subjected to a reduction in funding, because of cuts to the Section 180 Homeless Prevention Grant and the Supporting People Program; however, the financial cutbacks were still in its infant phase, with the effects not yet experienced. These funding cuts resulted in the total income being reduced by over £40,000 in 2014/2015 (Bank Hostel 2018) and consequently, the organisation sought to re-structure their projects to make financial savings. One of the primary attempts at reducing expenditure was to review and make changes to both staffing structure and levels, thereby creating a domino effect which had detrimental impacts on residents and staff members.

Although funding cuts came into effect in 2014, the full extent of the impact of the subsequent structuring changes was not experienced until the beginning of 2016. Between the 2015 phase of data collection and the 2016 phase, the organisation reduced staff salary, and sick pay and introduced 'waking nights', which entailed staff members working during their night shift rather than sleeping, as they had done previously.

Resident Characteristics

As can be seen in the chapter 'Study in Context,' a vast amount of previous research focusing on homelessness has been cross-sectional in nature, meaning that data has

been gathered at one point in time. Cross-sectional studies are popular in research, particularly in social science when analysing social behaviour (Davies 1994) but do not provide the opportunity to measure the effects of social change (Ruspini 2002). This study takes a longitudinal approach as it aims to capture the effects of social change between the two data collection periods. The first collection phase occurred in early 2015, with interviews conducted with five participants who were residents and the hostel manager. The second collection phase took place in 2016 and included interviews with five other residents, three staff members and the new hostel manager. A full description of the data collection process can be found in the method chapter of this study. The characteristics and descriptions provided in the remainder of this chapter do not cover reasons for leaving the family home, or the familial relationship itself in any depth, as this information is better placed in Chapter 5 'Care and Making a Home', where the social relationships and social networks of the participants outside of the hostel sphere are considered in detail for the purpose of gaining a deeper understanding of the social worlds of the young people.

When the interviews commenced, all the young people except one were residents of the hostel. The only participant that was not a current resident, Colin, who was a member of the 2015 group, had recently been evicted, meaning that he was living in a nearby Bed and Breakfast. He maintained regular contact with the hostel, including bi-weekly support sessions and was on the waiting list to return as a resident. Due to his previous status as a hostel resident, his ongoing close contact with the hostel and his expectation to resume his position in the hostel sometime soon, Colin was included as a participant in the study and from this point will be considered a current resident during discussions. While it is unknown if this participant returned as a resident after the interview, he was not a resident when the 2016 interviews were conducted, meaning that he either did not return to the hostel as expected, or he did return and departed again before the commencement of the next phase of data collection.

As the Bank Hostel supports those between the ages of 16 and 24, all resident participants met this criterion, although the actual ages of participants varied. The 2015 phase group had an average age of 19 and included both the youngest (17 years old) and the oldest (24 years old) participants of the resident research population. The average age of residents in the 2016 interview group was 20, with the youngest participant aged 18 and the oldest aged 23. The table below provides an outline of the additional key characteristics of the participants:

Table 1: Participant Characteristics

Name	Gender	Age	Housing situation at the time of interview	Length of time living in the hostel	Year group
Simon	Male	19	Living in hostel	Five months	2015
Lucy	Female	17	Living in bungalow	Thirteen months	2015
Pete	Male	24	Living in hostel	Two months	2015
Colin	Male	20	Living in B&B	n/a	2015
Ed	Male	18	Living in hostel	Five months	2015
Richard	Male	20	Living in hostel	Nine months	2016
Steve	Male	21	Living in hostel	Four months	2016
James	Male	21	Living in hostel	Five months	2016
Chloe	Female	18	Living in hostel	Two months	2016
Amelia	Female	23	Living in hostel	Fifteen months	2016

To meet the criteria for becoming a participant, each resident was required to have been accessing support at the hostel for a minimum of one month. Ensuring that participants were able to meet this standard allowed for detailed accounts and descriptive experiences in the interviews. The specific length of time everyone had been a resident

varied considerably, with the young person who had been a resident the longest and the person who had been a resident the least amount of time both being members of the 2016 group (fifteen months and two months respectively).

It transpired during the data collection process that several residents from both groups were 'repeat residents,' meaning that this was not their first experience in the hostel, as they had transitioned to independent living in the past but had returned for a variety of reasons. Of the total ten residents interviewed, five had previously been residents at the hostel and had moved on to independent living or the hostel bungalows but later returned. Below is a table briefly summarising some of the reasons behind this:

Table 2: Repeat Hostel Residents

Name	Interview group	Number of experiences as a resident in the main hostel	Type of transition	Reason disclosed for returning to the hostel
Pete	2015	2	Transitioned to independent living	Difficulties with neighbours, which he found difficult to manage.
Simon	2015	2	Transitioned to hostel bungalow	Too much independence led to increased drinking and a desire to return to the hostel
Lucy	2015	2	Transitioned to hostel Bungalow	Loneliness and depression resulted in a lack of self-care
Steve	2016	2	Transitioned to independent living	Too many parties led to the tenancy being terminated

James	2016	2	Transitioned to independent living	Too many parties led to the tenancy being terminated
-------	------	---	------------------------------------	--

Ed, a 2015 phase resident did not disclose in his interview that he was a repeat resident; however, in 2016, a staff member explained that he was a repeat resident at the time of the 2015 interviews and had transitioned out of homelessness and back to the hostel again shortly before the 2016 interviews commenced, meaning that at the time of his interview in 2015, he had been a resident at least twice and at least three times by 2016. However, as he did not personally disclose this information during his interview, he has not been included in the table above.

As illustrated in the above table, only one resident, Pete, from the 2015 group, returned to the hostel as a resident for his own safety, compared to the others who were evicted from their accommodation. Staff had become concerned regarding Pete's welfare as he was struggling to manage his difficult neighbours and was becoming increasingly withdrawn. The situation was assessed, and Pete was offered the opportunity to return to the hostel. Steve and James, from the 2016 group had previously spent time as residents before transitioning to independent living; however, they were unable to maintain these tenancies and were subsequently evicted and moved back to the main hostel. Both participants reflected in their interviews that due to their behaviour, their evictions were inevitable and deserved. Reasons behind the evictions were similar for each of these participants: too many late-night parties, anti-social behaviour and in one case, 'smashing up the flat.'

Simon and Lucy from the 2015 group were the only participants who had spent a period living in the bungalows before being 'evicted' and transferred back to the hostel. For both residents, it was the decision of the staff rather than the residents to transfer back to the hostel, because of a perceived inability to manage independent living. Shortly

before data collection, Lucy had secured a place in the bungalow and was living there for a second time.

It is well acknowledged by academics that mental health, substance misuse and alcohol abuse issues are widespread among the homeless population (McGrath 2007, Collins 2009). Therefore, unsurprisingly, the majority of resident reported issues with mental health, and some regarded themselves as having an issue with alcohol or substance abuse. Before moving to discuss these issues in more depth, below is a table that briefly presents the issues and behaviours residents disclosed in their interviews. Notably, due to the sensitive nature of the topic, it is entirely feasible that residents did not divulge the entirety of their personal issues, and in addition, how residents perceived their personal drug and alcohol usage had a role to play in their perception of dependency. Therefore, this table should be taken as a general guide for the purpose of these findings and not necessarily representative of the full picture.

Table 3: Identified Issues and Behaviours

Name	Year group	Mental health issues	Substance misuse	Alcohol dependency
Pete	2015	Obsessive Compulsive Disorder and Anxiety	No	No
Ed	2015	Depression	No	No
Lucy	2015	Depression	No	No
Simon	2015	No	No	No
Colin	2015	Severe anger issues	Yes	No
Steve	2016	No	Yes	No

Richard	2016	No	Yes	No
Amelia	2016	Depression	Yes	Yes
Chloe	2016	Depression/suicidal tendencies	Yes	No
James	2016	No	Yes	Yes

Two residents identified that they had issues with alcohol dependency. James believed that his alcohol issues were currently well-managed to an extent; however, he recognised that he could quickly become aggressive and violent when he did consume alcohol. Amelia, on the other hand, had an ongoing battle with alcohol dependency, citing that she would consume alcohol to an excess, daily. Although she received support from hostel staff for her addiction, which had improved since becoming a resident, the issues remained ongoing, nonetheless. Regarding substance misuse, most residents admitted that they consumed illegal substances, mainly cannabis, on either a daily or weekly basis.

As noted, while some residents acknowledged that they regularly consumed illegal substances, they did not always consider it an 'issue' as such. In particular, the use of cannabis was generally downplayed and was deemed 'not a real drug,' therefore residents who admitted that they use cannabis did not believe that they had a dependency, nor that there were any problematic effects of using the substance. Only one resident from both year groups, Chloe, recognised that her substance misuse was a problem, with all other residents regarding substance consumption as normal behaviour for an individual of their age.

No residents were employed or in education at the time of the interview; however, Lucy, from the 2015 group, was awaiting a response from an electrical firm regarding an apprenticeship. Despite none of the participants being in education or employment, there were some residents living in the hostel in 2015 and 2016 who were in either

education or employment, or in some cases, both. These residents were offered an opportunity to take part in the study; however, scheduling conflicts meant that they were unable to attend pre-interview sessions. Residents described how it was difficult for them to secure a position and advance in employment whilst living at the hostel, as their rent paid through Housing Benefits would be either partially reduced or stopped completely if they were to earn over a certain amount of income per week. Given the minimal employment prospects and low wages in the area, this proved problematic for many residents, who would not earn enough to make it worthwhile working whilst simultaneously paying high rental costs to remain in Bank Hostel, thus deterring them from seeking employment.

Staff Characteristics

Considerably fewer personal data was obtained relating to staff characteristics; however, all staff members interviewed were female, which is not atypical of the staff population of the hostel. During the data collection phases, only one male staff member was encountered during my visits and was due to be interviewed for this study; however, he resigned from his position before his interview was conducted. Both managers interviewed possessed a university undergraduate degree, although none of the other staff interviewed had any formal qualifications. The table below depicts some of the characteristics of the staff participants, again to ensure anonymity and confidentiality, pseudonyms have been used.

Table 4: Staff Characteristics

Name	Gender	Position	Length of time as a staff member
Claire	Female	Current Manager	Four months
Susie	Female	Previous Manager	Five years
Amanda	Female	Floating Support	Nine years

		worker	
Laura	Female	Key worker	Seven years
Sophie	Female	Key worker	Eight years

Pen Portraits

One of the objectives of this chapter was to provide an in-depth description of Bank Hostel including its design and rules to set the scene and create context and a point of reference for the upcoming discussion of findings. The second objective of this chapter was to provide information concerning the characteristics of the participants of this study. Therefore, to expand on the information already outlined in this chapter, the final section of the chapter includes brief pen portraits of the residents and their diverse experiences from becoming homeless to moving into Bank Hostel, with the experience leading up to the point of homelessness being explored in greater depth in the forthcoming chapter. The pen portraits are not intended to be an incredibly detailed account of the experiences and issues encompassing the participants' lives, but through a brief summary of their contextual background, we can introduce the young people and gain a better understanding of their demographic factors, their experience becoming homeless, their employment status and other information.

Ed

Ed was a nineteen-year-old male, who had been living at the hostel for five months at the time of the interview in 2015. Having first experienced homelessness aged eighteen, he described how frequent arguments with his mother and his mother's partner had led to him leaving the family home of his own accord. There was a long history of conflict between him and his mother's partner, who was abusive towards not only him, but his mother too. Due to his disdain for this person, he did not refer to this male as his 'stepfather' at any point, choosing to label him 'her boyfriend,' when discussing this

individual in the interview. He described how he had once felt a sense of relief when he and his mother relocated to avoid her partner a few years ago but he was left dismayed and disappointed when she allowed her partner to join them again shortly after. Prior to moving into the hostel, Ed had stayed between a few family members for a brief time, although this was strained as his social relationship with them was weak. He had attempted to contact his biological father to notify him of his homelessness but was unable to stay with him as it would affect the 25% discount his father received on his Council Tax as a single occupant of his address. Ed identified having elevated levels of depression and anxiety, yet he discussed how his mental health issues were present before becoming homeless and were not an effect of or exacerbated by his current living conditions. Ed noted how he struggled to control his mental health and felt that it fundamentally impacted his daily life, creating barriers to employment, education, and training.

Simon

Simon was an eighteen-year-old male, who had been living at the hostel for five months prior to his interview. This was his first experience of homelessness, having previously lived with his mother and younger brothers; however, he was one of two participants who was moved to the hostel from the adjoining bungalows, as he struggled to live independently. Simon had no contact with his biological father, having not seen him since he was three years old, he stated that many of the arguments between him and his mother throughout the years stemmed from him feeling 'left out' as he had a different father to his younger siblings and did not feel that he belonged in the family home, despite not having a particularly poor relationship with his then stepfather. Simon was the only participant from both year groups who reported no mental health, alcohol, or illegal substance issues. Although he was seeking employment at the time of the interview, he described how he was unable to find a job in the area as there were few opportunities available. Simon was in a committed relationship and regularly spent time away from the hostel with his partner, who lived with her mother.

Lucy

Lucy was a seventeen-year-old female and the only participant that had previously spent time in care. Craving autonomy from an incredibly early age resulted in Lucy befriending older individuals and experimenting with a wide variety of illegal substances. Between the ages of twelve and sixteen, Lucy had been unable to find a stable foster home and described how she would constantly be moved from one place to another, meaning she never had the opportunity to feel secure in her accommodation. At the age of sixteen, social workers moved Lucy into the hostel, where she had remained since. Shortly after becoming a resident, the hostel staff decided that Lucy was displaying strong independent living skills and thus, she was moved to the adjoining bungalows; however, this living situation was difficult for Lucy, who suffered from mental health issues, resulting in her residing at the bungalow for only a few weeks before being moved back into the main hostel. As outlined above, Lucy did have a history of taking illegal substances for social purposes but was abstaining since moving into the hostel. Although not currently employed, Lucy was eagerly waiting to hear whether her application for an apprenticeship as an electrician had been successful and was aiming to transition to independent living in the next six months.

Pete

Pete was a twenty-four-year-old male and the oldest participant in the study. Although he had been a resident for only two months at the time of the interview, he had previously spent time as a resident at the hostel before transitioning to independent living five months prior. Due to mental health issues, Pete struggled to live independently and manage day-to-day tasks. Staff conveyed how they were already considering moving Pete back to the hostel before an incident occurred between Pete and his neighbours, resulting in the neighbours becoming aggressive and displaying threatening behaviour. The decision was then made to transfer him back to the hostel. Pete had no issues with substance misuse or alcohol; however, as noted he suffered

from mental health issues including obsessive-compulsive disorder, depression, and anxiety. He described how his mental health interfered with his day-to-day life and affected his ability to form social relationships. The only participant with a university degree, he was not in employment, education, or training at the time of the interview but did aspire to be a private detective and was using his time within the hostel to research this career path. Pete was approaching 25 years old at the time of the interview and was feeling anxious about where he would live once he no longer met the age criteria for the hostel. He disclosed that he had managed to save a few hundred pounds and was planning to move to Scotland to begin a new life when eventually made to leave Bank Hostel.

Colin

Colin was a twenty-year-old male from the 2015 phase of interviews and the only resident who was not living in the hostel accommodation at the time of the interview (aside from Lucy, who was living in the adjoining bungalow but still on the premises). Colin initially spent six months as a resident, after becoming homeless aged nineteen due to several violent altercations with his stepfather. He described how his life had been plagued with severe anger issues, which he had unsuccessfully sought help for in the past. Colin admitted to selling illegal substances to make ends meet in the past but typically avoided consuming substances himself. His eviction and current housing position in a bed and breakfast meant he was consuming cannabis regularly, to combat boredom, he knew this behaviour was problematic but found it difficult to cope with being housed in the Bed & Breakfast without some form of outlet.

James

James was a twenty-one-year-old male who had been living at the hostel for five months at the time of the interview. Like other participants, this was not his first experience of homelessness or being a resident at the hostel, having previously lived there in 2013, at age eighteen. James had his first experience of homelessness at age fifteen after

frequent conflict with his mother in his family home led to him being asked to leave. Between the age of fifteen and first moving into the hostel aged eighteen, James lived between friends and various family members. Shortly after transitioning from the hostel to independent living in 2015, James began struggling to cope with the pressures and loneliness of independent living. To combat these feelings of isolation and loneliness, he arranged parties in his flat for his friends and acquaintances, some of which would last for days at a time. The parties and heavy substance use culminated in James destroying his flat, which saw him promptly evicted. Following this, a friend had agreed that he could sleep on his sofa temporarily; however, these conditions were not ideal and after several arguments, James was asked to leave. With few other places to turn, James spent a short period of time street homeless, before referring himself back to the hostel. He described how he abstained from alcohol consumption as he would often exhibit aggressive behaviour towards others when under the influence, directly impacting several of his social relationships with peers and family.

Richard

Richard was a twenty-one-year-old male who had been living at the hostel for nine months prior to his interview. Richard had been homeless since the age of fourteen when he was asked to leave the family home after frequent arguments with his mother. Between the ages of fourteen and twenty-one, Richard lived between family and friends after spending several years living with his maternal grandmother; however, his mother continued to have more children after he left home and these younger children eventually moved to live with their grandmother too, meaning there was no longer room for Richard. After running out of options and friends to stay with, Richard became a hostel resident at the age of twenty. He was not in employment, education, or training at the time of the interview and was not seeking any opportunities, although he did express that he wished to find employment in the future as he wanted to begin to settle down and get his life 'straightened out.'

Steve

Steve was a twenty-year-old resident who had been living at the hostel for four months at the time of the interview. Steve had a long history of homelessness, having first become homeless at the age of thirteen due to constant arguments with his mother. Throughout his teenage years, Steve moved back and forth from his family home to homelessness, before finally moving into the hostel for the first time when he was eighteen. During this first experience, Steve had been a resident for a little over twelve months before transitioning to independent living, which he admitted was a struggle. After approximately six months of living independently, he was evicted from his flat due to loud and drug-fuelled house parties. Once evicted, he was able to secure a place at the hostel as he did not want to return to his family home, although he stated that was an option. No mental health or alcohol dependency issues were reported, although he did highlight that he smoked cannabis daily with participants Richard and James, who were his closest friends in the hostel.

Amelia

Amelia was a twenty-three-year-old female and had been a resident for a total of fifteen months. Although Amelia was officially a resident in the 2015 data collection phase, she was not interviewed as she was at a residential rehabilitation centre, receiving support for alcohol abuse at the time. Of all the participants, she was the most reluctant to discuss her childhood and experiences leading up to homelessness; however, what was conveyed was that her mother had died at a young age and her father was extremely abusive, resulting in her leaving home and moving into the hostel. As outlined above, Amelia described herself as having an alcohol dependency and would consume large quantities of alcohol most days. In addition, Amelia would regularly consume illegal substances, such as cocaine with other residents during 'parties' in the private bedrooms. Amelia appeared to have a good bond with the resident Chloe and would socialise with Steve, James, and Richard on occasion.

Chloe

Chloe was an eighteen-year-old female. Having only been a resident for two months at the time of the interview, Chloe had the least experience in Bank Hostel. She was the only resident that had lived with both biological parents since birth; however, her relationship with her father was poor due to verbal and physical abuse from a young age. While her mother had never actively abused her, she had allowed the abuse to continue, thus impacting her relationship with Chloe as she became older. After repeated suicide attempts, Chloe's already strained relationship with her parents worsened as they struggled to manage her ongoing mental health issues. At the age of eighteen, her parents asked her to move out of the home and following this, she spent a week living with other family before moving into the hostel. Mental illness continued to be a prominent issue for Chloe, whose suicide attempts had continued since becoming a resident. This was being managed by staff members, but Chloe had been warned she was close to being deemed 'high risk' which would compromise her position in the hostel.

Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to provide some background information on the case study hostel for context. The chapter provides information relating to the organization, including its aims, ethos, and history, before describing the visual characteristics of Bank Hostel using images and floorplans to help construct a mental image of the environment. The chapter then included a brief overview of the characteristics of the participants in this study before concluding with some pen portraits of the residents, to help the reader become more informed of the background and situation of those involved in the research. This chapter concludes Part Two of this thesis. The final section is Part Three and will present the findings of this research through an application of the various theoretical and empirical studies outlined in Part Two.

Part Three:

Care and Control in Bank Hostel: Resident and Staff Perspectives

The primary objectives of the following three chapters are to present the key findings of this study and examine their meaning through a symbolic interactionist perspective and within the context of the wider existing theories and research explored in Chapters Two, Three and Four. To provide a full account of the social and cultural systems embedded in Bank Hostel and how they are interwoven and can influence behaviour, the following

chapters bring together the voices of the residents, staff and hostel management over approximately seventeen months.

An examination of the relevant academic literature as detailed in Chapters Two, Three and Four demonstrated that whilst some studies explore certain individual elements of hostels for young homeless people (McGrath and Pistrang 2007; Armaline 2005; Stone 2010), the vast majority fail to explore the hostel in its entirety, through studying the different perspectives of the groups within and the various power relations and socio-spatial factors which can either help contribute to a shaping positive social environment or conversely, hinder it. The lack of research in these areas means that we rarely have an opportunity to consider the intricate elements of hostels and reflect on how their practices, policies and even design can feed into the wider social atmosphere and experiences of both young homeless people and staff members. As a reminder, the research questions considered in this study were as follows:

- (1) What role do social relationships play in a young person's experience of homelessness?
- (2) How do hostel staff exert power and control and how do these methods impact the social atmosphere and level of rule adherence?
- (3) How does the use of space in the hostel affect the social relationship dynamics of residents?
- (4) What impact does social change have on residents and staff in the hostel environment?

As noted within Chapter Six of this thesis, Bank Hostel experienced significant social change during data collection which resulted in a pause in the research and a fundamental shift in hostel policies and provision. The following finding chapters aim to document and explore some of the reasons behind those social changes and examine how they influenced the cultures, relationships and behaviours within the environment.

To capture this, the findings presented in Chapters Eight, Nine and Ten, although interconnected, have been structured in a way to highlight the core themes underpinning the environment throughout the change, that is care and welfare versus power and control. Other prominent themes concerning social relationships and interactions alongside how they influenced the wider environment are interwoven throughout each chapter and help to explain and understand some of the behaviours and actions of residents, staff and management.

Chapter Eight is primarily structured around the data collected before the social changes, where notions of positive staff-resident social relationships, interactions and positive reinforcement were used alongside the effective use of space as means of social control. The construction of social relationships is discussed along with residents' use of hostel space, including communal areas and the staff office. The chapter also considers ways in which young people attempted to create a sense of home and belonging through informal social interactions and developing a community-based culture. Therefore, Chapter Eight is aptly titled 'Care and Making a Home' and examines the hostel through the lens of a place predominantly of *care*.

Chapter Nine, 'Power and Control' documents the changes in the environment following the pause in data collection mainly caused by the new hostel rules and policies. These changes included the appointment of a new hostel manager, who implemented more stringent control methods and disciplinary techniques (Foucault 1977) such as restrictions on resident use of space, an increase in formal surveillance and the administration of sanctions to those residents who did not adhere to hostel rules. This chapter, therefore, contrasts the first, as it examines the hostel as a space more of *control*, where social relationships were replaced with hard power techniques (Crewe 2011; 2013) in an attempt to achieve compliance and establish a routine in the lives of the residents. The chapter also considers how residents responded to the social changes

and in particular, how they responded to the shift in power dynamics and the loss of control over their lives. Responses centre around how some residents used resistance as a mechanism to cope and garner counter-power in the environment, but the chapter also documents the breakdown in the staff-resident relationships and how this aspect influenced the wider social system.

Chapter Ten is the final findings chapter and is titled 'The Staff Experience'. Unlike the preceding two findings chapters, this chapter aims to provide a different perspective, that of the staff of Bank Hostel. Although the chapter provides insight into how staff experienced the changes in the environment themselves, it also explores the staff role and fundamental issues more widely. For example, it discusses how issues inherent in the role can lead to stress and pressure, which in turn impacts staff morale, wellbeing, self-legitimacy and team identity.

Chapter Eight:

Care and Making a Home

Following on from the above, this chapter 'Care and Making a Home' unpicks the complexities and importance of social relationships in hostel settings and describes how they are constructed through regular positive social interactions both within formal and informal spaces. The chapter examines methods of social control used in the environment and how rules were implemented by hostel management in a manner which focused on the concepts of communication and reciprocal trust, which in turn

enhanced compliance. The discussion of findings that follows is therefore organised and structured into sub-sections, or 'themes' which emerged from the data collection, and primarily reports the analysis from the data collected before the pause and prior to the social changes. The chapter begins by expanding on the key demographics outlined in the Methodology Chapter detailing the residents' pathways to homelessness before providing a brief examination of their social networks outside of the hostel environment. Next, the chapter looks more specifically at the hostel pre-changes in the environment and explores the social relationships between residents and staff, including how they were fostered through positive informal interactions and caring relations. Finally, the chapter discusses the control strategies used by management to gain compliance in the hostel and how residents responded to these methods.

Pathways to Homelessness and Social Networks Outside of the Hostel

The main reasons stated by residents for becoming homeless were not atypical from those acknowledged in other studies exploring youth homelessness (Homeless Link 2014; Crisis 2012; Centrepont 2010; Tavecchio and Thomeer 1997; Monfort 2009, Heineman 2010; O'Grady and Gaetz 2009), with family breakdown routinely stated as a leading cause of their homelessness. Similarly, as supported by other studies (Buchanan et al., 2010) the family breakdowns were not due to isolated incidents but were generally the result of a culmination of events, and were combined with a myriad of other issues, with several residents reporting periods of drifting between homelessness and returning to their family home throughout their adolescence. Despite findings by Monfort (2009) stating that the social relationship between young homeless people and their families tends to improve once the young person has left the family home, the findings of this study suggest that it was more common for the young people to have sporadic contact with their family once they became homeless, with limited to no parental emotional or practical support. Consequently, the relationship between residents and their parents, once they left the family home for the most part, was

characteristically unstable, meaning the young people were often void of a safety net or familial support network outside of the hostel, leaving them in a significantly more vulnerable position than their housed peers.

Brief summaries of the resident's experiences of becoming homeless are outlined in the table below.

Table 5: Residents Pathways to Homelessness

Participant	Parent/guardian	Reason for homelessness	Ongoing contact with parent	Method of contact
Pete, Group A	Mother and stepfather, no contact with biological father.	Poor social relationship and conflict with stepfather. Mother and stepfather refused to accept his mental health issues (OCD). Asked to leave the home.	Intermittent	Mainly messaging with some face-to-face contact
Ed, Group A	Mother and stepfather, no contact with biological father	Poor relationship and conflict with stepfather. Asked to leave the home	Intermittent	Mainly messaging and telephone calls, with some face-to-face contact
Lucy, Group A	Mother and stepfather, no contact with biological father.	Became a resident directly from the care of the Local Authority aged 16.	Yes	'Regular' face-to-face contact every couple of weeks both within the

	Entered the care system aged 12			family home and in other settings
Simon, Group A	Mother and stepfather, no contact with biological father.	Family home was over-crowded with new siblings leading to arguments. Asked to leave the home	Yes	'Regular' face-to-face contact usually once a week both within the family home and in other settings
Colin, Group A	Mother and stepfather. Biological father lived abroad until his death, therefore limited contact.	Poor relationship and conflict with stepfather. Asked to leave the home	No	n/a
Steve, Group B	Mother, no contact with biological father	Arguments with mother. Asked to leave the home	No	n/a
Richard, Group B	Mother, no contact with father	Arguments with mother led to him leaving the family home and sofa surfing, eventually running out of options, and becoming formally homeless.	Intermittent	Very limited contact, usually by telephone or messaging with some face-to-face contact which was irregular

James, Group B	Mother and stepfather, no contact with biological father	Arguments led to him choosing to leave the family home.	No	n/a
Amelia, Group B	Father, mother deceased.	Poor relationship with father. Asked to leave the home	No	n/a
Chloe, Group B	Biological mother and father	Parents unable to manage her mental health needs. Asked to leave the home	Yes	Limited telephone contact

As Table 5 shows, among the study population, the majority were either raised by their mother alone or by their mother and stepfather. Only one participant was raised by both her biological parents and one participant was raised by only her biological father. Whilst it is accepted that the study sample of this research is too small to make generalisations, it would appear separated or divorced biological families were overrepresented amongst participants, suggesting a potential risk factor for youth homelessness, a concept which has previously been noted in other studies (Tavecchio and Thomeer 1997). Like the findings of Heineman (2010), Monfort (2009) and Tavecchio and Thomeer (1997) which focus on the attachment issues of young homeless people, themes of insecure attachment since childhood were a pervasive feature in the interviews with residents. During discussions concerning relationships and childhood, several participants commented that they felt 'unwanted' and 'let down' by their parent(s) during childhood and adolescence, with most residents noting the necessity of learning to be independent at a young age as they needed to look after not only themselves but in many cases, their younger siblings. In the main, residents had no contact with their biological fathers and mostly described their mothers as emotionally

unavailable and unreliable during their childhood. The following brief excerpts from resident interviews discussing their mothers illustrate this:

She used to go out a lot, so I just used to do what I wanted. I can clearly remember being out with my mates about seven years old and stealing my mum's fags to smoke. I'm sure she knew but she didn't care.

Colin, Group A

When I was younger, she didn't really care about me or act like a mother. Then as soon as I turned about 12, she started treating me like a kid and telling me what to do all the time.

James, Group B

The above conveys general feelings of parental neglect and feelings of mothers 'not caring' enough. These initial feelings of rejection from an early age, later evolved into a source of friction in the family home once the young person was older and had gained a certain level of independence. Notably, it was the arrival of a stepfather which often led to escalating conflict, as several residents recounted several instances where they felt disregarded and betrayed when their mother 'chose' the side of their stepfather during arguments. Male residents took issue with no longer being 'the man of the house' and described feelings of being emotionally rejected or cast aside as the result of the new relationship. In many cases, a particularly volatile argument between the young person and their stepfather had been the final event that led to them being asked to leave. For this reason, residents often felt they had been 'pushed out' of the family in favour of the

stepfather, meaning once they became homeless, they were hesitant to maintain contact as they felt as though they had been replaced, or had 'lost' the battle. Re-establishing and re-building social relationships between residents and their mothers was a challenging task for many, as the rejection meant they would refuse to return to the family home to visit, no longer seeing it as their 'home' but that as their mother's new family, adding further strain to the relationship. It is perhaps for this reason that some residents continued contact, but only one described having a quality relationship with their parent, in the sense of the parent being a resource for positive emotional and practical support.

Monfort (2009), who researched the family life of young homeless people, found that those who had been a resident of a hostel for less than a month were less likely to have contact with their family as the relationship had not yet had time to be repaired and re-established. Although the sample in the current study is too small to support or refute this argument, interestingly, the sole resident who referred to having a close, supportive, and healthy relationship with her parent was the only resident who had been in care prior to homelessness, meaning she had been separated from her mother for four years, allowing time for the relationship to be re-established. Whilst on the surface this may provide some limited support to the notion that longer separations can lead to an increased probability of repairing the family relationship (Monfort 2009), it contrasts further findings of Monfort's (2009) study, where care leavers were distinguished as having a more complicated relationship with family and were identified as being more likely to rely on peers for closeness and support.

Social Relationships with Housed Peers

Residents had a diverse range of responses concerning relationships with peers outside the hostel both before and during their period of homelessness. The majority could identify at least a handful of individuals with whom they shared a close relationship with

pre-homelessness, and for the most part, these relationships continued once they became a resident, albeit face-to-face contact tended to diminish quite rapidly as they formed new friendships with other residents. Conversely, those who were devoid of a social group of friends prior to homelessness, often remained this way during their time in Bank Hostel and were significantly less likely to form relationships with other residents, preferring the company and support of staff members. Not only was this true of the young people who participated in this study, but staff members stated in their own interviews that it was the norm for residents with limited social networks to rely more heavily on staff for their social needs and support. As Amanda said,

A lot of young people just don't have that safety net. They don't have many friends to lean on and they don't always want to mix with the other residents. Quite often that means they want to spend more time with us, or they want to come to the office and chat and talk about their day. That's ok and it's their decision but it's not always healthy and we do try and encourage them to mix with the others and make friends outside these walls, because there is only so much support staff can provide, and we aren't here forever.

Amanda, Staff Member

This notion echoes Tabner's (2013) understanding of relationships amongst homeless youth, where it was noted that those with fewer informal relationships were more likely to engage in a formal support network by way of staff and other service providers. The decision to avoid developing social networks with either housed or homeless peers may suggest those who lack relationships prior to becoming homeless find it more difficult or lack the necessary social skills to form relationships with other young people, which may become problematic once the young person exits homelessness and no longer has access to a staff support structure. This finding suggests the need for caution in staff approach to their relationship with more introverted residents, to ensure a young

person still has opportunities to develop social skills and friendships outside of the staff network, as these relationships can only ever be temporary given the nature of the hostel as a service. However, it also indicates that staff members can perform similar roles to a family member or friend and provide a young person with a valuable support network and its associated benefits, at least during the vulnerable period of homelessness. Therefore, having staff available to undertake such roles even in a formal capacity can be considered imperative to those lacking a social network and alleviate the detrimental effects reported by researchers including, higher levels of isolation (Johnsen et al., 2005; Farrugia 2011), higher stress levels (Gasior 2015), poorer sense of wellbeing (Tabner 2013) and as Docherty et al., (2006) note in their study of relationships in a residential care home, lower levels of success and general happiness.

As noted earlier in this chapter, findings concerning the residents' social relationships with peers outside of the hostel were consistent with the literature (Buchanan et al., 2010; Johnsen et al., 2005; Tabner 2013), in that many of these specific relationships were distinctly and significantly weakened during the period of homelessness, with only one resident continuing to rely on friends as a stable influence. This was due to a variety of factors but at least for some part, it seemed becoming homeless shifted the priorities of a young person, which meant they no longer aligned with those of their housed peers, many of whom were either still in school, or were preparing for university. Indeed, most residents felt it was difficult for their friends to fully appreciate or comprehend the myriad of complex issues and adjustments they were experiencing as homeless young people, having never been in a comparable situation themselves. However, irrespective of the changing dynamics, it was evident that the effects of homelessness and the hostel itself were further distinct barriers to maintaining existing social relationships.

Some young people, for whom it was necessary to move to the local area to become a resident in Bank Hostel, described how maintaining physical social contact with friends

and family was challenging, due to a lack of transport links and a lack of disposable income to spend on the limited travel that was available. As Bank Hostel was the only medium-support level homeless hostel for young people in the county, and one of just two hostels in the area that housed young people in general, it was necessary for some to move up to 20 miles from their hometown and social network to secure a place as a resident. Due to the greater physical distance, some residents found it challenging to maintain their place within the family or their social network and eventually, the relationships were adversely impacted and weakened.

Residents who were within the proximity to maintain their social relationships tended to still experience significant barriers in that they largely had insufficient financial means to partake in social activities with friends outside of the hostel, meaning they were often excluded from nights out, meals and cinema trips with others of their age. For most, being unable to participate in such activities with peers weakened the relationship bonds whilst simultaneously reducing the opportunities available to build new relationships by restricting their access to social settings. One resident explained:

I've got no money to go do things they want to do so it's either they come sit here or we sit outside. They want to go to the cinema and the pub and stuff; I can't afford that.

Steve, Group B

Presenting a further barrier and stressor on residents' attempts to maintain their social relationships with those outside of the hostel were in-house policies such as curfew and visitor rules and regulations. Having a strict curfew meant that those who did travel a distance to socialise with friends and family needed to return early, as transport was unreliable. Likewise, residents expressed frustration at the requirement to return to the

hostel by a set time when they were in the pub or engaging in other social activities with their friends. In response, residents would often attempt to negotiate a flexible curfew with staff in the office:

Amelia came into the office to talk about the evening plans with Sophie (staff).

Amelia wanted to go to the nearest city for a night out with friends, but the public transport home meant she would either arrive back in the hostel an hour and twenty minutes before curfew, or twenty minutes after it. She asked whether she could be allowed into the hostel after curfew so she could make the most of her evening.

Sophie explained that it wasn't possible, and twenty minutes was too long after curfew. Sophie advised that Amelia stay with a friend overnight instead and return in the morning, especially if she was intending on consuming a lot of alcohol.

Amelia said she would just have to leave early or not attend as she had nowhere else to stay and left the office.

Field Notes, 2015, Staff Office

This type of conversation was a common occurrence in the staff office, with residents attempting to convince staff to bend the curfew rules as most nightlife was a 30-minute train journey or one hour and a half bus journey from the hostel site and the transport was infrequent. Staff were almost always inflexible to this pre-emptive request but conveyed that when residents return 5 or 10 minutes later than curfew, they would not be refused entry and would typically be allowed in without any repercussion. Any later and residents would be allowed in but would be given a formal warning. The inflexibility surrounding curfew forced further distancing from social networks, as the young people were embarrassed by having temporal constraints to their freedoms that their friends

no longer experienced as they emerged into adulthood. Taken together, living in a rural area alongside having curfew restrictions and little to no money for social activities fundamentally compromised pre-existing social relationships and led to an increase in socialising in the hostel environment with other residents who were experiencing the same circumstances. Similar issues have been reported by Cloke et al., (2002), who argued that poor and expensive transport options can create impermeable barriers to maintaining social networks and compound the disadvantages rural homeless people face. Therefore, unsurprisingly living in a hostel in a rural area can lead to high levels of social isolation and exclusion for the already marginalised homeless youth (Buchanan et al., 2010; Stone 2010).

Although it could be argued that residents opted to socialise in the hostel and befriend other residents as a coping mechanism to manage the barriers hostel living created, some residents described how they preferred and actively attempted to develop attachments with other residents as they were considered to be a more convenient relationship and source of support. This was evidenced further when residents described how they would often replace friendships once an individual moved to independent living rather than maintaining the relationship they had forged with the departed resident:

We used to be mates, but I don't really see her now. She moved to the other side of town and it's not an easy to hang out as it used to be. She can't really come here, and watch films at night with me anymore, or make tea with, or just chat about stuff in our rooms. There's been loads of people moving out recently though, so we've had some new girls in and they're pretty sound, I get on really well with one of the girls on the top floor

Lucy, Group A

Staff accounts revealed similar insight, acknowledging from past experiences that it was common for young people to distance themselves from their peers and form fast and intense relationships with other residents as they were considered to be more physically accessible as a constant source of company, a behaviour that they discouraged as staff members.

They have a couple who still keep their outside networks but most of the time they tend to forget that they have friends outside. I remember asking a resident who they were friends with before they moved in, and they just said they don't see them anymore. When I asked why, they just said because their mates were all in here now. It's not healthy, not good.

Sophie, Staff Member

Concerningly, it was apparent through interviews and observation that those who integrated themselves fully into the social world of the hostel were more likely to have their entire needs met on the premises, meaning they had fewer reasons to leave the environment thus weakening their bonds with the rest of society. Similar concerns have been raised by Reeves (2016), who found in her study of probation hostels that adults who severed social ties upon entering prison in favour of establishing new relationships with other offenders found it more difficult to reintegrate into the community on their release. With no participants in employment, training, or education, being a part of a social group within the hostel often meant that residents would sleep, eat, and play all within the physical boundaries of the building, thus creating an 'enclosed' setting with characteristics broadly similar, yet to a lesser extent of Goffman's (1961) 'Total Institution'. This type of all-encompassing behaviour is generally frowned upon by scholars as well as staff members, as it can lead to individuals becoming dependent on the institution which can consequently have adverse effects and hinder not only a person's transition out of homelessness (Tabner 2013) but their sense of self and

identity (Stark 1994). Tabner (2013), offering further insight into the effects of close-knit networks amongst homeless people, described how individuals can become dependent on their relationships with others experiencing homelessness and can eventually become 'entrenched in a culture of homelessness' (p.25) making it harder to escape from the cycle.

Interestingly, however, there were some instances where the distance from social relationships outside of homelessness was beneficial to the young person. In these situations, the social networks of the residents outside of the hostel were counterproductive due to negative and exploitative influences and involvement in criminal behaviour. For these young people, being able to physically distance themselves from their social circle and create a new social network with other residents meant they were able to cut ties with their peers, whilst avoiding complete alienation from others. To some degree, therefore, being able to build a social network with other residents, although not without its issues, was considered a safety net for those who wanted to move away from old relationships but feared being left completely isolated. As one young person who had recently been evicted from Bank Hostel but was on the waiting list to return explained:

when I was here last time, I was sorting myself out, for the first time in my life things were getting done and I was getting somewhere, that's where I want to be again. My friends are career criminals. I don't want that. I want a good life. That's why I want to come back (to the hostel) because when I'm out here I see them more often and then I start doing bad things too.

Colin, Group A

Another resident who had been in the care of the Local Authority since she was 12 years old, shared similar views and described how her friendship group prior to moving into the hostel consisted of significantly older individuals, who encouraged her to take illegal substances from a young age. She provided the following account:

It was hard breaking out of that cycle because I didn't really have many other people. It took a long time for me to realise my friends were the cause of a lot of my problems but when they know where you are and what your routine is, you can't get away from them. I made mates here that are more my own age and who I can hang out with, it's much better for me and it's helped me get my head screwed on

Lucy, Group A

The idea of the hostel and the relationships within acting as a protective factor against substance abuse and crime by separating the individual from negative influences and exploitative relationships is an interesting finding, and one which contrasts those by other researchers (Ennett et al., 1999), who have argued that maintaining relationships with those outside of homelessness, can, prevent a homeless person from abusing substances. Whilst this does not negate the issues surrounding the sharing of illegal substances between the residents themselves, which has been consistently shown in other research (Stone 2010; Hoolachan 2015) and will be discussed in more detail in the next chapter, this finding does recognise that the effects of the hostel on relationships with housed peers are not always necessarily negative and harmful.

Social Media Habits of Homeless Youth

One prevalent and multifaceted tool residents of Bank Hostel utilised to combat the barriers homelessness placed on social relationships with housed peers and family, was technology, or more specifically, social media. Whilst research on how homeless youth engage with the internet is limited, the notion that young homeless people use innovative technology to their advantage echoes that of the growing body of literature which shows that young people experiencing homelessness use social media as an avenue to maintain their social networks (Guadango et al., 2013; Rice and Barman-Adhikari 2014). Prior to the rise in ease of accessibility of the internet and associated social applications, young homeless people had few resources to create and maintain social networks during the period of homelessness (Rice and Barman-Adhikari 2014), which could prove detrimental, considering the negative consequences of poor social networks reported widely across research studies (Gasior 2015; Buchanan et al., 2010; Blake et al., 2008; Monfort 2009; Heineman 2010). However, due to advancing technology, residents are now able to communicate and facilitate relationships with their family and friends through free services on their Smart Phones, such as WhatsApp, and social media platforms such as Facebook, providing they have a Wi-Fi connection. All residents interviewed appeared to have access to a Smart Phone device which they were observed using at various points during interviews, in the communal areas and the staff office. The phones appeared to be primarily used to communicate conveniently and inexpensively with friends and family by using hostel Wi-Fi. Beyond direct interactions through telephone calls and messaging, residents also utilised social media platforms to create an online virtual presence and maintain their sense of belonging within their peer group in the absence of their physical presence. As one resident explained.

It's easy to just kind of fade away and be forgotten about when you're not in school anymore, but I can usually keep up with what's going on Facebook, that's where I find out most of the gossip

Similarly, residents described the benefits of using free calling facilities on some social media apps and using features such as internet-based video calls to talk to friends and family, adding another layer of intimacy and closeness to communications whilst simultaneously strengthening a young person's social support network. Thus, engaging with social media enabled and empowered residents to maintain a sense of self outside of the hostel space and separate from that of the hostel resident, as a 'normal' young person.

A significant body of research has shown that homelessness is often associated with being isolated or alienated from family and friends, and such experiences can be a significant threat to a young person's sense of identity, as they 'lose sight' of who they are (Riggs and Coyle 2002). Stark (1994) drawing on Goffman's (1961) 'Total Institution' theory, notes that hostels are institutions that marginalise homeless people by isolating them from their social networks and controlling their lives, leading to dependency, a loss of identity and eventually, 'Shelterization'. Stark (1994) argued that the longer an individual spends in a hostel, the weaker their bonds to the rest of society become and the harder it is for them to live independently without the institution to meet their needs. Across other institutions, Crewe (2009) attests that prisoners who retain their social ties during their imprisonment are less likely to become reliant on the prison system and find it easier to reintegrate on their release. The findings of this study would support this notion and suggest that residents' ability to stay connected to their social networks through various internet activities, or even develop a new identity and expand social networks by forming positive new online virtual relationships, can prevent a person from becoming wholly encompassed and reliant on the hostel, as it enables residents to maintain their social bonds and retain their sense of self, regardless of

whether they remain within the physical boundaries of the hostel. In other words, access to technology gives residents personal control over their social interactions and can act as a link to remain integrated into society. It can therefore be considered a strong protective factor to at least some degree against dependence, isolation, and social exclusion and can help mitigate the effects of the financial and physical barriers that homelessness and hostel policies can create.

Constructing Relationships – Showing That They Care

The staff-service user relationship has garnered research interest across a wide variety of settings and institutions. Although researchers report the importance of this relationship dynamic to varying degrees, it is widely accepted and understood that this particular social relationship is one of utmost importance and carries a range of benefits for the young person and their navigation to independent living (McGrath and Pistrang 2007; Bland 1997; Easton 2001; McKellar and Kendrick 2013; Cahill et al., 2016; Neale 1995; Stevenson 2014; Homeless Link 2018). Indeed, research has shown that a positive relationship and rapport with staff are essential to aid the development of effective interventions (Cahill et al., 2016), build a young person's confidence and self-esteem (McGrath and Pistrang 2007), resilience (Altena et al., 2017) and has shown to promote empowerment (Easton 2001). Whilst this relationship dynamic has proven to be a crucial feature in the experiences of older homeless adults (Neale and Stevenson 2015), given the young age and associated vulnerabilities of residents living in supported accommodation for young people, a pragmatic and trusting relationship with a supportive adult is perhaps even more important.

The findings of this study support several others (McGrath and Pistrang 2007; Bland 1997; Easton 2001; McKellar and Kendrick 2013; Cahill et al., 2016; Neale 1995; Stevenson 2014; Homeless Link 2018) in that all young people interviewed felt a good

relationship with staff was a critical aspect of their experience as a resident and the support they receive. Staff offered a wide variety of support to residents beyond assisting them formally, including informal budgeting advice, relationship advice and help with cooking, in a similar way to a parent or friend. However, a dominant and pressing issue in the youth homelessness literature concerning staff-resident relationships is the inherent difficulties staff experience attempting to connect with residents when they are reluctant to open up and trust due to past experiences of being let down by adults from an early age, thereby making it challenging for them to engage with services (McGrath and Pistrang 2007; Heineman 2010). As discussed earlier in this chapter, participants of this study presented similar stories of being let down and neglected by parents throughout childhood, meaning inevitably some shared similar initial reluctance to develop a working relationship with staff. Although developing a positive relationship could be difficult, the consensus across all residents was that they were willing to work on building a rapport when staff in turn demonstrated that they cared for the young people beyond their role and duty as a keyworker. This meant that residents expected staff members to have an accepting, respectful, and non-judgemental attitude towards them and take the time to engage in personal informal interactions. Such interpersonal interactions demonstrated to residents that they were viewed by their keyworker as an individual worthy of attention and respect in their own right, rather than just being another room number. Based on this notion, it was shown that the most effective approach extensively used by staff to address the challenges and construct a relationship, was to immerse themselves in the communal areas and engage in informal interactions with residents. It was by making themselves physically and emotionally accessible that staff were able to show they cared and viewed their work as more than just a job (Glenn and Goodman 2015). As one resident stated:

Time is what is important. I've dealt with services in the past and they don't take the time to get to know you or anything, they just want to me to start telling them my problems straight away. That's what was good in the beginning, when I

was probably feeling a bit awkward, the staff would come in here and just watch the soaps with me. They took the time to chat and see what I was up to.

Ed, Group A

Being able to engage informally in the communal areas through repeated interactions, helped residents progressively relax in the presence of staff and established a sense of stability in the relationship. In the same way, they were important building blocks for shaping an initial rapport, informal interactions were considered crucial to garnering respect and trust, maintaining the social relationship, and encouraging residents to 'open up.' It was clear that it was paramount for young people that they felt comfortable talking to staff members, and this level of comfort was only achieved if the staff member had attempted to construct a social relationship and took the time to engage with them informally. That is, residents needed to know staff cared before they were willing to accept help, open-up and share their stories. Altena et al., (2017) describe these initial interactions as the 'affective bond' and note that its shaping is essential to the development of a strong 'working alliance' (also referred to as a 'therapeutic alliance' by other researchers such as McGrath and Pistrang 2007), a concept which describes the collaborative relationship and shared goals and aims of residents and staff. By using informal interactions to win the trust of residents, staff were able to develop a working alliance and create a relationship where residents felt safe to discuss issues and express their feelings (Altena et al., 2017).

However, it was not only the current residents who engaged in informal interactions with staff in the communal areas. One afternoon Colin, who was living in a bed and breakfast at the time of the interview, was visiting the hostel and the below interaction occurred:

Colin: There's nothing to cook with, all I've got is a kettle and I'm spending all my money on takeaways.

Amanda: It's not ideal but there are a few things you can try. You can make those instant rice things and add stuff like ham, cooked packaged chicken and frozen peas.

Colin: Frozen peas?

Amanda: Yes, they are cooked in advance and frozen so if you put some in the hot rice and cover it, they'll cook themselves.

Field notes, 2015, Living Area 1

Although Colin was on the waiting list to return to the hostel and was not a current resident, he was permitted to visit the premises to maintain his connection with the site and staff by sitting in the communal areas and interacting with those within. Colin's repeated visits back to the hostel appeared to suggest that he still thought of the hostel as his home, where he engaged in regular place-making activities and control the environment by sitting in his preferred place on the sofa and watching television (Hoolachan 2015). Within the context of staff, as the above shows, not only was the acceptance of Colin within the environment an indicator of staff caring about the young people beyond what is normally expected of their role, their informal practical advice helped to strengthen and maintain their bond with the young person.

Residents' ability to relax during the interactions in the communal areas differs from the staff-resident encounters in the more formal office space, which regardless of context, naturally occur in an environment where power imbalances and authority are more pronounced, due to the business-like facilities and bureaucratic structure of the staff space. Whilst office exchanges did have their purpose in the development of the relationship, staff being willing to sit and socialise in the communal areas removed an

essential layer of authority, thus humanising themselves and presenting more as equals, rather than staff members. Several residents recounted how they found it easier to talk to staff about their issues when in the communal areas than in formal keyworker meetings in the office as there was significantly less pressure to engage in an indirect conversation. They spoke about feeling awkward during the more formal exchanges and described not knowing how to begin or accurately articulate how they were feeling. Conversely, when in a more relaxed environment and making general conversation, it was easier to disclose personal problems and have sensitive conversations:

It depends on who's there really and whether they are busy. I like going in for a chat and that sometimes but there's always phones ringing or people coming in and out.

Simon, Group A

Staff echoed these sentiments and explained how relatable storylines on television programmes sometimes prompted residents to discuss past traumatic experiences or problems, making interactions in informal spaces an even more valuable tool. This explanation as to the more nuanced details of why interactions in informal settings and how the use of shared television watching can encourage residents to open up is an interesting finding and one that does not appear to have been reported in other studies.

A defining feature of Stark's (1994) argument that hostels resemble total institutions and a key element of Goffman's (1961) theory, is the distinct divide between those who possess and exert power (the staff) and those who are controlled by such exertions (the residents). For this structure to exist, a pervasive and unequal distribution of power must be evident and reinforced through strict rules established to control and regulate the lives of residents. However, because the concept of a total institution (Goffman 1961) and the concept of 'Shelterization' (Stark 1994) relies so heavily on the idea of

staff as authoritative figures, their willingness to build a rapport and desire to create a more equal and inclusive environment places the hostel as a direct contrast to Stark's (1994) disciplinary institution. Therefore, not only can informal interactions encourage engagement and build staff-resident relationships, but they are also of great importance for establishing a caring and therapeutic environment.

Though without a doubt invaluable, informal interactions were not the only way staff could form a relationship with the young people. As noted, it seemed the quality underpinning all successful positive staff-resident relationships was staff showing residents that they care in a variety of ways. This was evidenced by examples residents gave of moments where staff had done something which made them feel valued including the following:

He came in here Christmas Eve and gave us £50 to get a takeaway. I think that shows he cares, you know, he wasn't even working that day or nothing.

Colin, Group A

When I was in rehab yeah, my key worker was texting me and that to make sure I was ok, it was nice to know she was thinking of me

Amelia, Group B

I told her about a film, 'A Walk to Remember,' that reminded me of my Nanna because we used to watch it together when I was younger. She knew how much Nanna meant to me and how much I miss her. A few months later I was feeling

down and wasn't in a good place and she brought in a DVD of that film. She said I could keep it because she didn't watch it anymore, but it really cheered me up. It meant a lot that she remembered.

Lucy, Group A

The above are all examples of staff going 'above and beyond' their line of duty to do something nice for residents. Although staff being expected to go above and beyond has been noted in other studies as a leading cause of staff burnout and poor wellbeing (Karabanow 1999), as will be explored in Chapter Ten from the perspective of staff, it seemed that these small and random acts of kindness were often performed without prompting from management and according to some staff, without the knowledge of colleagues or higher management at all. Whilst unlikely the above acts were carried out for the sole purpose of establishing a rapport with residents, staff members' willingness to offer more of themselves than the basics required for their role helped to establish a strong, stable, and trusting relationship, essential characteristics found in a positive and supportive environment (Durrant 2014). In line with the findings from this study, Conradson (2003), who researched drop-in centres, found that care and caring relations can be found in 'everyday encounters' and serve the purpose of creating a therapeutic and inclusive environment. It is within these environments that staff create a space of care through their warmth, attentiveness, positive regard, and empathy towards the service users. Such supportive behaviours and encounters were evident in the staff-resident relationships and interactions during the 2015 data collection and collectively helped shift the feel of the environment to that which was based on care (Conradson 2003).

Once staff had succeeded in breaking down the barriers of a young person and a positive social relationship was fostered, residents and staff would often quite quickly slip into a more family-like dynamic, which was reinforced by referring to one another as 'key mum' and 'key child.' Similar behaviours have been found in other settings such as long-term foster homes for children (Biehal 2014), where it was found that children and young people would refer to foster parents in a family practice such as 'mum' and 'dad' to solidify their membership within the family. However, interestingly, during discussions staff referred to past residents as their key-children, suggesting it was staff members who encouraged the use of these familial terms rather than the residents themselves. For example, on one occasion whilst in the office and discussing previous residents, I asked Laura whether she stayed connected with any of the young people she supported:

I still try and keep in contact with my key-children. Sometimes they drift away, and you lose touch but it's nice seeing them out and about in Tesco and having a catch up. I was in Tesco a few months ago and saw a young person who used to live here about 18 months or so ago. She was so pleased to see me and introduced me to her friend as her key mum. She gave me her phone number and we've been in touch a few times since.

Field Notes, 2015, Staff Office

Again, the use of emotive language, positive regard and warmth (Conradson 2003) expressed by staff towards past residents appears to demonstrate the level of care staff have towards those who they support and the nurturing relationship that can exist beyond a young person's period as a resident of the hostel. Hence, staff demonstrated characteristics which contradict the notion of the hostel being a purely disciplinary institution (Stark 1994; DeWard and Moe 2010).

Building a Community and Developing Hostel Cultures

The chapter has so far provided a brief insight into relationships between residents and despite the evident disadvantages discussed earlier, findings also suggest having some level of relationship and interaction between residents is useful for combatting loneliness and isolation, a notion that is supported by some other researchers (Farrugia 2011; Maitland 2015; Durrant 2014). While some young people felt able to develop relationships with other residents using their own social skills, staff presence in the communal areas appeared to help facilitate positive interactions and encourage quieter individuals to socialise. As one resident stated:

I only really use them (communal areas) if certain staff are there. Sometimes we have pizza night, and we will rent a film or something, I'll come down then but no, I don't usually sit in the living room when they aren't there because I don't know any of the others well and I never know what to say.

Pete, Group A

By creating a safe environment emanating an inclusive ethos, residents of all backgrounds and experiences were able to interact, whilst more reclusive young people who are ordinarily 'othered' by society and sometimes by other residents (DeWard and Moe 2010) due to their poor social skills, low self-esteem and in some cases, stereotypical homeless appearance, had an opportunity for positive social encounters with peers of a similar age. This is a benefit of particular significance given that research denotes how the decline in support and social networks during a period of homelessness can lead to alienation and exclusion for young people (Eyrich et al., 2003). Whilst there was no suggestion these interactions guaranteed lasting friendships, the opportunities for socialising in the presence of staff members created a safe space for

individuals to relax and chat, helping to establish an emotionally supportive environment and a sense of belonging and community. Staff were aware of the benefits of their presence in the communal areas in terms of resident interactions and discussed trying to 'bring residents together' in these spaces to help alleviate loneliness and boredom:

If I was working a late shift, I would try and spend a good few hours in the living room with the residents catching up. It would be a good time to get the residents together and have some fun and a bit of a laugh, especially if there were some newer residents. If I'm there I can ask them questions and try and find some shared interests, something for them to talk about.

Laura, Staff Member

The concept of resident support helping to promote wellbeing is echoed in other studies such as that by Durrant (2014). Although there was no indication of staff presence in communal areas facilitating relationships in Durrant's (2014) study, residents who engaged in peer support were shown to form 'empathetic relations based on shared experiences' (p.29), which helped alleviate feelings of marginalisation and fostered a family-like environment which bound residents together. Unique opportunities for informal socialising with staff in the communal areas can therefore have the important function of creating a family-like nurturing environment and atmosphere, where residents engage in day-to-day communications, strengthening their status as a part of the group and reinforcing a shared sense of 'home' and normality (Biehal 2014).

Sophie: Why don't you come downstairs for some pizza tonight?

Ed: Maybe

Sophie: I think you should, it'll be a good chance for you to mix with some of the others and get out of your room a bit

Ed: Can we watch a film?

Sophie: Sure, it'll have to be after around 9pm but I'll join you for it.

Field Notes, 2015, Staff Office

Ed was a quiet resident who mostly preferred his own company in his room, where he would spend a considerable amount of time reading. Staff described how he would rarely socialise with residents and had few social networks outside of the hostel. Because of this, staff would sometimes encourage him to spend an evening in one of the living areas with other residents by agreeing to accompany them. Their presence during these periods of socialising eliminated any awkwardness between residents as they could initiate conversations, ask questions and generally facilitate positive social interactions. Staff attendance therefore contributed to the sustainability of a socially inclusive homely environment and helped build a sense of community (Doherty et al., 2006; Berridge, Biehal and Henry 2012).

Though it retained several institutional features, residents and staff tended to agree that the built environment of the hostel was effective at facilitating interactions and establishing a sense of community and inclusivity. In terms of general layout, having the option of several living areas, meant that residents retained some personal control over their use of the communal areas and could opt to use a quieter room if others were busy or they preferred some privacy. Having choice over the communal areas was also effective at limiting conflict, as residents who preferred somewhere quiet to watch television could choose a different room rather than attempting to quieten the other

residents. I frequently witnessed this navigation of the communal areas, often observing several residents together watching television in living area 1 whilst others played computer games in living area 2. Having the ability to control privacy levels is significant to people experiencing homelessness (Berens 2017). Therefore, whilst having large spaces for residents to interact and socialise together is important for promoting social relationships, having additional spaces for residents to choose to use which may be quieter and more private, is of equal importance to creating a positive perception of the built environment. Although Bank Hostel did have one appointed 'quiet room,' researchers have suggested that multiple quiet spaces allow residents greater control over their privacy and provide opportunities to reflect (Rutledge 2015).

Staff described how the large dining table in the main living area enabled residents to sit together to eat food and was often used to 'gather around' when house meetings were in progress, or outside services were delivering sessions. Other furniture was also utilised during social activities and aided in the promotion of inclusiveness and community simultaneously. One staff member said:

As far as the necessities go, they have a lot. Most of the furniture is hard-wearing and cheap, but there's plenty of space for everyone to sit together, or to space out, if that's what they prefer. It's useful having a lot of furniture when we have our Pizza nights, or when we play boardgames.

Amanda, Staff Member

Similar findings have been reported by Rutledge (2015), who noted how shared spaces and carefully crafted spatial layouts in hostels can create strong bonds and a sense of community amongst residents. Based on his review of research focusing on the built

environment for recovery from homelessness, Berens (2017) drawing on the work of Evans (2003) states that furniture placement can have an impact on behaviour as its arrangement can increase socialisation and help develop a social support network with others.

However, it was not just the communal areas that had implications on the wider social environment. Findings demonstrated that the staff office played a key role in residents' perception of the environment and was a space where informal and formal interactions between staff and residents occurred. As such, although informal interactions in the communal spaces were considered crucial for the development of the staff-resident relationship and for creating a sense of home, encounters in the office also had a significant impact on the formation and maintenance of this relationship dynamic. Seminal contributions such as that by Garside et al., (1990) denote that the inclusion of staff space in homeless hostels can contribute to the institutional feel of the environment due to their business-like purpose and can therefore alter the internal social dynamics. Further research by Glenn and Goodman (2015) reinforced the negativity associated with the staff space, arguing that the physical closing of access to the office created a social hierarchy between residents and staff, generating feelings of inequality and authority by suggesting interaction was not welcome. In other settings such as residential homes for children, researchers have argued that the requirement for an office should be challenged as they are a distinct physical barrier to interactions between staff and residents (Docherty et al., 2006). However, conversely, the findings of this study suggest that when used effectively, the office can promote relationships regardless of its bureaucratic appearance. For example, residents were regularly observed drinking tea in the office with staff and engaging in informal conversations with a variety of staff about everyday topics:

Amanda (staff member) is showing photos of her dog to Lucy.

Lucy: He's so cute. I miss having a dog, I'm going to get one when I have my own place

Amanda: What kind of dog did you have?

Lucy: It was a yellow lab but she died when I was younger

Amanda: Was she well-behaved?

Lucy (laughing): No, she used to drive my mum up the wall.

Field Notes, 2015, Staff Office

These daily encounters were of particular importance to residents who had no social network and who relied on staff for many of their social needs. As one resident explained:

I don't see many people and I don't always want to mix with the other residents, so it's nice to talk to the staff in the office sometimes. I feel like I have more one on one time then as it can get quite crowded in the living rooms.

Ed, Group A

The casual interactions and sharing of experiences helped to diminish the authoritative nature of this office and therefore, rather than emphasising the inequality in the staff-resident relationship (Glenn and Goodman 2015; Garside 1990), the office space helped to shape the environment as a supportive space of care and acceptance (Conradson 2003) and where therapeutic encounters could be promoted (Durrant 2014).

As shown in the diagrams included in Chapter Five of this study, in 2015 the hostel manager's office was next to the door to the main staff office. Whilst the main door leading into the staff areas was always kept open, the manager's door and the door leading into the general office would typically remain closed, due to practicalities and the private and confidential conversations and documents within. Therefore, whilst the physical knocking of the separate areas created a partial barrier between residents and staff, an obstruction which has been criticised in other research (Docherty et al., 2006), the main door itself being open retained some level of visibility and connection between staff and residents, thus creating a semi open-door policy and signifying to residents that the office was metaphorically 'open'.

In addition to staff, interestingly, comments from residents suggested that the manager's shared philosophy of maintaining a semi-open-door policy in her own office helped create a strong bond and social relationship. According to the manager, she chose the location of her office purposely, as she wanted to convey to residents that she was physically accessible and willing to communicate. Whilst residents could generally approach her with urgent matters at any time, she had set hours, several times a week in which her office operated a wholly open-door policy. During these hours, residents could sit in the manager's office and discuss any issues formally, or they could simply sit with her and engage on a more informal level. This practice was well received by residents who felt valued and respected as the most superior (in terms of authority) staff member was not only willing to communicate with them but encouraged such encounters by displaying posters around the hostel and on her office door, noting the times and days that she would be readily available. When discussing experiences of using the manager's open-door policy, one resident said:

I find it difficult to talk to people sometimes, I can be really shy which means I find it hard to make friends. She is always up for having a chat and she cares, which is important for someone like me

Ed, Group A

However, whilst the actions of the manager fed into the hostel being viewed as a space of care, regulating the hours residents could visit the space, meant the manager was able to retain control over the interactions and ensure her work was not disrupted by constant unexpected interruptions. Likewise, keeping her office separate from the general office signalled to both residents and staff that she was a figure of authority, even if her approach to communications suggested otherwise. This balance between both care and control created a structure to the manager's in-office interactions with residents which appeared to be essential, as having some restrictions provided stability in the relationship, shaping the encounters to be reliable, with everyone understanding their position and limits. This strategy seemed to be effective as for residents, regardless of time restrictions, being welcomed into the manager's office helped to reduce feelings of inequality by dissolving the physical barriers between staff and resident space. In this sense, these relations, and invitations to enter staff boundaries challenged the bureaucracy and created a collaborative environment as the office was not exclusively a 'staff zone' (Durrant 2014), but a necessary space which served multiple purposes including relationship development.

Informal Surveillance as a Soft Power Measure

Due to its intrusive nature, surveillance is often considered to be a negative defining feature of a disciplinary institution and a major mechanism of control (Foucault 1977; Dandeker 1990). Generally thought to be a key component for achieving compliance in

institutional settings (Foucault 1977; Dandeker 1990; Reeves 2016), surveillance is used for the purpose of the 'rulers' observing the behaviour of the 'ruled' to ensure that rules and regulations are being adhered to and therefore, feeds into the inherent inequality and reinforces the social hierarchy in the institution. In the context of homeless hostels, residents are closely monitored and observed through a variety of means (Williams 1996), including using stringent systems such as Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) in communal and outdoor spaces; recording movements in case files; 'sign in' books at the entrance; room checks and curfews. Bank Hostel in 2015 was no different to the norm and featured all the typical invasive formal surveillance mechanisms including apparatus such as CCTV systems on the grounds of the hostel and in the communal areas and stairs, which transmitted a live feed into the CCTV-free staff office. These disciplinary features contributed to the institutional-like feel of the environment and was a direct contradiction to the warm homely feel management attempted to create with its practices. However, despite these extensive formal surveillance methods, findings indicated that it was the informal surveillance by way of staff presence in the communal areas that was the most effective deterrent against rule violations and conflict amongst residents. As one staff member stated:

You'll find that things are a lot smoother when we are in the communal areas. It is quite useful as residents can sometimes bicker in the evenings when everyone wants to watch one thing or another on tv, so if we are there with them, we can diffuse situations quite quickly and mediate where we need to.

Amanda, Staff Member

Conflict in the communal areas of homeless hostels is well-documented by researchers who note that the sharing of the space itself is likely to contribute to the level of tension

(Busch-Geertsema 2007; Neale 1995) and as a result, residents have reported being too afraid to use the communal facilities in fear of conflict turning violent (Golten 2015). By maximising the visibility in the communal areas, staff members were able to control and manipulate the behaviour of residents by ensuring that social order was maintained, and interactions remained positive. This was especially important when any disagreement was escalating (Golten 2015) but equally when in the aftermath of arguments staff could act as an informal and impartial mediator and facilitate safe interactions. Speaking about his experience leading up to being evicted from the hostel, Colin said:

I saw things get a bit heated a few times in the living room but usually things get calmed down pretty quickly. I had a few disagreements with the resident who ended up getting me kicked out, not that I started any of them like. She got in my face a few times in front of the staff when we were watching TV and they calmed it down pretty fast before I lost my cool.

Colin, Group

A

This finding appears to directly contradict that by Saunders (1986) who argued that residents in hostels are more likely to comply with rules when staff are not present as their presence leads to heightened feelings of animosity and friction. It also suggests that staff presence in the communal areas is more than just a method to facilitate social relationships but was also an essential soft power technique (Nye 1990; Crewe 2011), used to ensure residents were protected from conflict and bullying and a secure environment that resembled a home and refuge was established (Durrant 2014).

Relationships with Management

A key relationship dynamic that is vaguely understood in homeless research is that between the manager and the residents, meaning the emergence of the importance of this relationship was an unexpected and unique finding. Residents described how the manager in 2015 played an active role in the support they received and would integrate herself in the communal areas, engaging in pro-longed social activities such as film and board game nights, alongside more casual interactions. Discussing the 2015 manager retrospectively, one resident from 2016 said:

The manager was proper sound.... we could be chilling watching TV at night, and she would watch it with us, you could chat to her about stuff and that, she made an effort with you.

Richard, Group B

The 2015 manager in turn heavily advocated the need to get to know residents on an individual level and demonstrate that she was available both physically and emotionally. For her, she needed to have a good relationship with each young person built on honesty and mutual respect and trust, as it was this collaborative relationship that formed the basis of a positive and orderly environment. Explaining her decision to develop social relationships with residents, the manager said:

I find if you give a little you get a little. So, I give them a little bit of my time, I listen, I respect, and I get the same from them in return. They really appreciate staff going that little bit further for them

Susie, 2015 Manager

The discussion so far has identified the importance of the staff-resident relationship in reducing feelings of inequality and minimising the disciplinary and institutional feel of the hostel. These caring relations and interactions helped promote inclusivity and shape the environment to resemble a home, rather than a punitive institution, despite the hostel lacking in home-like aesthetic qualities. However, whilst these relationships and the integration of staff members in the communal areas assisted in breaking down the social hierarchy inherent in homeless hostels (Stark 1994), the inclusion of management as the highest visible authority in these social practices and her decision to socialise with residents on an individual level, helped diminish the level of bureaucracy and authority in the institutional structure even further and helped promote resident self-esteem and self-worth. Despite there still being a degree of inequality inherent in the relationship due to the status of the residents and the hostel rules and policies used to control the physical and social environment, it was clear that the manager fostering interpersonal relationships with the young people was particularly important for contributing towards enhancing residents sense of belonging to the hostel, as they felt respected and valued as individuals, particularly given that the hostel manager, who typically takes a more bureaucratic role in the hostel, is not required to construct such relationships as part of her position. Rather, she chose to develop a strong interpersonal relationship, which signified to residents that she cared. As one resident stated:

If you had problems and that she'd take the time to listen to you, that's what you need in a manager, someone that is going to listen. Because if they aren't listening to you, why would you listen to them?

Amelia, Group B

The above account supports the notion that the manager-staff relationship can be beneficial; however, it also highlights the importance of residents feeling as though they are being listened to by staff members and management. Importantly, residents tended to agree that not only did this enhance their respect for staff and in turn enable them to feel respected, but the extent they were listened to had implications on their likelihood of reciprocating that listening and cooperation, both in terms of rules and support plans.

Controlling Through Caring Relations

Rules are considered an essential aspect of society as they serve the purpose of providing structure in human interaction and can influence how individuals conduct their behaviours or 'perform' their roles (Skoog 2005). Formal and informal rules and regulations which are administered to control the behaviour of individuals are routinely found within institutions, including those which are 'open' such as schools and 'closed' institutions such as prisons (Goffman 1961). As noted in earlier chapters, homeless hostels are harder to categorise in terms of their 'type' of institution, given that they share many characteristics with both open institutions and the closed 'disciplinary' total institution, yet do not fit comfortably in either. It is for this reason that researchers have proposed the term 'quasi-total institution' to classify homeless hostels (Stark 1994; DeWard and Moe 2010; Armaline 2005). Not unlike other institutional settings, to ensure safety and establish structure in the lives of the residents, homeless hostels deploy rules and regulations which provide the function of maintaining social order and meeting the aims of the organisation. These social control methods and power relations embedded in hostels and across other settings have been the subject of much academic attention, with researchers generally agreeing that when applied too rigidly, rules can constrain the lives of those within and infringe on an individual's identity (Stark 1994), leaving a young person distressed and feeling trapped (Heineman 2010), frustrated (Glenn and Goodman 2015), infantilized (Hoffman and Coffey 2008), and can blur the

lines between the hostel being a comfortable and secure environment and that which resembles a disciplinary institution. Given this, it is hardly surprising that several studies report individuals referring to their respective hostels and experiences as prison-like and restrictive, most notably that by DeWard and Moe (2010) who conducted research in a women's shelter and drew a comparison between the shelter and an all-encompassing restrictive disciplinary total institution (Goffman 1961), which compromises residents personhood and autonomy. However, whilst hostel provisions have received much criticism, it is generally accepted that due to the nature of hostels and specifically perhaps when they house young people, some rules are necessary for security (Glenn and Goodman 2015) and to create consistency, structure and teach young people social boundaries (Armeline 2005).

As noted earlier in this chapter, Bank Hostel in 2015 was a site where management and practices were carefully crafted to focus on creating an environment resembling a space of care, through support, positive everyday encounters and stable social relationships between residents and staff. Comparable to 'softer' measures of power as denoted by researchers (Johnsen et al., 2018; Crewe 2011) staff mostly relied on and advocated relationships and communication to persuade and influence residents to comply with rules and regulations as opposed to perhaps more traditional and pervasive coercive methods and surveillance (DeWard and Moe 2010). Similar 'influencing' methods have been described by Johnsen et al., (2018) in their typology of social control as the idea of discreetly promoting behaviour change through persuasion in the form of effective speech and other symbols to shape behaviours and beliefs. Often overlapping with the other modes of power within the typology including 'force,' 'coercion,' 'bargaining' and 'tolerance,' 'influence' is characterised as power which focuses on persuading clients to consider making changes in a non-direct manner and staff using strategies and support to 'enhance readiness to change' through positive engagement (Johnsen et al., 2018). In the current study, whilst there were certainly elements of influence and persuasive techniques in the strategies to encourage compliance, it was clear that the qualities

underpinning the relationship of mutual respect and trust were the fundamental core in establishing order within the environment. For example, residents explained how they valued their relationship and level of closeness with staff and did not want to jeopardise this by breaking rules or being obstructive. As one resident explained:

She's done a lot for me, and she's been there for me when I didn't really have anyone else. I've not had many people like that in my life, so I keep myself to myself and I try not to make too many waves as I don't want to ruin it.

Ed, Group A

Residents also spoke of how trust was the foundation of their relationship with staff and how it allowed them to feel comfortable enough to confide in staff members and have open conversations, as they felt safe and secure in the relationship. Consequently, they wanted to protect this faith and reciprocate by showing that they were trustworthy. To illustrate, Pete described his reasoning for avoiding rule infractions:

If you're going to disrespect them, then they aren't going to be as willing to work with you. It's a two-way thing, they treat me as an adult, and I treat them as an adult. You have to be able to trust each other. I trust them to support me as best as they can, and they have to trust me to not behave like a prat.

Pete, Group A

Because research tells us that trust is a driving factor in a strong staff-resident relationship and plays a key role in improving engagement (Neale 1995; McGrath and

Pistrang 2007; Armaline 2005), it may help explain why residents are willing to sacrifice certain freedoms and conform to hostel rules and policies to avoid that trust being broken. Moreover, intricately linked to the concept of trust as a reason for adherence was the idea of accepting authority to continue to be viewed and treated as an adult. Contrary to studies which suggest hostel rules and regulations infantilise residents by stripping them of their autonomy (Hoffman and Coffey 2008) thus reducing them to a 'child-like' and demoralised status (DeWard and Moe 2010), findings indicated that it was being treated as an adult by staff on a day-to-day basis which positively influenced residents decision to accept and adhere to the rules, even when they did not necessarily agree with their purpose. As Lucy stated:

The no drinking, I think is a big one, I kind of understand why they don't want people falling around drunk but at the same time if I'm paying rent here then I don't expect to not be able to drink in my own room. I would if I lived at home, and I would if I had a flat. But like I said, the rules are here for a reason, I spoke to the manager about it once and she said we have to have some rules because we have to make sure we are safe, I understand that it's just a bit frustrating. I can see it from her point of view though, if residents are all drunk and something happens then staff have to deal with that. I try to stick to the rules as much as I can. The staff respect me and treat me like an adult, I don't want them to think I can't be trusted. They've explained to me why certain rules are needed and I have to respect that. I wouldn't want staff to think I'm a troublemaker anyway.

Lucy, Group A

In this case, residents were appreciative of being treated as adults, rather than children and therefore, they believed that to maintain treatment in such capacity, they needed to act in an 'adult' manner, which typically involved conforming to 'acceptable'

behaviour and refraining from major rule infringements and being viewed as a 'troublemaker.' This interesting finding contradicts Stark's (1994) argument that residents become distressed as abiding by hostel rules makes it impossible to continue to function as an autonomous adult, as it suggests residents are willing to conform to rules and restrictions previously described by researchers as infantilising (Hoffman and Coffey 2008) in order to continue to be treated as an adult by staff, a seemingly contradictory concept.

However, it was not just the fear of weakening the trust, respect and autonomy in the relationship that encouraged conformity. Another important reason disclosed by residents was the notion that they felt indebted to staff members for providing a secure and stable space of refuge, along with the tools to learn to live independently. Hence, some residents wanted to return this perceived kindness by avoiding placing undue stress on staff and behaving in a challenging way:

I've not found any rule so far that I don't agree with. They are there for a reason and to make sure it's safe here, besides the staff have given me a place to stay, so I'm not going to repay them by breaking stupid rules for no reason.

Simon, Group A

This sense of feeling appreciative or perhaps even duty-bound to repay staff members, therefore, reflects the extent of relationships, empathy, and mutual trust as powerful factors in influencing and motivating the behaviour of residents and their decision to adhere to hostel rules.

It has been established in this study that the staff-resident relationship can take the form of a parental relationship in some circumstances, given the nature of the hostel and the age of the residents. This familial role has been heavily criticised by researchers who posit that this dynamic can feed into the inequality inherent in the relationship and can thus lead to tension and a loss of resident autonomy (Hoffman and Coffey 2008). However, interestingly, the findings of this study indicated that one of the reasons some residents chose to comply with hostel rules was that it gave them a sense of gratification and increased their self-worth when staff expressed pride towards their good behaviour or individual achievements, like that of a parent and child. Staff members recognised the influence that they had in this capacity and discussed how they would often compliment residents and praise their behaviour, such as telling them they were proud of their accomplishments, that they were doing well to show independent living skills, or telling them they were conducting themselves maturely and positively in the hostel. This positive reinforcement made residents feel good about themselves, improved their self-esteem, and enhanced the probability of compliance as they were reluctant to 'let the staff down.' As one staff member stated:

You will find that they don't want to let you down, especially the younger ones. They want us to tell them how good they are doing, most of them probably haven't heard that much before and they'll cling to it because it makes them feel good. Whenever they achieve something, like a certificate after completing a course, or even when they've made progress in their support plan, they can't wait to tell you because they know I'll tell them how well they've done and how hard they've worked. It's a good strategy that most staff have used for years.

Laura, Staff Member

The effectiveness of the combined soft power techniques and everyday subtle uses of authority found in this research has been noted in studies concerning other institutions, including those which are considered to be a wholly closed disciplinary 'total institution' (Goffman 1961). For example, Crewe (2009), who researched staff-resident relationships in a prison, argued that power can work by psychological means through internalised self-regulation as opposed to the more punitive physical restrictive means. This 'soft power' he explains, is likely more efficient and a direct contrast to 'hard power' as it enables compliance directly through prisoner-staff relationships and indirectly through the policies and rules which are implemented and encourages individuals to self-regulate their behaviour and engage positively (Crewe 2009). However, Crewe (2009) commented how these displays of soft power are still intrusive on an individual, who must be proactive in showing a willingness to change, as opposed to simply adhering to the rules of the institution and so-called softer methods, which can be difficult to manage in a naturally coercive and untrusting environment. The degree to which the use of soft power in the current study is intrusive is difficult to accurately measure, however in a similar vein to Crewe (2009), its impact was an indisputable motivator in influencing and shaping behaviour boundaries.

DeWard and Moe (2010) presented a typology of 'survival' strategies women in their study deployed to cope and 'navigate' the authoritarian and oppressive power exertions in the case study hostel. They noted that an individual's response to the bureaucracy of hostel rules was to either a) submit and accept, b) adapt and reframe perspective, or c) reject and resist (DeWard and Moe 2010). On the surface, it may appear as though the accounts presented by Group A residents determine that they fall into the first of these categories; those who are willing to 'submit' to the institution and its power hierarchy (DeWard and Moe 2010). Submitters were explained within the framework to be those who did not question authority and appeared grateful to staff members, thus reinforcing the inequality and creating a mutual co-dependency between themselves and the institution. However, rather than 'unquestionable acceptance' (DeWard and

Moe 2010) as explained, some residents noted certain rules which they perceived to be unnecessary but chose to follow them anyway due to stronger motivations and ties to the staff-resident relationship, adding a further layer of complexity. In this sense, whilst residents may be conforming to retain their status within the hostel and may even be exerting their own power by acting the part of the compliant subordinate to protect the roof over their heads (DeWard and Moe 2010), or secure follow-on accommodation; rule infractions did still occur regularly, demonstrating that generally compliant residents were not wholly submissive to the bureaucracy. Therefore, the data from 2015 would indicate that rather than having a fixed strategy at the outset to manage rule systems, residents were more inclined to behave more fluidly, mostly adhering to rules but drifting to the occasional infraction to varying degrees. Based on the findings, it appeared the ultimate decision whether to accept authority was more likely dependent on:

- a) The strength of the attachment and bond with staff, as described to this point
- b) How residents felt they were treated in the hostel day-to-day, in other words, feeling respected and valued and
- c) How the rules were enforced.

Residents' decision to conform to hostel rules and authority due to their attachment to staff may be explained by adapting and applying Hirschi's (1969) Social Control Theory. Hirschi (1969) argued that having protective factors such as strong social ties, beliefs, values, and connection to the community enables individuals to have more self-control and influences a person's decision to conform to the rules in society and desist from delinquency (Hirschi 1969). According to this theory, the four social bonds: Attachment, Involvement, Commitment and Belief, bind individuals together and it is when these societal bonds break down or weaken over time, that individuals are more likely to engage in criminal activity. In the context of this study, young people experiencing

homelessness could be considered to lack these controls as they are thought to possess weakened bonds with society, from which they are often alienated and ostracized (Riggs and Coyle 2002; Roos 2014; Buchanan et al., 2010; Johnsen et al., 2005) an issue that is thought by some researchers to be compounded by living in a hostel (Stark 1994). By creating a home-like environment and a space of care through positive social encounters and establishing a sense of community, some homeless youth who may no longer have strong societal bonds can find elements of the four social bonds within the hostel sphere and when taken together, may help create a more harmonious and controlled environment.

As discussed earlier in this chapter, young homeless people are characterised as having poor and sometimes volatile family relationships and are consistently shown to have insecure attachments with primary caregivers (Tavecchio and Thomeer 1997; Heineman 2010). Given the potential for a parental style relationship between residents and staff, under Hirschi's (1969) framework, this relationship dynamic may in part act as a bond that restrains residents from rule-breaking. This was evidenced by staff members who stated in their interviews that it is generally accepted that residents who have better social ties and relationships with staff are significantly less likely to violate hostel rules, a similar sentiment to those found in other studies including those concerned with the prisoner-staff relationship (Freeman 2003):

You'll find that residents who you have that bond with are more likely to listen to you and avoid breaking the rules too much. At least the big ones anyway. They want to protect that relationship with you, especially if you're the only constant that they have.

Amanda, Staff

Member

The strong social ties between residents and staff can therefore be understood to limit rule infractions, as residents are emotionally invested and would rather protect their social relationship with staff and retain their respect by engaging in positive behaviours and avoiding major rule infractions. Hirschi's (1969) other bonds present within the environment which allows for internal constraints to develop include commitment, which involves the level of commitment the residents have to the hostel as a social institution and their willingness to adhere to the internal social expectations. To a lesser extent there is Involvement, which denotes that when an individual's time is filled with activities, they do not have opportunities to be involved in delinquent behaviour. Whilst the hostel did have a structured and regular activities programme many residents had ample free time as they were not in employment, education, or training. Finally, Belief, which in this case relates to an individual's level of acceptance of the common rules, values, and morals within the hostel. Put simply, this means an individual is more likely to conform to norms and rules when they believe in them and to believe in the system and the rules in Bank Hostel, they needed to be applied fairly and flexibly, as shown in the following sub-section.

Resident Rule Perception and Staff Application

As previously discussed, whilst Bank Hostel in 2015 was mostly a calm and well-ordered environment, it was not without some rule violations. Whilst these were mostly minor infractions, staff reported how major violations did occur at times, including that by Colin from Group A, who had been evicted from the hostel previously for being aggressive towards a pregnant female resident, and was currently on the waiting list to return. Whilst there seemed to be some minor differences in staff members' methods of dealing with rule-breaking, in the main, it appeared as though the hostel manager had a blanket flexible rule policy and expected staff to follow her lead. This meant that, unlike the participants in the study of DeWard and Moe (2010), staff had little discretion over

their application of rules, resulting in the minimal potential for misuse of authority and the reduced likelihood of staff utilising their power to reinforce the social hierarchy. In her interview, the 2015 manager, Susie, described her approach to managing rule violations as focusing on communication and collaboration with the resident to avoid future occurrences. According to Susie, if some rule violations were overlooked, or approached pragmatically, then the resident would be more likely to respect authority and fundamentally less likely to repeat that behaviour in the future. This finding supports seminal contributions by Buenhler et al., (1966), who argued that the likelihood of individuals repeating deviant behaviour was dependent on how the environment approaches that deviation when it occurs for the first time. Describing her approach in-depth regarding Colin's eviction, Susie said,

No, that was quite a rare case to be honest but unfortunately, the situation called for an immediate eviction and my hands were tied. Usually, I prefer to give residents a second chance. They aren't school children, and I don't agree with treating them like that. If a resident comes in here and they are under the influence as a one off, then I would speak to them about why they are taking drugs, see if there are any other issues, explain that I understand they are at that age. Then as long as it's not time and time again, I'd say I'm going to overlook it this time but I'm trusting you not to do that again. That works sometimes, of course not every time, but it does work with some things. If it got repeated, then I'd give a warning.

Susie, 2015 Manager

This idea of staff using their personal skills to resolve conflict and rule violations as opposed to coercion and threats echoes other research in institutional settings which contends that those who rely on force to gain compliance are perceived as having lower

levels of legitimacy than those who attempt a more understanding approach (Wooldredge and Steiner 2016; Tyler 2006). Legitimacy, defined as being viewed as an appropriate authority, is one of the four characteristics Tyler (2006) posits are required to achieve compliance. Therefore, by using these 'softer' power techniques and interpersonal communication skills to encourage a resident to adhere to rules, staff members were strengthening their legitimacy thus directly impacting their position as a just authority.

Reeves (2016) conducted research concerning the lived experiences of sex offenders in a probation hostel and found that while residents respected the rules being flexible, some individuals were frustrated by the wide margin of rule enforcement and felt it resulted in feelings of instability, as they were never sure which rule violations would be overlooked, and which would be punished. Surprisingly, no residents in this study expressed similar concerns, with no reference made to any 'grey area' (Reeves 2016) or confusion over infractions. It appears the difference between the responses in this study and those in Reeves' (2016), is the staff in Bank Hostel's reliance on communication skills to explore the violation and manage the infraction on an individual basis, rather than having a wholly erratic rule enforcement approach. For example, one resident provided a recollection of an incident whereby he had broken a hostel rule as a small, half-empty bottle of red wine had been found in his bedroom during room checks, which was against hostel policy. During subsequent conversations with the manager, Ed apologised and admitted he occasionally enjoyed a small glass of red wine in his room whilst reading, which was predominately how he spent his free time as he had no social networks. Under these circumstances, management decided to effectively turn a blind eye and opted not to administer a punishment. Discussing the incident, he said,

Yeah, she's good like that, she speaks to you like an adult. She could have given me a warning, but she didn't, that's why you can trust her, she's one of the good ones.

Ed, Group A

In this sense, whilst the conversation with management may not strictly mean the resident in question would refrain from bringing small bottles of alcohol to his room in the future, the respect for his circumstances and the willingness to listen to his perspective meant the staff members legitimacy increased, and the resident would be less likely to be involved in other potentially larger infringements going forward. Such responses reflect Crewe's (2009) contentions that individuals are more likely to conform to rules and policies when they believe they are being treated fairly and demonstrate how a flexible approach to rules can aid autonomy development as it encourages residents to self-regulate their behaviour. The flexibility of the rule system which incorporated the circumstances of everyone rather than using a blanket policy was essential to creating what Reeves (2016) refers to as a 'person-centred approach' which focuses on the needs of the resident, rather than the bureaucracy of the organisation and helps reinforce the staff-resident relationship. Similarly, research in prison settings has found that where compromise was prevalent and minor infractions were overlooked by staff, prisoners were more likely to desist from major rule violations (Crewe 2009).

Flexible approaches to rule enforcement are therefore consistent with what research heavily advocates as the factor which impacts the probability of rule adherence (Armaline 2005; Homeless Link 2018; Hoffman and Coffey 2008; Crewe 2009; Freeman 2003). Most notably, it appeared that by having a flexible model of rule enforcement rather than a zero-tolerance approach (Homeless Link 2018), the hostel was able to

frame and negotiate itself as a site predominantly of care, whilst still maintaining the degree of control necessary to ensure a well-structured, ordered, and secure environment. In this sense, Bank Hostel was exerting power and control through caring relations, rather than as an oppressive disciplinary institution and thus was able to minimise any attempts of resistance from residents (Stark 1994). As both residents and staff approached hostel rules with a degree of flexibility, with rules being challenged by residents at times and overlooked by staff at others, the findings further reject the idea of the hostel being a site of complete control which inhibits its residents from achieving autonomy by stripping them of their identity and imposing disciplinary restrictions (Stark 1994). Rather, it appears that rules and regulations are permeable and enable residents and staff to negotiate their behaviour and respond in a manner that is reflective of the wider setting. That is, when staff help foster a positive and homely environment for residents and a sense of community and belonging, residents are less likely to resist institutional power (Durrant 2014) and are more likely to conform to authority.

Shared Power as a Tool of Empowerment

This chapter has explored the use of power and control in Bank Hostel in 2015 and noted how positive everyday encounters, positive staff-resident relationships and a sense of community helped to construct the hostel as a site primarily of care, thus rejecting the notion that homeless hostels are an all-encompassing disciplinary institution (Stark 1994; DeWard and Moe 2010). The positive attitude of management and staff and their belief that communication, trust and respect are the building blocks of social relationships and successful resident engagement helped to create a mostly well-ordered, secure, and calm environment without the need for invasive and over-zealous rigid rule enforcement or surveillance methods. However, in addition to this, certain practices adopted by Bank Hostel went beyond helping shift from the idea of the hostel is an institution of control to that of the hostel being a setting where power at least to some extent was shared with residents. The notion of shared power, although

neglected in research pertaining to homelessness, is a forward-thinking concept which re-imagines the traditional forms of power, which despite being well-meaning, often have adverse and wide-ranging consequences (Centre for Public Impact 2019). The Centre for Public Impact (2019) produced a paper on shared power in the governmental context and argued that this method can lead to better outcomes and more legitimate solutions due to its ability to overcome temporal and financial constraints by distributing power and giving decision-making power to 'subsidiaries' given their in-depth knowledge, experience and understanding of the relevant issues (p.8).

As noted, similar distributions of power appeared to be valuable in Bank Hostel, where residents have delegated roles and decision-making powers along with the opportunity to routinely challenge authority. In line with the underlying principles described in the discussion paper of the Centre for Public Impact (2019), residents would use their individual experiences and knowledge of what works, and what does not, as motivation to work collaboratively with staff and encourage change by providing input to hostel provision. Aside from the drop-in sessions with the manager in her office, the forum used most regularly for residents to discuss hostel matters was the weekly House Meetings. Taking place in the communal living room every Monday evening, these non-mandatory meetings were used for several purposes including sharing ideas, organising activities, conveying messages, structuring rotas, and discussing any issues. Hostel management in 2015 noted that this was an especially important part of the week, where power was disseminated, and residents could contribute towards the hostel policies and decisions:

Susie: The house meetings are supposed to be a safe space for residents to just talk about anything. You'll find that we usually get a full house, or maybe one or two residents missing. I try to attend them where possible because I think my presence is important. I can also help calm things down a bit then if things ever get heated.

Researcher: When do things get heated?

Susie: Not often, sometimes they will bring up disagreements they've had in the week with other residents and talk through that. Having staff there as a third-party helps to calm things and suggest solutions. It's a bit of a team-building activity.

Field Notes, 2015, Susie's Office

Having staff present to mediate and answer questions therefore helped to facilitate the power distribution among the residents, reframing the hostel as a collaborative environment with elements of shared power. By creating a shared commitment and sense of belonging, residents were able to establish a sense of pride, accountability, and ownership which in turn strengthened their social bond with the hostel as an institution (Hirschi 1969). For example, residents described how they would be asked to create a fair cleaning rota during these meetings which enabled residents to keep the hostel tidy. Residents would decide who would be undertaking certain domestic chores during the week and any other ad-hoc in-depth cleaning chores would be suggested and incorporated where necessary. Other roles were that of meeting notetaker and meeting chair, which systematically gave each young person an opportunity to effectively lead the meeting, increasing levels of empowerment and a sense of personal worth. As one resident stated:

The house meetings are pretty good and usually have a good turnout. It gives us a chance to ask staff questions or talk about the rules and that. The staff were telling us a few weeks ago that some residents are being caught with weed all the time now, so they spoke to us about that, and we asked why we have to have a rule like that anyway because if I was in my own flat, I would be allowed to do it, but I respect what they're saying.

Although the rule surrounding bringing illegal substances onto the hostel premises was highly unlikely to be revoked despite resident challenges, this example demonstrates the collaborative and open approach embedded within these meetings and the distribution of power between staff and residents, even if staff had the final say in any decision-making. By ensuring power is co-constructed, staff and residents can negotiate and use their individual experiences to develop effective and legitimate solutions to problem-solving. Equally, by giving residents power, staff were able to strengthen the trust and respect in the relationship which as this study has shown, are central characteristics to ensure the hostel remains effective in its aims.


Summary

The first chapter of the findings and discussion began with an outline of residents' pathways to homelessness and their social networks with those outside of the hostel including those with family and those with peers. The chapter highlighted the role social media plays in maintaining these bonds and the importance for residents to have access to these means as a result. Next, the chapter examined how the hostel is more than a physical place of refuge for young people. Although it provided necessities such as warmth, cooking facilities and a bed, it also functioned as a community within its own right, where staff offered formal and informal support to residents that extended beyond that expected in their capacity as staff members, which helps to establish the environment as a place of care (Conradson 2003). The chapter described how the staff-resident relationship is constructed through repeated positive informal everyday interactions in the communal areas, which enable staff to show that they care. Although most important, the findings also showed that informal interactions are supplemented

with interactions within the staff office, which helped to weaken the inequality between staff and residents in the environment that has been reported in other studies (Garside et al., 1990; Glen and Goodman 2015).

The chapter discussed the hostel manager and her place within the social world of Bank Hostel. An unexpected finding given the limited literature available, it was found that the manager showing an interest in forging a relationship with residents helped to alleviate the inequality typically found in the hostel environment and the manager, who was perceived to be the highest visible authority, wholly integrated herself in the lives of the residents and engaged with them on an individual level. Like staff, by showing that she cared about residents, the manager was viewed as a legitimate authority and was able to achieve a generally well-ordered environment.

The chapter then focused on the presentation of the hostel primarily but not exclusively as a place of care, whose purpose is to provide the young people with a family-like environment and the support and security necessary for residents to use as a base to develop independent living skills. The findings showed that Bank Hostel was a site where disciplinary techniques and social control strategies did exist but were imposed using softer power measures, such as social bonds, positive interactions, effective communication, and positive reinforcement. The findings in this chapter add further weight to the notion that to be effective, rules need to be flexible and administered by staff members who treat residents fairly and with respect. It was through this respect and relationship that these staff members were able to gain compliance as they were perceived as a legitimate and just authority. The chapter closed with a brief exploration of the concept of shared power and how it can encourage a sense of belonging and autonomy in residents who value having a forum to challenge rules and opportunities to have more control over hostel decisions which impact them on an individual level.



Chapter Nine: Power and Control in the Hostel

Chapter Eight examined the hostel through a lens predominantly of care, where the

staff-resident social relationships were used as a subtle strategy of social control, and positive social interactions promoted empowerment, and inclusivity and encouraged routine and a sense of belonging. Chapter Nine documents the data collected after the pause and after the hostel experienced a period of significant social and organisational change. Due to the new emphasis on obtaining control through coercive means and punishments the chapter examines the hostel as a site which resembled more of an institution of social control. The shift in perspective between the two chapters is reflective of the rapid changes Bank Hostel experienced during the fieldwork and captures the responses and reactions to the changing power dynamics in this environment. As a reminder, during the pause of approximately 12 months in data collection, the hostel as an organisation was subject to financial cuts which adversely impacted pay and working conditions. As a result, several experienced staff vacated their positions within a short space of time, leading to an influx of newer inexperienced staff members, most of whom also left the organisation shortly following commencement. During this period of high-staff turnover, the hostel manager interviewed in 2015 departed and a new manager was appointed, who had a vastly different management style and expectations. The findings presented in this chapter; therefore, report how staff and residents were managing the effects of the changes in the environment and how they responded and adapted to the changing power dynamics.

It is important to note that the descriptions of the change in management style as examined in this chapter do not intend to portray the management strategies as attempts to marginalise or purposely disrupt the lives of the young people. Rather, the shift from a more family-like environment to one that was more business-like appeared to be an attempt to eradicate all rule-bending and create more structure in the lives of the residents, many of whom at the time were neither in employment nor education. In addition, as we will learn, some rule changes and weakening of staff-resident bonds were the results of trying to manage the aftermath of the financial constraints and their implications on staffing levels. It is also worth noting that the interviews for Group B,

took place at the height of the effects of all these changes and emotions were still heightened, both for residents and staff. As such, this chapter aims to analyse and explore those changes and their effects and try and understand how a shift in power relations and weakening of social relationships created barriers and altered the social atmosphere and dynamics of the hostel.

Staff-Resident Relationship Breakdown

In Chapter Eight, it was explained that the benefits of a relationship between residents and staff extends beyond what is already understood (McGrath and Pistrang 2007; Bland 1997; Easton 2001; McKellar and Kendrick 2013; Cahill et al., 2016; Neale 1995; Stevenson 2014; Homeless Link 2018) in so far that the findings showed the bond and attachment between residents and staff can act as a form of social control, with residents choosing to conform to hostel rules and provisions due to a reluctance to jeopardise the relationship, even when did not necessarily agree with the basis of a rule itself. It was found that the staff-resident social relationship was fostered and maintained through a combination of positive social interactions and staff demonstrating to residents that they care beyond what is expected of their role (Karabanow 1999). Similar findings have been found in other studies which support the notion that going beyond what is expected of the role is pivotal to relationship development (Glenn and Goodman 2015). The non-judgemental attitude and genuine warmth (Conradson 2003) shown to residents by the staff helped to create a space of care and social refuge (Durrant 2014), where social control was still prevalent, but administered in a way that promoted an inclusionary, safe and collaborative environment.

Staffing issues in the homeless sector are not a new concept. Homeless hostels in particular often being reported as being chronically understaffed and having a low retention rate (Homeless Link 2018; Stone 2010). However, the staffing issues that arose as a result of the financial cuts in 2016 were unpredictably significant, as staff turnover

happened on a more rapid basis than that which is usually expected. As will be explored in more detail in Chapter Ten, the result of the sudden change in staffing meant that the remaining staff were unsurprisingly experiencing higher than usual workloads, fatigue, and heightened stress and consequently, had low job morale. The difficult working conditions and associated effects on staff presented marked challenges in their ability to deliver quality service and provide high levels of support to the young people. Of particular importance was that staff shortages and high workloads significantly diminished opportunities for the staff to socialise in the communal areas and engage in informal interactions with residents, which as explained in Chapter Eight, were essential for creating a space of care (Conradson 2003). During interviews and informal conversations in the staff office, staff members frequently described the difficulties they were experiencing when attempting to balance their increased workload with maintaining their relationship with and supporting residents. Compounding the issue further, was that the new manager had increased levels of paperwork staff were expected to complete during their shift, meaning they were often overwhelmed with administrative duties which needed to take priority. One staff member provided the following account during her interview:

We are constantly under-staffed and can't juggle the admin side of everything along with supporting the residents properly.

Amanda, Staff Member

However, as noted, similar complaints were a feature of conversations in the staff office. One day I arrived at Bank Hostel to interview Sophie, who had arrived for her shift earlier that day and discovered the relief staff member she was due to be working with had failed to turn up, meaning she was working from 8 am until 5 pm alone. As the office could not be left unstaffed, when I arrived at the hostel the interview was cancelled for that day. Sophie was apologetic and repeatedly expressed frustration over the new

policy that the office must have a member of staff at all times. Later, whilst in the office, the following interaction occurred when James, a resident entered the room:

James knocked on the office door and Sophie signalled to him to come in.

Sophie: What do you need?

James: was just going to ask if you wanted a brew.

Sophie gestured to a pile of papers on her desk

Sophie: I can't I have to get through all this, you'll have to come back later.

James left the room

Sophie (to the researcher): I feel bad but what can you do? He will be here all day once he starts talking

Field Notes, 2016, Staff Office

As the above indicates, whereas once the young people valued their interactions with staff in the office, drinking tea and engaging in casual conversations, the need to prioritise and focus on paperwork together with being unable to leave the office meant that staff could no longer give the residents the one-to-one attention which used to make them feel special and appreciated.

Chapter Eight highlighted how informal interactions in the communal areas were shown to be a multi-layered and dominant method staff members used to build a relationship with the young people. By integrating themselves into the communal areas, staff members were able to soften the authoritative staff-resident physical divide reported in other studies (Stark 1994) and reduce feelings of inequality in a relationship dynamic that by its very nature has an unequal distribution of power. It was by making themselves physically and emotionally available that staff were able to demonstrate to residents that they cared, which in turn helped to build mutual trust. In the previous chapter, trust was identified as a principal factor in the development and quality of the

staff-resident relationship and was commonly discussed as being the element which helped to dissolve the barriers homeless youth often experience with adults and services, a concept that is supported by other studies (McGrath and Pistrang 2007; Heineman 2010). As there was less scope for staff to integrate themselves into the communal areas, the unique benefits associated with informal interactions were lost and the bonds which once played a crucial role in resident motivations to conform, began to weaken (Hirschi 1969). Residents were frustrated with the lack of staff availability and felt as though they were being rejected by those who they had worked hard to trust. Relevant comments articulating this included:

They don't really have time for us anymore. It's like they don't really care. It makes you wonder if they cared to begin with.

Chloe, Group B

They barely come out of the office. They don't sit with us like they used to, and they are always too busy to chat. I feel like they are trying to rush through a conversation with me because they have to say they have had it, instead of because they genuinely want to know how my day has been.

James, Group B

In general, whilst aware of the practicalities of financial cuts and staff shortages, residents interpreted the change in staff physical availability as a sign that they no longer prioritised their relationship and in response, residents emotionally distanced themselves from the situation. These perspectives echoed the respondents of Glenn and Goodman's (2015) study in a women's shelter, where it was argued that staff showed respect towards residents by engaging and integrating themselves in their social world and showing they care by making themselves physically and emotionally available. In

contrast, they highlighted that those staff who physically isolated themselves in the office made residents feel inferior and “less than others,” and as a result, it was those staff who residents avoided talking or reaching out to. In the current study, with residents no longer feeling special, valued, or validated (McGrath and Pistrang 2007), the mutual respect and trust which were once the framework of the relationship were diminished and consequently, without these fundamental qualities, residents were reluctant to approach staff with any personal and sensitive issues they were experiencing.

Besides staff availability, residents struggled with the loss of experienced staff members with whom they had developed a close bond. With several staff departing in such a short space of time, the instability and uncertainty in Bank Hostel were almost tangible, with residents and to some extent staff, not knowing who they would be working with at any one time. Residents described being circulated between key workers depending on staff availability, leaving them feeling disrespected and like cattle rather than human beings. As one said:

My keyworker left, so I got a new keyworker, then they left so now they've given me a temporary one and I don't know how long that's for. It's confusing keeping up with them coming and going and I feel like I spend most of my keyworker meetings explaining to a new person what I spoke about in the last one with someone else. It makes me not want to go to them.

Richard, Group B

Research has shown that stability is a crucial feature in the relationships of young people living in institutions (Docherty et al., 2006), particularly as traumatic experiences such as homelessness can leave individuals alienated from their social networks and excluded from society (Buchanan et al., 2010; Eyrich 2003). Heineman (2010) and Tavecchio and

Thomeer (1999) drawing on Bowlby's (1969) attachment framework, made the connection between insecure attachments and young people experiencing homelessness, noting that these individuals often have poor quality parental attachment in early years and as such, lack opportunities to form a confident and 'secure' working model of attachment. In the absence of such stability and the presence of repeated rejection and non-availability of the parent, the young person eventually constructs a negative image of themselves which can influence future social relationships due to a lack of trust in others. However, whilst attachment issues are often engrained in young homeless people, opportunities to forge secondary attachments in the form of stable relationships with other adults, can compensate for poor attachment and eradicate the associated adverse consequences (Tavecchio and Thomeer 1999; Heineman 2010). The previous chapter demonstrated that staff members have the potential to function as secondary attachment figures for young people and can therefore be a stable base to correct an attachment disorder and enable a young person to build other relationships, develop confidence and re-construct both self-image and image of the wider environment. Due to general past negative attachment experiences, however, staff members need to offer stability and a high degree of availability and personalisation in the relationship. This was evidenced throughout all resident interviews, where the young people repeatedly emphasised the importance of staff showing that they care. Therefore, understaffing can be understood to inhibit the initial development of the essential building blocks of the relationship and can thus hinder the chances of a young person forming a protective secure attachment. However, importantly, it is notable that as some residents had already formed a secondary attachment to staff when the relationship and interactions unexpectedly became uncertain and unstable, it may be that the experience evokes the rejection and unavailability of the primary caregiver in childhood and compounds any pre-existing attachment issues, resulting in residents being more wary and even less likely to accept help from adults or services in the future.

The Arrival of the New Staff

As previously noted, during the pause in data collection, several experienced members of staff departed because of a change in working conditions. Sometime shortly after, a further experienced member of staff resigned after disagreements with the newly appointed hostel manager. To replace those who had departed, several new staff members were employed; however, due to the change in working conditions, and a shift towards a relevant undergraduate degree being an essential criterion of the role, the type of candidates were young, inexperienced and in the main, recent university graduates. Similar issues with candidate pools have been reported in other studies such as that by Homeless Link (2018), which noted that due to lower wages resulting from financial cuts, applicants were generally graduates with few of the personal attributes and experiences necessary for the position. Residents found it particularly difficult to bond with the newer members of staff and mostly rejected their support, as can be seen in this excerpt from the fieldnotes which capture a conversation between a resident and Laura (staff member):

Richard: I need to go to the job centre on Thursday morning, can you take me?

Laura: I'm not back in until Friday, but Tracey (new staff member) is here, why don't you ask her to take you?

Richard: Nah I can't be bothered with her, who else will be here?

Laura: Amanda (staff member) is in but she has meetings all day so won't be able to take you, just ask Tracey.

Richard: I'll just walk then

Field Notes, 2016, Staff Office

This refusal to accept support from the newer staff member was not uncommon, with residents regularly refusing offers of help, even if it put them at a disadvantage. In summary, it appeared that residents were reluctant to accept the newer staff for the following reasons:

- a) The perceived lack of experience of new staff members and similarity in age to some residents
- b) Being expected to repeat life stories and personal issues to multiple individuals
- c) Rejection of newer staff as a manifestation of the resistance to the changes being implemented.

Examples of each of these factors are elaborated on in the following paragraphs.

To elaborate further, residents tended to prefer staff members to have life experience rather than qualifications, with some suggestion that having a personal experience of homelessness was advantageous as it enabled staff members to genuinely appreciate the difficulties the young people were experiencing. These sentiments tie well with previous studies, where it has been reported that residents place considerably more value on staff members possessing adequate life experience than on educational achievements (Buchanan et al., 2010). This study expands on that finding by showing that residents expressed contempt towards younger staff members, as they were not too dissimilar in age to the residents themselves. As Bank Hostel was located in a small rural town, some of the residents mixed in the same social circles as the new staff members during their school years, and as such, they struggled to separate the identity of the individual from social acquaintance to an authoritative figure. As one resident explained:

Some of the new staff that have started, I know them from the town, they were in my school and only a couple of years older than me. I would never tell them any of my stuff, they would tell everyone. They know the same people as me.

Amelia, Group B

Residents being reluctant to collaborate with new staff was another prominent factor. Primarily, they felt as though they had already opened up and divulged intimate and private details of their life and background to their previous keyworker and did not want to re-live the trauma by repeating their story to another person, who may or may not be replaced soon. One resident said:

I'm a private person, I don't like people knowing my business. It takes a lot for me to talk to people. It took me a while to talk to my old key worker, then they left so I can't be bothered starting all over again.

Steve, Group B

In a similar vein, another resident said:

I used to get on good with one of the guys that used to work here and now he's just gone too. There's no point speaking to most of the new staff because they'll be gone soon too, I can't be arsed with all that, me.

Richard, Group B

This sense of not wanting to open up to a new member of staff is perhaps unsurprising considering what we understand of the behaviours of young people experiencing homelessness. As previously noted, research consistently asserts that difficulties trusting adults and working with services are characteristics of young homeless people and consequently, it can take a considerable length of time for key workers to dissolve barriers in the relationship and encourage a resident to fully engage (McGrath and Pistrang 2007; Heineman 2010). Finally, it may be argued that residents refused to form a bond with newer staff as a coping mechanism and power exertion of their own. As one

staff member stated:

Some residents have lost their key worker or their favourite member of staff and are powerless to stop these changes. They have put barriers up. They aren't willing to even work with the new staff.

Amanda, Staff Member

Left feeling powerless to prevent the rapid staff changes and their implications, residents had little control over the changing environment and the losses of staff, and it was this sense of helplessness that led to the rejection of new staff members and resistance to change through persistent inertia and a refusal to recognise or accept those staff as legitimate forms of authority.

Taken together, each of the factors suggest that residents' rejection of new staff members was at least in part due to them being perceived as having low levels of legitimacy, which in turn had implications on the respect and trust staff garnered from residents and the extent to which residents were willing to develop a working relationship. Tyler (2006) discussing the concept of legitimacy, noted that the belief that an authority, institution or social arrangement is just and proper will lead to individuals voluntarily obeying rules. He explained that this type of influential power can shape behaviour and promote rule adherence in a social environment, without the need for coercion or more forceful 'hard power' methods, meaning it is often more effective and economically beneficial. In this context, due to the variety of reasons mentioned, residents did not believe newer staff were 'deserving' of the right to enforce rules and be in a position of authority and therefore refused to be treated as a subordinate as they felt there was no obligation to listen to these staff. Ultimately, residents' refusal to work with, engage or obey newer staff members created a ripple effect, ensuing palpable tensions and mistrust thus creating an environment that was hostile and uncooperative,

a direct contrast to the homely atmosphere once experienced. Newer staff members resigned quickly, with one being dismissed for reasons which were undisclosed, meaning those experienced staff members remaining were tasked with heavier administrative workloads resulting in even less time to engage and informally interact with residents, weakening the existing staff-resident bonds further. These findings when compared to those described in the previous chapter, further evidence the importance of staff members being perceived as a legitimate authority by residents and to at least some extent, emphasise the core role legitimacy has in the development of respect and trust in the staff-resident relationship.

The New Manager

As noted earlier in this chapter, the departure of staff coincided with the appointment of a new hostel manager who upon her arrival, sought to overhaul the existing management practices and attempt to create a more orderly and structured environment. From the perspective of the new manager, too many rule infringements had been overlooked in the past leading to an environment where residents had little routine and limited discipline.

The previous manager let a lot of things slide and it meant that most young people were not in employment or education. I'm here to manage the hostel and make sure it's working for the residents, not to be their best friend. That means taking some control and getting things in order

Claire, 2016 Manager

The above shows Claire's clear disapproval of the management style of the previous manager and her comment surrounding not being the 'best friend' of the young people indicates her negative perception of using positive social relationships as social control method (Nye 1990; Crewe 2011). The potential impact of authoritative and punitive

management practices has been highlighted by Stark (1994), as one of the reasons why homeless hostels possess similar characteristics to Goffman's (1961) all-encompassing total institution. Stark (1994) argued that management practices which advocate strict rules and policies that are designed to protect the institution from the potential 'chaos' and unruly behaviour of residents reinforce the notion that people experiencing homelessness are a problem which requires fixing (Williams 1996; Durrant 2014). Describing her approach to the role, the new manager said:

I'm not here to look after the residents, that's the staff's job, I'm here to make sure they do it properly.

Claire, 2016 Manager

Attempts at creating a more authoritative relationship dynamic with residents included the decision to relocate the manager's office. As previously explained, in 2015, the manager's space was situated near the entrance of the main staff office, meaning the manager was visible to residents when they were near this vicinity. To establish a rapport and mutual trust, the manager provided regular opportunities for interactions by having specified times of the week when she would operate a physical and metaphorical 'open-door policy.' Although this model was well received by residents who valued having one-on-one time with the manager and respected that she was willing to effectively go above and beyond her role to accommodate them, according to the new manager, this was unprofessional, blurring lines and incorrectly suggesting to residents that the manager was a friend, rather than a senior member of staff and rule enforcer.

They don't need to see me and see what I'm doing. If they need anything then they can ask the staff for help, or they can ask the staff to come and get me. I have so much work to do, and I can't have interruptions constantly.

Claire, 2016 Manager

Therefore, to avoid pre-conceptions that the manager's office was a space that was open to residents, Claire relocated her personal office to the rear of the staff space, meaning she was not visible to residents from anywhere in the hostel, including the staff office itself, due to walls separating the spaces. Whilst there is not a considerable amount of literature published on the hostel manager's space, perhaps due to limited options of its location, Garside et al. (1990) asserted that separate staff space in hostel settings can amplify the institutional feel, as staff members are too remote and distanced from residents, thereby inevitably emphasising the inequality inherent in their respective statuses within the hostel. Similar sentiments were described by participants in response to the changing location of the manager's office, as they reported feeling disrespected and insulted by the seemingly obvious attempts to block any relationship development or opportunities for interaction. For most, it seemed the spatial manipulation of extending the physical distance and closing the space was symbolic of the emotional barriers purposely implemented in the relationship and suggested that the manager considered herself to be of higher social status. Therefore, by deliberately constructing a more bureaucratic built environment and business-like dynamic to create more structure and control in interactions with residents, the manager created a relationship marked by social inequality and disdain. Discussing the manager's arrival, one resident said:

You never see her. She's not interested in us at all, she's moved her office so she doesn't have to see us and can pretend we're not there like an inconvenience or something. When she first started, we were just down the road near the lane having a smoke and she drove passed us on the way home, we waved at her, and she just point blank ignored us. Like we weren't even there. I didn't bother again; I know where we stand.

James, Group B

However, it was not just opportunities for interaction in the office that the manager restricted. Whereas the previous manager aimed to integrate herself into the communal areas of the hostel and engage in interactions with residents, which was shown to aid the relationship development and tie in with rule adherence, the new manager avoided the residents' physical spaces in a further attempt to create authoritative barriers in the relationship and prevent spontaneous encounters. Again, this was because the manager believed she should remain distinct from staff who were key workers and that it would be counterproductive to build anything more than a cordial rapport with the young people, as her role was to manage the staff rather than the residents. Not unlike their negative reaction towards the relocation of the manager's office, residents were extremely critical of Claire's decision to avoid informal interactions in the communal areas, believing that her unwillingness to make herself physically, emotionally, and socially available showed that she did not care about or respect the young people. As one resident stated:

She's horrible, she's doing her job, but she comes here to work, it's work for her. We got to live here, she doesn't understand us or even try. You can tell the whole place has changed because of her.

Steve, Group B

The negative comments from residents towards the new manager due to her refusal to build a close bond reinforces the earlier argument that residents perceived staff who made themselves physically unavailable as purposely isolating themselves and viewing residents as inferior (Glenn and Goodman 2015). Hoffman and Coffey (2008) noted the power relations in the staff-resident relationship means that homeless people can often feel disrespected and dehumanised, particularly when they feel as though they are treated as a number, rather than an individual. They concluded that treating homeless

people with dignity and respect was crucial for reintegration into society and suggested that individuals often 'opt out' of homeless services to avoid poor treatment by service providers and maintain a sense of self-worth, leading to perpetuating homelessness (Hoffman and Coffey 2008). In the context of the current study, it appears residents coped with feeling disrespected and similarly objectified by new management. Whilst they did not wholly reject the service in response to the social inequities and disrespect shown in the same vein as Hoffman and Coffey's (2008) participants, they did clearly and openly reject the manager as a legitimate form of authority. Hence, not only did a shift in management practices impact the atmosphere and social environment, but it also had implications for rule adherence and resistance, as will be discussed in the remainder of this chapter.

With such a vast range of compounding issues at the time of the interviews, it is difficult to ascertain the true root cause of the hostility towards management from the residents as it is entirely plausible that other factors were aggravating the tensions. Nevertheless, in the last chapter, we saw that a manager who fully integrated herself into the social world of the young people and was willing to dissolve the authoritative barriers in the relationship helped to establish a more inclusive 'homely' space of care, where residents felt respected, valued, and cared for. In contrast, a shift towards a more business-like functional relationship between residents and management distorted the perception and created almost a 'them and us' mentality and divide, objectifying residents and highlighting the inequality and differences embedded in the social groups, thus reinforcing the social hierarchy, and shifting the perception of the environment towards that of an oppressive disciplinary institution (Stark 1994).

Shifting from Care to Control

Shifting towards a more authoritative relationship and limiting management-resident social interactions were not the only changes that new management introduced to

construct a more structured and regimented environment. Believing that too many rules were overlooked by staff and management in the past, the new manager aimed to completely moderate rule infringements by enforcing more rigid control mechanisms and increasing the level of formal surveillance. She believed that combatting rule-bending and imposing spatial restrictions would benefit residents as it would enable them to develop a more organised routine and would also benefit staff constrained by staffing shortages and limited resources, as it would mean they would not need to spend as much time dealing with any unwanted behaviour. The decision to shift towards a more authoritative approach to rules offers interesting comparisons to existing research by Freeman (2003), on prisons, who argued that prison officers who forged poor social relationships with inmates were more likely to enforce strict rules than those who shared a good relationship, as they would be more likely to perceive the dynamic as one based on authority and power. Therefore, it may be that adding layers of authority and depersonalisation in the manager-resident relationship resulted in at least to some extent, the dehumanised perception of residents, thus fundamentally minimising empathy and impeding the ability to see the young people as individuals, instead of a social group of subordinates in need of control. The following section will briefly explore the rule changes introduced in 2016 and will subsequently examine the change in rule adherence and the role of management practices in this change.

New Rules and Restrictions

As noted, the new manager determined that more control needed to be exerted in the hostel and deployed a variety of punitive mechanisms to achieve this objective. Methods primarily included overhauling the rule system and approach to rule enforcement, as it was felt that too many transgressions were occurring and that residents had little in the way of routine in their lives. Explaining her decision to impose more control based on her personal perception of resident needs, the manager stated:

There weren't any rules. Alcohol was being brought in, cannabis was being smoked, not much was being done about it.....I've told staff that if residents break the rules, then punish them otherwise, they won't learn, you can't have people here thinking they can run around doing what they want when they want.

Claire, 2016 Manager

Changes in control mechanisms were far-reaching and impacted most aspects of the environment. Introduced over a short period, management first decided to close the communal areas during the day alongside prohibiting any of the residents' visitors to the hostel between the hours of 9 am and 5 pm. These changes aimed to encourage residents to seek employment or be productive during the typical working hours, instead of socialising with friends and family in the communal areas. Hence, although the new rules aimed to motivate residents to be more productive and establish a routine, the method used to achieve this created barriers in the social support systems and interpersonal relationships residents possessed outside the hostel environment. Although residents only briefly referred to this change in their interviews as part of a wider discussion on rules, staff members expressed their dislike of the change, as it placed restrictions on the residents' ability to control their social interactions and unfairly assumed that all young people were actively seeking or were even in the psychological position to be able to gain employment or return to education. As one staff member stated:

I don't agree with the new visitor rule. Visitors are not allowed here now between 9 am and 5 pm. The manager decided that during these hours the residents should be out working or in college. But some young people don't want to go to college and never will. It's not something they want to do. If it was my home, I'd want my visitors when I want them.

Sophie, Staff Member

The disparities between the treatment of those who were deemed to be conforming to 'acceptable' standards in society by being in employment and education, and those who were unemployed and not in education are reflective of the historical concepts of the 'deserving' and 'undeserving' poor, the latter of which are considered to be undeserving of help and assistance, as their 'laziness' is believed to be the root cause for their situation (Robinson 2013). In addition, some research depicts unemployment in supported accommodations to be as high as 95% (Blake 2008), one of the reasons for this is likely because if residents have a source of income, they may lose their Housing benefit entitlement and will be forced to use most, or all of their income to fund the high rental costs associated with the hostel. This is a complex matter which has previously been raised by other researchers who assert that this dilemma can leave residents in precarious financial situations and caught in a loop of unemployment and homelessness (Stone 2010). Exacerbating this further, other research has shown that homeless hostels themselves are a distinct and stressful barrier to individuals trying to re-enter or indeed remain in educational establishments (Utting 2009). Given what research tells us, such hostel provisions implemented to limit social interactions and push individuals to gain employment or return to education, appear counterintuitive and potentially harmful.

Alongside prohibiting visitors during certain hours, a new provision was introduced restricting residents' use of the communal areas overnight, on the basis that this would address the problem of the young people staying awake until the early hours. The restrictions meant that once the front door was locked at 12.30 am, the communal areas, including the kitchen, would also be locked, and residents would be made to return to their bedrooms for the remainder of the night. This was particularly problematic for some residents, as it meant that if they stayed out until curfew, they would not be able to access the kitchen facilities once they returned. As a result, they either had to choose to return earlier than curfew, thus limiting their opportunities to

socialise outside of the hostel sphere, or return at the latest possible point, and not be able to prepare a meal for themselves. Describing the extent of the restrictions the manager stated:

The pool room was left open all night, so the residents were up all night making noise, so I've stopped that and now they have to go to bed.

Claire, 2016 Manager

By closing the communal areas overnight, management believed that it was possible to control the social activities and movements of residents and with a lack of sources of entertainment in bedrooms, they would have little choice but to fall asleep at what was perceived to be a respectable hour. Hoffman and Coffey (2008) claim that residents feel infantilised by similar over-zealous control methods, and so rather than promoting a transition to adulthood, this can lead to individuals losing their sense of autonomy and self-respect. The closing of the communal areas overnight was a contentious point of conflict for many residents who felt as though they were being treated as children and disrespected by the staff members who enforced the policy. As one young person explained:

They've locked all the rooms downstairs so they tell us when we can go to bed and that. I'm 21, I'm not being told when to go to bed. We're in prison, it's like lights out, go to bed now. I know they do it, so people get into a routine and that, but I think most people here think of it as their freedom has been taken away.

James, Group B

Taken together, the fundamental overarching aim of management was to spatially restrict and regulate resident movements and social interactions to periods which were

deemed to be socially acceptable. From the perspective of management, these coercive policies fulfilled the aims of the organisation and influenced resident behaviour in a manner that was considered immediately effective, without the need for heavy staff involvement or resources (Crewe 2011). However, by removing personal control and choice from residents and attempting to coerce them into altering their behaviour, management was feeding the growing sense of inequality in the environment and weakening the levels of mutual respect and trust in the faltering staff-resident relationship, the very factors that were shown in the last chapter to influence resident conformity.

The preceding chapter examined how a young person can create a sense of home, by immersing themselves in a supportive, secure, and inclusive culture thereby establishing a sense of belonging and ownership. As noted, opportunities for young people experiencing homelessness to place-make and instil a sense of home have been reported as crucial given their potential vulnerabilities and lack of familial support (Hoolachan 2015). However, by restricting residents' spatial autonomy, creating a sense of ownership, and belonging becomes significantly more difficult, as the young people are prevented from exercising and negotiating their agency within these spaces and boundaries. Green (2018) who researched the spatial behaviours of young children, found that the exertion of spatial autonomy enabled the children to develop a bond with their environment and the items within the space. They also found that by providing the participants with a degree of spatial control, their level of self-confidence, individuality and sense of self was strengthened. Therefore, by using coercive methods and restricting residents' personal control of their use of space within the hostel, the shared feelings of attachment and community which once bound the residents and staff together (Hirschi 1969) and helped to create a safe homely space considerably diminished, and without the sense of home distracting from the institutional aesthetic features of Bank Hostel, the environment continued to tilt towards that which resembled a disciplinary institution, rather than a space of care.

Social activities to prevent boredom and increase skills are an intrinsic element of supported housing projects and were a prominent feature in Bank Hostel. Ranging from more extensive and costly activities such as adventure weekends away, to those that were smaller and more personal such as movie and pizza nights, the consensus amongst residents and staff was that activities served the purpose of alleviating social isolation and establishing social relationships. The wide range of psychosocial benefits associated with activities have previously been documented in research conducted in institutional settings, including prisons (Brosens et al., 2014), older persons' residential homes (Murphy et al., 2006) and homeless hostels (Iveson and Cornish 2016; Homeless Link 2018). However, despite the evident benefits, activities were not always popular with residents, many of whom found certain types such as cooking or gardening uninteresting as they did not align with their personal interests and hobbies. Similar findings concerning personalisation have been found by Murphy et al., (2014) who described how it was pivotal to residents that social activities were constructed in line with their personalities and personal interests.

Recognising the multitude of benefits they can bring, as part of the changes introduced, the new manager determined that all social activities would now be mandatory for all residents who were not in employment, training, or education. Residents who refused to participate were either sanctioned or if the refusal was persistent, were given a warning and a reminder that they were in breach of their tenancy agreement as they were not 'engaging' with the service. Perhaps unsurprisingly when combined with the other issues in Bank Hostel, residents reported feelings of frustration and anger towards the decision, stating that they felt as though they were being stripped of their individuality and control over their lives:

It's stupid that they make us do it too, if you're going to force us to do something, we're not going to do it. If they said, you know, we're going to start Breakfast

Club you can come if you want, I might go on some days but because they are trying to tell me I have to go, I don't want to be there. You have to go to it, and you get a warning if you don't go

Steve, Group B

'Breakfast Club' took place several times a week at 9 am and involved the residents eating breakfast together in the main living room, whilst outside services delivered talks or presentations, ranging from mental and sexual health to promoting training courses. From discussions with staff, it appeared the purpose of 'Breakfast Club' was twofold, as not only did it allow services to offer support to residents, but by attending, management could ensure that residents were up and out of bed by a set time, thus superficially continuing to fulfil the aims of creating more structure and routine in their lives. This rule, along with other noted in this chapter demonstrate that by only imposing control methods on those residents who were not in employment, education or training, management inadvertently created two distinct social groups amongst the resident population; those who were deemed to be conforming 'acceptably' to society's standards and norms by engaging in employment and training, and those who were not and who were consequently subject to more stringent and draconian control mechanisms. The 'othering' or categorisation based on negatively contrived stereotypes has been reported in the literature as being embedded in the experiences of homeless people, many of whom find their 'homeless identity' becomes impermeable and binding (McCarthy 2013) and are ostracised and marginalised from society as a result. Further research has found that homeless hostels and the interactions with staff can help re-frame this discourse and provide a safe, non-judgmental, and protective space for individuals to express themselves and not be treated differently for being homeless, thus rejecting the notion of being 'othered' and stigmatised by society for not conforming to the perceived social norms and expectations (Durrant 2014). Hence, by treating

residents who were not in employment or education differently to those who were, management was removing the important protection from being 'othered' that homeless hostels can provide and instead, reinforced the notion that those who were not conforming to society's standards were inherently different and in need of being controlled. However, the impact of othering ran deeper than residents being treated differently, as by assigning them into social groups, a social divide and tensions amongst residents emerged, hindering the sense of community and inclusivity that were once the building blocks for a caring and supportive environment.

Stripping residents of autonomy and reasserting a sense of being 'othered' were not the only implications of mandatory activities, as removing personal choice impinged on residents' sense of self-identity and their personal growth, leading to discontent:

if they just asked me then maybe I'd want to take part. Maybe I'd enjoy the activity, but by saying you've got no choice, they are taking that decision away from me.

Amelia, Group B

Stark (1994) postulated that residents in homeless hostels can struggle to retain their identity as their societal roles before homelessness can often become lost as they take on the encompassing role of shelter residents and surrender their efforts to gain autonomy. Prior to activities becoming mandatory, residents could tailor their participation to align with their personality, interests, strengths, and abilities and could opt to decline those from which they would not obtain enjoyment. By having free will to participate in social activities, residents were thus able to explore and shape their sense of self and make choices based on their personal characteristics and unique identity. Conversely, removing personal choice restricted the young person's sense of individuality

and ability to carve out who they are and who they wanted to be, instead creating rigid uniformity.

The regulation of space and forced participation in social activities were implemented for the specific purpose of creating a more regimented and structured way of life in Bank Hostel and demonstrate undeniable similarities to Goffman's (1961) notion of a total institution. According to Goffman (1961), total institutions are distinguished in that they create a separate social system for their inhabitants, dissolving the work, sleep and play barriers that normally separate our lives and have a distinct social inequality between those authorities who enforce strict control and power mechanisms to create a "formally administered round of life" (Goffman 1961 p.11), and those who are 'ruled'. A defining implication of individuals belonging to a total institution is the process of being socialised and leaving their identity behind, or what is known as the 'mortification of self' (Goffman 1961), where a person's sense of self is replaced by the new identity given to them by the institution. This process is hastened by the uniform treatment of the individuals, where they are coordinated to routinely complete all aspects of their lives and daily activities together per the demands of the organisation and institutional expectations, all whilst under the supervision of higher authority. The previous chapter explained that by framing the hostel as a space of care, where social control was achieved through soft power exertions based on social relationships and trust, residents' self-esteem, confidence, and well-being were strengthened, as they were able to negotiate their identity, develop social skills and learn to be an autonomous adult from a secure base. It was this system and approach to management that protected residents from the potential negative effects of hostel life and 'Shelterization' which has long been the subject of academic discourse (Stark 1994; Durrant 2014; Stone 2010). However, the new systematic strategies and control procedures were counterintuitive to this system and although superficially fulfilled the aims of the institution by creating a strictly regimented life for residents, it resulted in a forced adjustment and adaption of their behaviour to cope with the new environment and preserve a sense of self (Goffman

1961)

Sanctions

Prior to the changes in 2016, Bank Hostel, like most other similar supported housing projects, operated a warning system consisting of an initial verbal warning, a more formal written warning and finally a 28-day eviction notice. Whilst the manager at the time attempted to avoid formal warnings, only relying on them and the eviction policy when necessary, such as the participant Colin's eviction due to threats towards a pregnant resident, they remained an inherent feature of Bank Hostel. When the new manager was appointed in 2016, she instructed staff members to use formal warnings and other sanctions for every rule breach and introduced new stringent sanction methods to produce conformity. Recognising the crucial role social media and communication applications played in the lives of the young people, one of the new sanctions introduced was the removal of Wi-Fi privileges for those residents who had broken any of the hostel rules. Discussing how they approached the obstacle of residents sharing the password, one staff member, Laura, said:

Laura: We change the password each week and we put the password in all the phones of the residents who haven't been sanctioned. The only people who know the password are the staff.

Researcher: So, are residents only sanctioned for a week?

Laura: Usually, it depends really. It depends on what they've done. Sometimes it's a week and sometimes much longer. It also depends if they carry on breaking the rules.

Field Notes, 2016, Staff Office

The previous chapter demonstrated that although residents often integrate themselves physically into the social sphere of the hostel, which in turn weakens their social bonds

with peers, family, and the rest of society (Tabner 2013), they can establish a 'bridge' with their social networks by using their Smartphones to maintain contact (Rice and Barman-Adhikari 2014; Oliver and Cheff 2012; Guadango et al., 2013; VonHoltz et al., 2018) and an online or virtual presence, thus enabling them to avoid succumbing to the mortification process (Goffman 1961) and retain aspects of their pre-homeless identity. Having access to free Hostel Wi-Fi was imperative to reaping the benefits associated with the use of social media, as residents often did not have the financial means to stay connected with family or peers by other methods. As such, residents expressed deep frustration and hostility towards the new sanction, with staff members, despite having to administer the punishment themselves, also strongly disagreeing with the new methods. Some relevant resident and staff comments included:

the Wi-Fi getting stopped, that's a big one for me because I haven't got any money for credit so I use Facebook to speak to people and I can't do that without the Wi-Fi.

James, Group B

A lot of the residents that come here don't go out very much, so you often see residents talking to family or friends over that video thing on Facebook because it's free. Without that then they don't really have a chance to speak to their families and friends as much, which kind of goes against what we encourage.

Amanda, Staff Member

Therefore, those residents who were sanctioned in this manner lost the very apparatus that was shown to some extent to protect them from the negative effects of homelessness reported in other studies including dependency and over-reliance on the hostel (Stark 1994), feelings of isolation (Riggs and Coyle 2008) loneliness (Roos 2014)

and alienation (Eyrich et al., 2003).

For staff to remember who was being punished each week, the hostel had a large 'sanctions' whiteboard in the staff office which listed each of its room numbers along the left-hand side and communicated any sanctions its inhabitant was under at any time. Designed to ensure staff, particularly relief staff, were always aware of who was being denied access to facilities such as Wi-fi, computer and office telephone, the board was visible to any person who would enter the office, including outside services and the residents themselves. Residents were regularly observed walking into the office and reading the whiteboard. Sometimes they asked the staff questions about why people were being punished, other times they passed comments such as 'harsh' in response to seeing Wi-Fi, and computer and office telephone access were prohibited:

Amelia came into the office to pay her utilities.

Amelia: why is room 8 on a sanction?

Sophie: None of your business

Amelia: Is it because they were late coming in the other day?

Sophie: As I said, it's not your business

Amelia: (laughing) I'm going to ask Richard (resident)

Field Notes, 2016, Staff Office

Such 'public shaming' has been discussed by other researchers such as Armaline (2005), who reported a similar sanction recording system in his study. Armaline (2005) noted that such tools used in hostels have a bureaucratic organisational function to publicly evaluate the behaviour of residents and social control, as in total institutions (Goffman 1961) and quasi-institutions, thus serving as a reminder that residents are constrained by the rules, policies, and punishment within the boundaries of the hostel. As a key psychological power tool (Foucault 1977), the sanctions board objectified residents,

reinforcing that they were the subordinates under constant observation, control and “institutional dominance” (Crewe 2009 p.85), and was thus symbolic of the power disparity between residents and staff. Although the sanctions board limited residents' power in comparison to staff, having it displayed in such a public area allowed the young people to access private information about other residents, which reasserted a degree of power for some residents, whilst further limiting the power of the residents who were being subject to punishment and publicly denounced.

Enhancing Formal Surveillance

Chapter Eight described how staff presence in the communal areas was an effective soft form of informal surveillance as it maximised visible presence and created a safe, secure, and inclusive environment which promoted positive social interactions between residents. However, as noted previously, staffing shortages meant that staff members no longer had opportunities to socialise with residents in the communal areas and therefore this method of surveillance was no longer viable. For this reason, to ensure compliance and the maintenance of social order, the new manager decided to install additional Closed-Circuit Television (CCTV) systems in the communal areas. Explaining her decision to increase formal surveillance, Claire stated:

There aren't enough cameras, we need more coverage. There are seven new cameras coming. All communal areas will be covered from every angle.... I have an issue with the office, we can't see enough from where we are, it's very blind so we can't keep an eye over what is happening. CCTV only goes so far, we have to be able to supervise at all times, so we can ensure that nothing is going on that shouldn't be.

Claire, 2016 Manager

The new pervasive surveillance systems were not well received by residents, who all appeared to find this change the most intrusive and frustrating. Comments from residents relating to the new CCTV included:

She's brought in loads more so everywhere you look there's one in your face. It's just a reminder that you can't be trusted that they think you're going to do something bad.

Richard, Group B

Although there is some legitimacy to using surveillance as shown in the last chapter, where it was found that surveillance enhanced caring relations by supporting the safety and protection of residents, as the above indicates, the enhancement of the number of CCTV systems meant that the surveillance was no longer seen as protective, but intrusive and oppressive. Embedded in social institutions as a major mechanism of control (Foucault 1977; Dandeker 1990), the use of surveillance of some degree is generally thought to be a requirement for achieving compliance (Foucault 1977; Dandeker 1990; Reeves 2016; Williams 1996; Crewe 2009, 2011), as inevitably, the 'rulers' will be required to observe and monitor the behaviour of the 'ruled' to gain full control, ensure conformity and to support the administering of sanctions where rules were breached. However, in the current study, whilst residents may have accepted that some forms of electronic surveillance were necessary to ensure the safety of those within, purposely increasing the number of existing CCTV apparatus created the perception that management was presumptuous about the behaviour of the residents and believed them to be untrustworthy to behave acceptably, thus reinforcing the negative stereotypes often associated with homelessness and lead to homeless individuals being 'othered' by society (Durrant 2014). Echoing Williams's (1996) points regarding the intrusiveness of surveillance, it appeared the purpose of the CCTV was to fulfil the organisational aims of assisting in 'fixing' and 'correcting' the residents, a process often

resigned to prisoners in a penal disciplinary institution.

The problematic issue which lies within the enhanced surveillance is that given our understanding of the basis of coercive power and its dependence on the continued presence of the person exerting influence through surveillance (Raven 2008), the degree of control and a resident's willingness to conform to hostel rules would likely only ever be short-term and extend as far as the communal and outdoor areas, as these were the only spaces where CCTV systems were able to be installed. This was illustrated during discussions between staff in the office:

Sophie: More CCTV has been ordered for outside the back

Laura: The residents won't be happy with that

Sophie: No, I can't imagine they will be. They will just go to the lane and smoke weed instead though

Field Notes, 2016, Staff Office

The above comments highlight the ineffectiveness of restrictive formal surveillance as a control measure, unlike informal surveillance which was shown in the previous chapter to increase self-regulation in residents and internalise conformity (Crewe 2009). Any influence over the residents to regulate their behaviour and comply with the rules in the hostel extended only so far that they could be monitored and recorded. Therefore, although the use of CCTV may have been superficially corrective (Foucault 1977) to some degree in that it helped to reduce rule-breaking within the confined CCTV spaces, it did not control unwanted behaviour, it merely moved it elsewhere. For this reason, there was no evidence that enhanced surveillance curbed unwanted behaviour. However, given that the findings of this study have shown that the staff-resident relationship is in itself an effective mechanism of informal social control based on mutual trust and respect, displays of distrust such as increased formal monitoring and

surveillance alongside other restrictive measures, damaged this relationship dynamic. Consequently, excessive surveillance was not only shown to be ineffective at preventing rule infractions, but it also diminished the social bonds in the staff-resident social relationship that were once effective methods of control (Hirschi 1969). In this sense, attempts at creating a more disciplined environment through the expansion of formal surveillance were counterproductive, as not only was there no suggestion that advanced surveillance had any meaningful relationship with the level of rule adherence, but its presence also weakened the mechanisms of informal control that had proven to be effective in the past.

Earlier in this chapter, it was explained that as part of the implementation of the social changes in Bank Hostel, the new manager relocated her office from a location where she was highly visible to the residents, to one where she was closed off and separated by walls and closed doors. This meant that during the majority of her working day, the manager could not be physically seen by the residents, even if they were in the general staff office. The direct contrast between a less visible manager and more visible residents on the new CCTV systems both amplified and signified the clear social hierarchy and inequality embedded in the environment and the authoritative nature of the manager-resident social relationship. Though not operating anonymously, higher management was operating unreachably with an almost intangible power, working from a distance by dispersing power to staff members and avoiding social contact with residents, making challenges harder to establish (Crewe 2009).

Power inequality is inherent in homeless hostels regardless of attempts to minimise the social hierarchy due to the marked differences in social status between residents and staff members (McGrath and Pistrang 2007; Stark 1994; Neale 1995). However, Chapter Eight of this study demonstrated that whilst inequality cannot be eliminated, the promotion of shared power techniques along with the use of other softer control methods can create a more empowered and harmonious environment. Conversely, this

chapter has shown that when taken together with excessive rules, enhanced formal surveillance contributed towards the growing power divide between staff and residents, which eliminated the core conditions necessary to create a caring social environment (Conradson 2003).

The New-Style House Meetings

As a reminder, House Meetings occurred weekly and provided an opportunity and safe space for residents to challenge authority, as they were able to question rules, policies, and decisions made in the wider hostel. Chapter Eight described how allowing the residents to take some control over the day-to-day decisions of the hostel promoted empowerment, and inclusivity and created social bonds between the residents and the hostel as an institution. Following the pause in data collection, it appeared the purpose of these meetings, at least in part had shifted, as staff members were instructed to use the opportunity to inform residents of new rules, sanctions, and policies. Challenges by residents were no longer constructive and opportunities to take control over day-to-day decisions in the hostel were impeded by the introduction of more restrictive measures. Due to the number of changes occurring around the time of data collection, both residents and staff had come to resent and dread the House Meetings, as they had become spaces of anger and hostility, with residents often becoming argumentative and frustrated with staff. Discussing the meetings, one staff member stated:

They shout and protest, but they don't understand that we can't change the rules. They think we've stopped caring and want to treat them like criminals but it's not like that. We have as much say in the rules here as the residents do but I guess they feel powerless, they don't know how to handle it and the emotion that comes first because of that is anger.

Sophie, Staff Member

However, perhaps one of the primary difficulties with staff members being tasked with informing residents of the rule changes, was that most of the staff did not believe the new regulations and policies were fair themselves, meaning it was more challenging for them to justify their basis to protesting residents. As the House Meetings were now mandatory and those who refused to attend were sanctioned, residents had no option but to attend, compounding the issue further as they anxiously anticipated the revelation of a new change. Speaking about this loss of control, one resident stated:

Before if there were any changes then we'd chat about them in the meetings, but the staff aren't interested now, they just tell us there's nothing they can do. We're just supposed to shut up and get on with it. It's like being in prison man.

Richard, Group B

Whilst another offered similar comments:

Just all of a sudden everything changed, and we were supposed to be ok with it all and change too. It's not on really. The manager keeps bringing in stupid rules, we've tried saying that the rules are too much, but we just get told that we can't be doing what we want all the time and that it's not a doss house apparently so that's it, we just have to do what she says.

James, Group B

As can be seen in the above excerpts, it appeared that residents felt they were no longer being listened to and their opinion was no longer valid, leaving them feeling powerless and helpless towards the changes pervading their lives. From their perspective, not being heard when expressing their wants and needs not only conveyed feelings of disrespect from staff, it worsened the growing tensions in the environment. Ultimately,

while multiple layers were contributing to the residents' frustrations, the loss of opportunities to disseminate and share power seemed to have a profound impact on the staff-resident relationship. This finding is perhaps unsurprising, given that research tells us that young people in hostels place considerable value on being heard and listened to by staff (McGrath and Pistrang 2007).

Crewe (2009) who conducted research in prisons, noted that for rules to be followed, those being ruled needed to believe that they were being managed fairly and respectfully. Applying this concept thus may help explain why the removal of opportunities to challenge rules led to an increased probability of them being rejected and violated. One of the main benefits of the House Meetings prior to 2016, was that they provided the young people with a voice that they often lose once becoming homeless and an opportunity to influence rules and policy within the hostel setting, a powerful tool to creating a semi egalitarian environment and providing residents with a degree of their own power. Stone (2010) shared similar views, arguing that the inclusion of young people in consultations concerning the hostel can improve the support they receive, increase their self-confidence, and can support the re-engagement of socially excluded individuals. By stripping residents of this power and their voice, rather than being a space of care and sanctuary, this new practice effectively reinforced the marginalisation and oppression experienced by young homeless people in their daily life (Durrant 2014). In response to losing influence within these meetings, residents asserted their own power by actively resisting the changes, resulting in what was once a safe space resembling more of a battleground and power struggle. As management did not attend these meetings, much of the hostility was directed towards the staff members delivering the messages, which caused further conflict in the staff-resident relationship, as staff grappled with trying to protect their faltering relationships with residents whilst being expected to introduce rigid control methods.

The New Bank Hostel

In 2015, the hostel, although entrenched in institutional features and aesthetics, was considered by residents to be a home with familial qualities, however temporary. Through positive social interactions, soft control methods and an emphasis on promoting empowerment and mutual trust, Bank Hostel was characterised as possessing high levels of community spirit, where not all residents had strong bonds, but in the main, were respectful and accepting of one another. The culmination of changes in the environment in 2016 and the growing power disparity created a largely different atmosphere in the later stages of data collection. A direct contrast to establishing a sense of home, all residents interviewed in Group B, referred to the hostel as being 'like a prison' on more than one occasion, due to perceived over-zealous power exertions and oppressive restrictions:

Richard had been caught drinking in his room a few days previously and was being sanctioned as a result. His Wi-Fi access had been stopped meaning he was unable to speak to his friends on Facebook. Richard entered the office and appeared frustrated.

Richard: Can I just have the password, please (referring to the Wi-Fi password)

Sophie: Not until next week

Richard: But it's not fair. Why are you being so difficult?

Sophie: You shouldn't have had alcohol in your room. You know that.

Richard: I hate this place, it's like a prison in here, man.

Field Notes, 2016, Staff Office

Although bringing alcohol onto the hostel premises was a direct rule violation, as explained in Chapter Eight, under previous management this particular infraction was sometimes overlooked, depending on the circumstances. In this case, much like Ed in

2015, Richard claimed the reason he had alcohol in his room was to consume it privately whilst relaxing. However, unlike Ed, Richard was sanctioned immediately and lost his Wi-Fi privileges for a week. The shift in the level of policing of this particular rule violation highlights both the change in how rules were approached and applied by staff under new management and the reduced degree of autonomy residents were given as a result. Similar comparisons to prison have been drawn by residents in other studies who are subject to draconian rules and harsh sanctions such as that by DeWard and Moe (2010), Homeless Link (2018) and Heineman (2010). Interestingly, it appeared that the shift towards a more disciplinary institution amplified the physical institutional features of the hostel itself, in such a way that the aesthetics and design were now described by residents as prison-like and uncomfortable, despite the physical environment itself not undergoing any significant changes during the period. Therefore, due to contempt towards their treatment and the shifting management practices, residents no longer wanted to look past the built environment and see Bank Hostel as their home, instead only seeing a pervasive, cold, and punitive institution.

Taken together, by diminishing interpersonal interactions and shifting power dynamics within the hostel, the environment rapidly shifted from that which wholly rejected the notion of the hostel as a site of bureaucratic discipline and control, to one which undoubtedly possessed similar characteristics in line with Goffman's (1961) all-encompassing and socially restrictive total institution (Stark 1994; Deward and Moe 2010; Bogard 1998), where residents were punished for small acts of deviance such as refusal to submit to compulsory activities. It was surprising to witness such a vastly different atmosphere in a relatively brief time and experience firsthand how everyday experiences, well-being and level of rule adherence can be fundamentally affected by changes in the environment. No longer treated as individuals with a focus on personalisation of needs, the spatial restrictions and attempts to control resident social interactions with the outside world resulted in social networks deteriorating at a faster rate, and residents forming an enclosed self-contained life within Bank Hostel, a

behaviour that Stark (1994) warns can contribute towards the notion of Shelterization, and dependency on the institution and resulting difficulty with reintegration.

In the previous chapter, we explored the application and approach to rule enforcement and described how management would rely on soft control methods including communication and flexibility to resolve minor infractions, rather than immediately sanctioning all those who violated the rules. The findings showed that in line with research, rules that were administered fairly and flexibly were more likely to produce compliance (Reeves 2016; Wooldredge and Steiner 2016; Tyler 2006; Armaline 2005; Homeless Link 2018; Hoffman and Coffey 2008; Crewe 2009; Freeman 2003) leading to autonomy development and self-regulation of behaviour. Similarly, staff who shared a good social relationship with residents characterised by mutual respect and trust were perceived as having high levels of legitimacy and were thus viewed as a reasonable and just authority (Tyler 2006). The changing power in practice meant that rules were now more rigid, and residents were bound by spatial restrictions and control over their social interactions and physical self. The shift to more coercive hard power techniques was shown to obtain immediate compliance to some extent, such as the locking of the communal areas which restricted physical access but was largely detrimental to general levels of rule compliance as residents perceived rules to be unfair and inflexible.

Tyler (2006) wrote that to be effective, rules needed to be administered and governed by a legitimate authority who acts fairly and reasonably. As the previous chapter explained, it is by possessing high levels of legitimacy that individuals can influence and dictate the behaviour of others and encourage them to adhere, regardless of whether those individuals believe in the rules themselves or not (Sparks et al., 1996). To be perceived as a legitimate authority and create a legitimate regime (Jackson et al., 2010), rather than using coercive and forceful methods of power to exert control, which can lead to resistance, individuals must exercise their authority based on fairness, which, if effective, will not only encourage compliance short-term but will encourage individuals

to regulate their behaviour when not being monitored (Jackson et al., 2010). Management's refusal to develop social relationships with residents and purposely creating a pronounced social hierarchy by implementing stringent and impermeable hard power techniques to gain social order, resulted in them being perceived to be unfair and unjust in their authority, leading to weak levels of legitimacy. As one resident stated:

The way I see it is if she doesn't respect us, we're not going to respect her. I'm not going to listen to her stupid rules when she doesn't listen to us

Steve, Group B

According to Jackson et al., (2010) when individuals have encounters with authorities and are not treated with dignity, or they feel they experience negative damaging stereotypes, they feel disrespected and will likely respond in an equally negative manner. Similarly, Wooldredge and Steiner (2016) pointed out that prison officers who rely on the use of force and coercion to achieve compliance are perceived as having weaker legitimacy than those who tend to use softer methods based on communication and their personal skills and expertise. Therefore, this may help explain why as residents felt disrespected by management practices and attitudes, they were substantially less likely to consider it to be a valid and just authority and thus were less likely to follow the rules imposed, regardless of restrictive sanctions, or the threat of eviction. In terms of the other staff, whilst residents still maintained social relationships with those experienced staff members who remained, their social bonds were weakened, due to the staffing shortages and reduced interactions. As the social relationship no longer bound residents and staff together and residents felt disrespected by the decrease in social encounters, staff members' pre-existing legitimacy was also undermined, albeit to a lesser degree. Interestingly and perhaps importantly, despite their vital role in supporting residents, it appeared that staff members individually being perceived as legitimate authorities was not as powerful compared to higher management legitimacy in the context of

compliance. Whilst the reasons for this are unclear, it is plausible that as management is considered the highest form of visible authority or most powerful within the hostel sphere, they are perceived to be the ultimate rule makers, and therefore, residents consider the rules to be a representation of the rule maker themselves, rather than those who simply enforce them.

Using Resistance as a Coping Mechanism

Resistance to power in homeless hostels and other institutions which govern and control their inhabitants is an inherent aspect of institutional life given their nature and pervasive power, with the management of this resistance being a complicated task for staff members aiming to maintain an ordered environment. The first chapter of findings and discussion demonstrated that pockets of resistance are a routine aspect of hostel life as residents negotiate their identity and attempt to regain some control over parts of their lives. Therefore, although resistance is a natural response to power exertions and restrictions on an individual's rights and freedoms, resistance levels may be partly controlled and minimised by the authority's response to early infractions and their ability to use their social relationship with residents to socially control. In contrast to the impalpable soft power techniques (Nye 1990), research tells us that overtly coercive hard power control methods designed to generate immediate results and compliance are only effective insofar that there are adequate resources to uncover rule violations and discipline those who are in breach (Becker 1968). In Bank Hostel, whilst stringent sanctions and regulations of space were introduced to gain compliance, staff were often under-resourced to discover and manage transgressions, meaning the coercive power, rather than being effective, was fundamentally perceived as weak. Combined with the weak levels of legitimacy possessed by management and residents' contempt and dissatisfaction towards the new changes and loss of freedom, the hard power techniques (Wilson 2008; Crewe 2009, 2011) were met with severe forms of resistance, as rather submitting to authority, residents grappled to regain and exert their own power

when the opportunities arose to resist oppression and retain their autonomy, sense of self, and dignity. As levels of resistance grew, staff members found it increasingly challenging to cope with resident behaviour, which in turn reinforced residents' sense of counter-power and encouraged further deviance. The following section explores how residents adapted to and resisted the changes and policies introduced by management and demonstrates the significant disparity compared to 2015 in residents' attitudes towards hostel control methods, along with their levels of rule adherence.

Given their limited power and resources, residents in this study had few options to express counter-power and therefore responded strategically, by carefully choosing the acts of resistance which would be most impactful, and which directly confronted their perceived ill-treatment (Reppond and Bullock 2019). This type of 'overt resistance' is less hidden than 'covert resistance' and was a method used when a resident in Reppond and Bullock's (2019) study wanted to challenge their subordinate place in the hierarchy or bring about change. As this chapter has explained, due to non-existent social relationships and coercive attempts at control, management was perceived to have low levels of legitimacy, with residents not considering their authority to be reasonable or just. As a result, many of the acts of deviance the residents participated in were overt and devised to communicate their collective strength and challenge management for their position in the organisational social hierarchy through a refusal to cooperate (Reppond and Bullock 2019). For example, recognising that one of the new manager's concerns was cannabis consumption and smoking cigarettes near entrances, residents would often congregate in areas visible to management and either smoke cigarettes or cannabis, knowing they would be seen and thus openly resisting. Such areas for cannabis smoking in particular included a lane just outside of the hostel premises and sometimes, near the hostel front door and visible to the CCTV systems. This was a significant act in terms of the power dynamics and demonstrated that not only were the disciplinary surveillance methods that were implemented ineffective, but residents also shifted their function from an apparatus of staff power to an apparatus of counter-power. Explaining

how they would exert power by violating rules within the view of the manager, one resident said:

She hates us smoking weed, I don't even know why but she does, so we just smoke it outside the front door or in the lane over there. Sometimes we go to the lane at 5 pm with our bongs and wave at her when she's driving past to go home. She goes mad, I just tell her to do one.

Richard, Group B

This notion was further supported by staff members who also appeared to be aware of the motives behind residents' behaviour:

They used to hide it, but we would still know because you can tell by their eyes. Since the new manager has come in and warned them about what will happen if they do it on the premises or get caught with it, they appear to be doing it more often.

Amanda, Staff Member

This behaviour is reflective of what Jackson et al., (2010) refer to as a "downward spiral of resistance and retribution" (p.5) where individuals respond to coercive attempts from those with weak legitimacy by actively participating in rule-breaking, demonstrating the importance in how those in authority exercise their power and control.

Active displays of resistance were not confined to cannabis smoking, residents also resisted in a variety of other ways. For instance, once activities became mandatory and threats of warnings and sanctions were given for non-participation, residents began to behave aggressively both towards staff and towards each other when undertaking the

activity, leading to a highly tense and volatile environment and situation in which residents were forced to be a part of without any consideration for individual needs or the potential for conflict and risk. As one staff member said when discussing the new compulsory activities:

We know it's not ideal, but we try to make it as fun as possible. They still get angry at us, they can get really aggressive towards us and the other residents, who are no doubt uncomfortable.

Laura, Staff Member

As a result, the multitude of benefits associated with social activities including improving social networks (Brosens et al., 2014) was completely lost, as rather than creating an inclusive and relaxed environment to foster and facilitate social interactions, quieter residents were subjected to harsh words and mistreatment from the residents who were seeking an outlet for their anger, fuelling the growth of an increasingly aggressive hostel culture. In a similar vein, residents explained in their interview how they were regularly rude and disruptive towards outside services who attended 'Breakfast Club,' as they felt personally disrespected being forced to attend and felt those services should be disrespected in response. Illustrating this point, one resident stated:

So, I piss them off at the table. If someone comes in and talks, I just interrupt them until they get stressed out. Why not, they make me sit there and listen to pointless crap, then I'm going to make them listen to my pointless crap.

James, Group B

As a result of repeated interruptions and hostility, several outside services refused to return to the hostel to give talks, which pleased those residents who had expressed their

resistance through rudeness and disrespect, as they felt as though they fought back towards the forced participation and had achieved their desired result and a small 'win' in the ongoing staff-resident power struggle. This win, along with other similar scenarios, signalled to residents that they were able to regain power and establish control in their lives by using hard power coercive techniques themselves.

Conflict, Bullying and Counter Power

Earlier in this chapter, it was explained that staff presence in the communal areas was replaced with more advanced CCTV system coverage, due to staff shortages. However, without staff attendance in the resident spaces to facilitate positive interactions and encourage inclusivity, and with the loss of the protective community spirit due to the changing environment, a social hierarchy began to emerge amongst residents, with those considered to have a lower social status being bullied and harassed by those who perceived themselves to be of higher social standing. Conflict among residents in the communal areas is not a new concept, with several researchers reporting that these spaces are the site of most disputes between residents (Busch-Geertsema 2007; Garside et al., 1990; Neale 1995), which often escalates quickly and can result in some residents living in fear (Golten 2015). To this end, the findings suggest that it was the absence of staff and informal surveillance in the communal areas, combined with the loss of the inclusive ethos and residents' need to gain power and control that created a hostile, unsafe and volatile subculture within that environment, characterised by gang-like aggressive behaviour, bullying and intimidation. Aggravating the issue and lending more power to residents were the messages surrounding rule enforcement, which were inconsistent, as although minor violations such as refusal to attend mandatory activities were sanctionable, major acts of deviance such as the bullying and intimidation of outside services were mostly ignored, due to limited staff availability to manage more complex and onerous violations.

I'm expected to be here, there and everywhere but I can't be. It's getting out of control a bit. We're supposed to be being strict so residents fall in line and things will get easier, but they aren't getting easier. Their behaviour is getting worse and I'm struggling to find the time to deal with that.

Laura, Staff Member

With staff no longer having the capacity to police behaviour, some residents reframe their powerless status in the increasingly restrictive environment, attempted to take ownership of the communal spaces and began to regulate which residents were permitted to enter, findings that are broadly similar to Dordick (1996), who noted that when an environment has an authority that cannot be relied upon for safety or the governing of rules, individuals may begin to systematically implement their own system of regulations. Describing their rejection of other residents, one resident stated:

They come in here stinking, and I tell them to get out, get back to your room. I don't want them in here when I'm trying to watch TV. They aren't welcome in here and I tell them that. They stay in their rooms now because no one likes them.

Richard, Group B

As explained earlier, Durrant (2014), noted in their study how hostels are characterised as spaces of acceptance, where those with unusual bodily aesthetics and dirty clothes are free from the prejudice they often experience in society and are instead welcomed into an environment without judgement, marginalisation, or 'othering'. The first chapter of these findings described a similar scenario, where an inclusive ethos was embedded in Bank Hostel, allowing those who are usually alienated and marginalised from society a safe space of refuge amongst other residents and respectful staff. In contrast, with the

changing dynamics in 2016, the residents who were perceived by others to be 'different' and of lower social status, were those who possessed some of the qualities associated with the negative stereotypes of a homeless person, including general unwashed and unkempt bodily appearance and some substance abuse. By distinguishing themselves from this 'type' of young person, the residents involved were able to assert themselves as superior and 'not one of them,' deeming themselves to be more worthy of the right to use the communal spaces by labelling and othering other residents who did not fit within the norms of their social group. This finding supports DeWard and Moe's (2010) 'recreation of hierarchy', an adaptive strategy to coping with shelter life involving individuals framing and differentiating themselves from others living in the hostel, thereby retaining their sense of self-worth by positioning themselves as 'better' than other residents who they viewed as conforming to a homeless stereotype while resisting such label themselves.

Notably, staff members being preoccupied with their administrative tasks and their inability to manage the bullying rife amongst the residents, fundamentally communicated to both residents who were bullied and those who were bullies, that staff did not have sufficient control over the environment, which in turn reinforced those at the top of the resident social hierarchy as the 'rulers' of the communal areas, ultimately resulting in the other residents retreating to their private bedrooms and avoiding interacting with other residents or using the communal areas. As the bullying continued and staff members failed to regain control over the situation, the behaviour was gradually normalised with little to no punishment or deterrent and was seemingly accepted by staff as an unfortunate consequence of limited resources. Discussing the matter, one staff member said:

You hear them calling others scum sometimes around the hostel and you try telling them that it's not nice to call other people names, but they don't listen. There's a lot of bullying happening at the moment, more than

I have ever witnessed since I've been here, but we just have so much going on that it's difficult to get a handle on, especially as those being bullied are hesitant to talk about it. There's not much we can do without evidence or time.

Amanda, Staff Member

Thus, the benefits of creating an accepting social space described in the previous chapter, which encouraged interactions between residents and protected against social exclusion and isolation, were lost due to the changing dynamics in the environment and staff shortages, with the consequence being that many residents who withdrew to their private spaces were now lacking any social interaction with peers, which was problematic, given our understanding of the significant adverse effects of poor social networks and loneliness in the homeless youth population (Blake et al., 2008; Gasior 2015; Ennett 1999; Bantchevska 2008)

As noted earlier in this chapter, to implement routine in the lives of residents, the communal areas were locked at the same time as the curfew, to prevent residents from staying awake all night and sleeping in late in the morning as a result. However, this coercive method of power appeared to be counterproductive, as residents adapted to this change by sneaking into private bedrooms late at night and engaging in all-night parties, fuelled by copious amounts of alcohol and illegal substances. Although residents were not permitted to enter other bedrooms after curfew, as the CCTV systems were only in the communal areas and landing, unless the staff member on shift happened to glance at the transmission in the office at the time a resident entered another bedroom, it was likely to go undetected. This was also routinely seen when in the staff office, as although the monitors' transmitted live feed from the CCTV systems in and around the building, staff were often preoccupied with the phone, completing paperwork or other work-related tasks and rarely spent time actively watching the monitors. Discussing

catching a resident sneaking out of the room of another one day, the following interaction occurred:

Laura: I caught Amelia coming out of Steve's room this morning

Sophie: Had she been there all night?

Laura: Looks like it. She must have snuck in during the night

Sophie: You're going to have to speak to her about it when she gets up. She can't be doing that

Field Notes, 2016, Staff Office

Therefore, it seemed that at least in part, by regulating resident space and restricting the use of communal areas to control behaviour, management weakened levels of control, as residents were now less visible and free to participate in risky behaviour. Staff members appeared highly aware of the actions and behaviours of residents in private bedrooms, highlighting that there was at least some evidence of potentially sexually exploitative relationships forming between male residents who were considered to be socially superior, and more vulnerable female residents, only for the males to then ridicule and bully the females afterwards. These findings are somewhat similar to that of Stone (2010), who noted in his study that some residents were being sexually exploited by other residents after consuming illegal substances and alcohol. Describing the issue in Bank Hostel, one staff member elaborated,

Sometimes you hear the male residents call the females dogs... but then the females will still sleep with them when they are drunk, you ask them why and they say they don't know, or they want to be liked. The boys jump into bed with another vulnerable person the next day then back again. It tends to be maybe the naive and vulnerable girls or those that aren't from around here, they are more desperate for others to like them here. At the moment this seems to be

happening more and more as with the communal areas locked, they are spending every single night in each other's rooms.

Laura, Staff Member

Whilst short-term sexual encounters between residents were not a new situation and occurred fairly regularly given the proximity in which the young people lived, it appeared as though the closing of the communal areas and the forcing of residents to socialise in more hidden areas of the hostel encouraged this type of behaviour, thus constructing an unsafe space for the vulnerable young people and potentially creating a safeguarding issue counter to the institution's aim to protect and support its inhabitants from harm.

The resistance strategies detailed above provide insight into how residents coped with their role as subordinates in the power imbalanced environment and how they sought to regain their oppositional power, with small but progressive acts of deviance and resistance, which spiralled as attempts to exert influence and overturn authority proved effective. Similar strategies of power have been found in other studies such as that by Glenn and Goodman (2015) who noted that their participants coped with staff members dismissing concerns by engaging in rule-breaking behaviour, with others expressing a desire to leave the hostel altogether. In terms of coping strategies in the current study, it appeared there were three categories of resistance utilised by residents to cope with the changing dynamics and hard power mechanisms (Crewe 2009, 2011) enforced in Bank Hostel. First, were the resisters, who consciously objected to the rules and consistently struggled with staff to correct the power imbalance, aiming to regain personal control in the environment by controlling and regulating the space of other residents in a manner not too dissimilar to how they had been controlled themselves. It was by asserting themselves as a source of power that residents were able to cope with the powerlessness and loss of freedom resulting from the change in the environment and maintain their dignity and self-worth, whilst simultaneously rationalising their behaviour

by framing themselves as victims of injustices and poor management. For example, James who had recently been placed on a 28-day notice, which meant if his behaviour did not improve in 28 days he would be evicted, rationalised his rule infractions by claiming they were a response and reflection of how he was being treated:

James explained that it wasn't his fault he was on a 28-day notice. He did break rules but justified that it was to be expected given how badly he had been treated by management.

James: If they are going to treat me like a criminal then I'm going to act like one

Field Notes, 2016, Kitchen

Those who chose resistance in response to rigid exercises of power would often work together to publicly reject authority, such as bullying other residents, meaning the strength of their collaborative power was far greater than an individual attempting to subvert authority. An example of this was seen earlier in this chapter, where residents' collectively expressed frustration and hostility towards services who were participating in Breakfast Club, which ultimately meant some of those services stopped attending, leaving staff in a difficult situation to find replacements. Historically, similar examples of collective power can be found in prisons, where groups of individuals jointly demonstrate their grievances through a collective expression of disorder and defiance towards the prison staff, albeit less common in more recent times due to the severity of punishment and more carefully contrived control methods (Crewe 2009).

The second type of resisters were those who did not strongly oppose staff or openly rebel against authority but would engage in seemingly sufficient minor acts of deviation and infringements to gain respect and acceptance from those who actively resisted and were perceived to control the communal areas, to avoid being targeted themselves. Despite these residents not truly believing in the cause of resistance, what was of

utmost importance was their willingness to follow those fully resisting where necessary, rather than the staff, suggesting that they either saw those resisting as more legitimate forms of authority (Tyler 2006) or that they believed it was those residents who had greater control over the hostel environment, thus implying their trust in staff to protect and control had been lost. An example of this appeared to be Chloe, a quiet resident who belonged to a social group with Amelia, Richard, James and Steve, but appeared to have befriended them due to self-preservation rather than actual friendship:

I try keep my head down mostly. I've seen what happens to the other residents here, the ones they don't like, they end up being pushed out and staff do nothing. I do feel bad for them residents but my mental health isn't good and I couldn't handle them being like that with me. I don't like confrontation and arguments and I just want an easy life. That means just going along with the group.

Chloe, Group B

Finally, some residents were wholly passive, very rarely protesting change and choosing to make life easier by completely withdrawing from the environment, seeking refuge in their private bedrooms away from the aggression and tensions in the communal and staff spaces. It seemed these residents, who were typically those lacking any social network, only emerged from the sanctuary of their private spaces when forced to participate in compulsory social activities and key worker meetings, avoiding other residents where possible, as it was this group of individuals who were the prime targets for bullying.

Disempowerment and Principles of Shared Power

The findings of this study add support to Nye's (2009) later notion that suggests hard

and soft power techniques have limited use when exercised singly and are likely to be more efficient when used collaboratively through *smart power*. Such a notion of the need for a combination of power methods to achieve the most effective power has been further noted by Wilson (2008), who argues that drawing on the strengths of both soft and hard power helps to diminish their respective weaknesses, thus leading to more advanced operations of power. However, in the context of homeless accommodation, it is not merely rejecting the traditional principal forms of power and embracing smart power which appears to be effective at achieving control, as careful consideration must be given to the nature of the hostel as an institution and the aims and goals of empowering those within, rather than encroaching on their autonomous development. As such, in line with the concluding remarks in Chapter Eight, the findings of this study suggest that smart power must operate as a component of *shared power* (Centre for Public Impact 2019) to be truly effective and address the challenges of controlling young homeless people through care, by providing those individuals with the tools to exert their influence and power, thus leading to a shared vision, goal and commitment to the hostel as an institution (Hirschi 1969), whilst simultaneously minimising resistance and ensuring the safety and security of those within.

Summary

The findings discussed in this chapter provide a firm basis to better understand the experiences of young people living in homeless hostels and how they navigate and negotiate being subjected to coercive power and social control. The chapter discussed the nature and scope of the changes introduced between the two data collection periods, noting how due to staffing shortages, the reduced social contact and opportunities for informal interactions led to a weakening in the staff-resident relationship and consequently diminished the mutual respect, trust and emotional bond that once acted as an effective form of social control. The chapter then described how new management policies were implemented to insert professional boundaries in the

management-resident relationship to establish a more authoritative environment. However, the findings demonstrated that as residents perceived the new rules to be unfairly administered, over-zealous and restrictive, some adapted to the changing environment by exerting their own counter power with escalating acts of deviance and defiance, ultimately leading to a volatile environment resembling a disciplinary institution, rather than a home. Others challenged the system for personal reasons involving the protection of self, rather than truly resisting, and participated in minor acts of deviance to obtain respect and acceptance from those actively resisting. Finally, some did not resist or express contempt for the changes, but emotionally and physically withdrew from the environment to avoid being caught in the power struggles emerging between residents and staff.

Overall, the concept of hard power and management practices in institutional settings such as homeless hostels for young people raises questions and dilemmas around the purpose of using such coercive control to bring order to an environment meant to house and promote autonomy in those who are already considered oppressed, isolated, and vulnerable. The use of power, particularly that within institutions, is often regarded negatively with connotations of superiority, coercion and unjust; however, the findings of the previous chapter demonstrated that exertions of power need not strictly lead to oppression, nor does it exist purely to exploit those perceived as weaker. Power as a concept is complex and when applied carefully, its use through attempts to control the behaviour of individuals can be both constructive and positive in achieving shared goals and bringing order to the environment.

Chapter Ten:

Staff Perspectives

The experiences of young homeless people often receive academic attention; however, in comparison, the lived experiences of staff members working in these hostels tend to

be neglected. For this reason, studies which examine staff perspectives, job demands, relationships, wellbeing, and morale are hard to come by, except for a few notable contributions (Johnsen et al., 2005; Karabanow 1999; Neale 1995; McGrath and Pistrang 2007; Stone 2010; Olivet et al., 2010; Schiff and Lane 2019). What is documented and prevalent in the literature, however, is the consensus that staff working in homeless hostels often experience significant emotional and practical challenges (Olivet et al., 2010; Peters et al., 2021) due to the expectations of their role (Karabanow 1999; McGrath and Pistrang 2007), minimal resources and low employee remuneration.

This study so far has recognised the crucial role staff members play in the hostel setting and the importance of a positive and supportive staff-resident social relationship, which is often interwoven with the wider social atmosphere. Given this, when attempting to better understand the experiences of young people living in hostels, it is necessary to also examine the perspective and experiences of staff members. This is of particular importance under the circumstances of the current study, as they too were exposed to rapid social change during the fieldwork, leading to a series of adverse effects. By examining the experiences and the changes discussed in previous chapters through the staff lens, we can gain a deeper understanding and insight into how staff perceive their relationships with residents and explore how social change and poor working conditions can have consequences on both their role and their emotional and physical wellbeing. This concluding chapter relating to the discussion of the findings, therefore, focuses on exploring the overarching themes of this study from a different context, that of the staff.

Staff Attitude to the Role and Challenges Experienced

Staff members' descriptions of their roles were mostly positive, with each explaining with passion and enthusiasm how much they enjoyed and valued their job. They listed the wide variety of ways in which the role aligned with their values and how they supported the young people, ranging from being a shoulder to cry on, to teaching them

how to prepare meals on a low budget. They noted how their personal innate qualities, non-judgemental attitude, empathy, and capacity to support others were the key skills that enabled them to perform their job to a high standard, offering similarities to what research tells us are the essential qualities in an effective keyworker (Durrant 2014; McGrath and Pistrang 2007). For example, when discussing with Laura why she decided to become a key worker in the hostel having first been recruited by the organisation in a domestic role, she said:

The work is just so varied, I love it. I'd never considered this line of work before but being in the environment all the time, interacting with the young people and seeing how much good we can do for them really motivated me to change roles. I've always been good at listening, I had a teenage daughter myself at the time I took the role on, so I was used to the highs, the lows and the drama. I'd like to think my experience as a parent makes me a good fit, I know how to keep a cool head.

Laura, Staff Member

On the other hand, the role was not without its limitations. One of the primary challenges staff cited was the amount of work they needed to undertake and their level of responsibility compared to the low salary and minimal employment benefits. Most, however, acknowledged that choosing this career path meant choosing to help others rather than be financially comfortable:

I'm not here for the money. I'm never going to be a well-off woman but as long as it keeps a roof over my head I'm happy. It's hard work but I knew it was hard work when I took the role on because the people we support are vulnerable and have a lot of issues, which means a lot of difficulties and a lot of work.

Amanda, Staff Member

As described briefly in Chapters Eight and Nine, historically, it has been reported that staff members in homeless hostels experience challenges with maintaining a sense of balance, when they are expected to balance multiple roles and identities (McGrath and Pistrang 2007; Karabanow 1999; Neale 1995) while being expected to go 'above and beyond' their line of duty by constantly putting residents needs before their own (Karabanow 1999). In a similar vein, some studies such as that by Glenn and Goodman (2015) in a domestic violence shelter, found that staff members regularly experience burnout and exhaustion due to the multiple stressors and balancing aspects associated with their roles. For staff working in hostels for homeless youth, the role can be perhaps even more challenging, as the demand to negotiate and balance the roles of 'ally' with 'agent of control' (McGrath and Pistrang 2007) is of significant importance due to residents age-related vulnerability and general distrust of adults (Heineman 2010). Staff members must, therefore, successfully support young people both emotionally and practically with transitioning to adulthood and independent living, whilst simultaneously, ensuring professional boundaries are maintained and hostel policies and regulations are adhered to. Adding weight to the existing literature, comments from staff participants in the current study mirrored the complex and contradictory nature of the role and the dilemmas they experienced when attempting to negotiate a balance (McGrath and Pistrang 2007):

Sophie (staff member): you have to be mum, dad, best friend, teacher, carer, disciplinarian, therapist, and mediator. The list goes on. It's hard keeping everything going and even harder trying to find the middle ground in all that. It can get exhausting.

Field Notes, 2016, Staff Office

Interestingly, the age of the residents appeared to be a factor in how staff members

perceived balancing their roles. For example:

Laura (staff member) recalled how she was uncomfortable treating a 24-year-old resident who was an adult in every sense like a child, by reminding him to wash his dishes, and ‘encouraging’ him to go to bed.

Field Notes, 2016, Staff Office

As noted in the preceding findings and analysis chapters, being subject to infantilization has been reported by researchers to be a detrimental barrier in the development of the staff-resident relationship as it conveys feelings of disrespect and mistrust (McGrath and Pistrang 2007; Hoffman and Coffey 2008). However, this study showed that staff members often disagreed with treating residents as if they could not make decisions on their own, but were conflicted as they were bound by instructions of higher management. Taking Laura’s story above as a pertinent example, she encouraged a resident in their mid-twenties to go to bed as she had been told during a recent team meeting that residents were sleeping too late into the day and needed a better routine. Staff were told that to combat this, communal areas should be locked overnight, and it should be suggested to residents that they go to sleep. This instruction was not viewed favourably by most members of staff who were uncomfortable with the request and ‘felt stupid’ when communicating it to the older residents.

The seeming juxtapositions in the purpose of the role caused a significant amount of stress and distress for staff members. As one staff member highlighted:

It’s not that I can’t do my job or that I don’t know what to do to help the residents, it’s that I don’t always know how to do it all at once. You’re kind of giving with one hand and taking with another. It’s stressful because you’re trying to teach them to adult properly but you’re treating them like you’re a parent. You

can't do both. Not at the same time anyway. In a matter of months, you need to turn these people from a kid to an adult and you can't be sending mixed messages, it'll just confuse them. Yeah, it's hard, I don't really have an answer.

Sophie, Staff Member

However, not all staff members shared these views and experienced such difficulties:

I wouldn't say I struggle to balance the roles. I mean yes it can be hard, but it's part of the job and I've been here a long time.

Amanda, Staff Member

Perhaps notably, Amanda was the only staff member other than the replacement manager who believed that in the main, more structured rules were necessary for the hostel and were necessary to ensure an ordered environment. She spoke in detail during her interview about her dislike of rule deviations and found the past 'glossing over' of some minor rule infringements troubling and undermining:

It could be frustrating at times. The other manager was very communication-based, which is good in a way, but sometimes the young people need to be punished for their wrongdoings so that they can learn. They need to be told that no, you can't stay up all night and no, you can't come in here stoned.

Amanda, Staff Member

This disparity suggests a potential link between staff members' approach to rule enforcement and their ability to juggle the conflicting roles. Unlike the other two members of staff, Amanda did not feel as though the bureaucratic rules infantilised

residents and again, unlike the other two members of staff, Amanda did not experience the same internal struggles with balancing the care and controlling aspects of the role reported here and across other studies (McGrath and Pistrang 2007; Karabanow 1999).

In addition to the challenges presented in negotiating a balance in the role, the financial cuts implemented during the fieldwork brought about a new obstacle which meant the staff needed to undertake an additional role, that of a trained counsellor. Prior to the financial cuts in 2015, young people living in Bank Hostel were able to access six free counselling sessions with a trained external counsellor. This individual would arrange appointments in the setting of the residents' choice. Typically, the sessions were in the hostel itself, or local cafes and other similar establishments. Once the six sessions were complete, the service would either conclude, or they would refer the young person for further counselling. This service was what the staff referred to as a 'godsend', as although offering emotional support was a central aspect of their role, they had not received accredited extensive training and could at times struggle to manage the multitude of psychosocial support needs a young homeless person can experience, ranging from mental health issues to substance abuse and self-harm (Tavecchio and Thomeer 1997; Crisis 2012; Llamau 2015; Hughes 2010; McGrath & Pistrang 2007; Blake et al., 2008). Having the external source relieved some pressure on staff, as the counsellor could listen to the young person's stories and explore the psychological difficulties they were experiencing from a trained eye. In addition, staff described how counsellors were often trained in assisting an individual to develop coping strategies, resilience, and communication skills, each of which was of utmost importance to prepare a young person for independent living:

Laura (staff member): Of course I don't mind listening to the young people and their problems, it's a part of my job and I genuinely care about them. Some of their stories are horrific and it's clear they need someone to talk to, I'm just not always sure that the advice I can offer in return is what is best for them. I worry I'm saying the wrong thing, or make it worse. Having an outsider come in to

ease some of that burden was so helpful. It just took a little pressure off and it's good having someone with a new perspective come in, you know?

Field Notes, 2016, Staff Office

The counselling service was shown to be effective in supporting the young people with a high level of participation. However, once this service was removed, staff members had virtually no external support to effectively share the burden of residents' complex and diverse emotional and psychological needs. The feeling of being over-extended led to exhaustion and impaired job performance. As one staff member stated:

We've all had a bit of a hard time recently. Along with the staff, they got rid of the counselling service the residents used to be entitled to, so they don't have that outlet anymore. It all falls on us. It can be exhausting because, for a lot of residents, I'm the only person they have to talk to now. I try my best but it's draining, and I worry I'm not giving them the same level of support they received from the counsellor.

Sophie, Staff Member

The above examples capture the difficulties staff face and the stressors they experience when attempting to provide a complete and optimal service to residents without adequate support and resources (Bickle 2021). This finding offers similarities to Schiff and Lane's (2019) study exploring burnout and Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), which noted staff members working in the homeless sector can experience adverse effects when attempting to manage the myriad of complex needs and trauma of homeless individuals leading to the potential for vicarious traumatising. The resulting emotional exhaustion and diminished feelings of accomplishment can lead to a staff member experiencing mental fatigue, which has strong correlations with high staff

turnover, weakened morale, poor productivity (Peters et al., 2021) and emotional harm (Bickle 2021)

The establishing of an initial connection and relationship with a young person was shown to be a further challenge experienced by staff members. The findings of the current study have already highlighted the importance of this relationship dynamic, as echoed in other studies (Stone 2010; Homeless Link 2018; McGrath and Pistrang 2007) and the crucial role its development plays in forming the 'core effective interventions' (Kidd et al., 2005). Therefore, unsurprisingly, the staff themselves recognised the integral role they play in the lives of a resident and noted the association between an effective staff-resident relationship and a positive outcome for the young person. With these concepts being at the forefront of the staff members' approach to the role, they sometimes placed considerable amounts of pressure on themselves to ensure they fostered a connection or 'therapeutic alliance' (McGrath & Pistrang 2007; Pable 2013) with the young people through a tailored and flexible approach. Whilst staff were usually successful in developing this alliance with the residents, they described the emotional impact and demotivation experienced when struggling to advance those relationships with some young people who were considered harder-to-reach. As one staff member explained:

It's difficult because we have a very short time to build these relationships before, we move on to the support part of our work. There have been so many times when I'm trying to move forward with a young person, but they won't let me in, those times I feel a bit like it's my fault, like I'm doing something wrong but some of these young people have such bad experiences with people letting them down that no amount of trying is going to get them to break down their barriers and open up to me, it could take years, but we just don't have that time.

Laura, Staff Member

The above quote illustrates the internal conflict and distress some staff experience with having to manage temporal constraints whilst trying to build a rapport and engage a young person. This accords with findings by Schiff and Lane (2019) who described how staff members attempting to achieve behavioural change may feel a lack of accomplishment when progress is slow.

Due to past negative experiences, betrayals (Kidd et al., 2005) and weak family relationships, young homeless people can often exhibit challenging behaviours towards other adults, which can include an inability or resistance to form a close social relationship with their key worker (Heineman 2010; Glasior 2015):

You have to understand the experiences of some of the people who come here. They've been abandoned by their parents and usually, every adult in their life has either let them down or turned their back on them. They've learned from childhood that the only person you can trust is yourself. Breaking down a lifetime of barriers is hard work. Sometimes it works and sometimes it doesn't. It can be so disheartening to think you're so close to getting through to someone but you never quite get there. They leave here and you just know they are in for a lifetime of trauma. It's hard not to blame yourself and the way that you approached it, even when you know deep inside that you did your best.

Laura, Staff Member

As the above quote shows, despite staff understanding the rationale behind some young people having impermeable barriers, they often felt exasperated by their inability to foster a connection, feeling it was reflective of their repertoire of professional skills, despite their knowledge of how past experiences can impact relationship building. The implications of this were that some staff experienced feelings of failure, both in the

context of their role and the service they felt they owed the young person. In contrast to Kidd et al., (2005) who described how staff recognised the residents' active responsibility in the engagement and change process, most staff in this study had what Kidd et al., (2005) referred to as unrealistic ideas in that they believed the responsibility was almost solely their own, as the expectations of their role were to inspire the young person to change and want to engage with the support system.

Changes in the Staffing Structure

It has been widely reported that working in hostels is associated with inadequate wages and poor working conditions (Schiff and Lane 2019; Stone 2010); however, the financial cuts introduced in 2015 meant staff were subject to further salary reductions, alongside reduced sick pay and less flexibility around working hours, which negatively impacted the working environment. One staff member expressed her dissatisfaction and fatigue experienced because of the changes:

We've a pay cut as well, and our sickness cut back, and other staff members have had their holidays reduced. It's not just the waking night, it's the next day and the day after that, I need to be on top of my game here, so I can provide all my support to the young people, I can't do that if I'm exhausted.

Laura, Staff Member

Similar findings in respect of working conditions have been reported by both Schiff and Lane (2019) and Olivet et al., (2010) who in their studies exploring the emotional impact of working in the homeless sector on individuals, noted that poor working conditions and low wages can lead to emotional exhaustion and low staff retention. Since poor working conditions have also been found to contribute to low levels of life satisfaction (Pasupuleti et al., 2009) financial constraints which adversely impact the already poor

working conditions of hostel staff are likely to directly harm the emotional and physical wellbeing of staff.

Karabanow (1999) describes how staff members in hostels for homeless young people have little respect for those staff who possess qualifications and degrees, regarding them as inferior. In the main, this was because staff viewed life experience as the essential criteria for being a 'good keyworker' and found those with professional qualifications often lacked this quality. Similarly, other research has found that staff who are employed to work in homeless services often lack professional qualifications and therefore, place a significant burden on the organisation it must deliver in-house extensive training to ensure staff are equipped with the knowledge to undertake the role effectively (Olivet et al., 2010). In this study, during the recruitment process to replace existing staff, hostel management insisted on a degree in a relevant topic as being an essential criterion for the role, believing that a theoretical knowledge of the subject would lead to a greater understanding of the complex behaviours of the young people. However, taken together with the inflexible working conditions and low salary offered, the expectation of an undergraduate degree meant the pool of applicants who were attracted to the role were recent graduates in their early twenties with little to no experience of working with young people with complex needs. In a similar vein to the staff in Karabanow's (1999) research, the staff members in this study had little respect for these individuals, believing them to be of lower social status, as they were perceived to be too young, inexperienced, and lacking the emotional capacity to support the young people effectively. As one staff member stated,

I think when the newer ones come here, maybe from Uni or whatever they come with rose-tinted spectacles, as in they think they will come here, have a nice talk with the young people then they are cured of all their issues and move on to new accommodation, but it's not like that.

Laura, Staff Member

Among the long-term staff members, none possessed a degree or had undertaken any formal training other than that offered by the organisation, suggesting contrasting values with the new, younger staff members. Therefore, not too dissimilar to the social divide emerging amongst residents during the interviews with Group B, it seemed there was a certain 'them and us' mentality and an element of 'othering' amongst staff, a discourse which coincidentally is typically attributed to those experiencing homelessness (Durrant 2014; Johnsen et al., 2005).

The refusal to accept individuals lacking in perceived life experience as legitimate team members unintentionally created challenges and barriers to rebuilding a sense of team by impinging on the ability to form social relationships and a supportive environment. This led to a higher-than-expected staff turnover as individuals became difficult to retain. Staff appeared to be almost caught in a loop of spiralling negative implications, contributing to the growing tensions in the environment and stressors experienced. This was at least in part because they were struggling to cope with the workload and challenges emanating from under-staffing yet were also reluctant to accept and welcome new staff members as part of the team. As one staff member stated:

The morale in the office has changed... when you finally feel like we are getting somewhere, the staff all get up and leave again, and then we start again, we feel like we are firefighting and not spending enough quality time with the young people.

Sophie, Staff Member

Not unlike hostels in other studies (Stone 2010; Hoffman and Coffey 2008), Bank Hostel

is required to be staffed 24 hours a day in line with hostel policy to ensure the safety of the residents. Whilst under-staffing never arrived at the extreme reported in other studies, which provide examples of homeless services being forced to close for the day (Clove et al., 2005) staff recalled several instances where shortages meant they were unable to leave the office and as such, remained without food or a proper break for the length of their shift, impacting their productivity. Further challenges associated with under-staffing included implications on the staff-resident social relationship and the staff members' ability to adequately support a young person. One staff member recounted how she had felt relief having finally 'got through' to a young person, only for her hard work to be lost:

I had a young person who wasn't engaging well, and she had finally agreed for me to take her to the job centre, but it wasn't able to happen because I couldn't leave, now we are back to square one with that resident. Very frustrating.

Laura, Staff Member

This comment is notable for two reasons. First, researchers have highlighted how crucial it is that staff do not 'let a young person down' (Peters et al., 2021; McGrath and Pistrang 2007), given that past negative experiences relating to inconsistencies and dependability are strongly associated with a reluctance for young homeless people to engage with adults. Secondly, it provides an example of the demoralising, distressing and emotional effects under-staffing has on staff members as individuals, whereby the product of their demanding work and invested energy can quickly come undone.

However, of utmost importance was an expectation from the organisation for staff to continue with their role regardless and present an upbeat outer self despite the turmoil and frustrations they were experiencing in their role. Applying Hochschild's (1983) concept of emotional labour, it appeared as though staff members were expected to

regulate and suppress their emotions when working and interacting with residents to ensure they continued to provide a 'smiling service', as in Hochschild's flight attendant example:

Amanda: The level of work I have at the moment is unreal. It's piling up and I can't seem to make a dent in it. The young people are wanting attention and I'm having to tell them I don't have time right now. I feel overwhelmed but I'm expected to pretend that everything is fine in front of them. It gets even harder when they are complaining to you or are getting frustrated. I'm frustrated too but I have to bottle that up.

Field Notes, 2016, Staff Office

These findings mirror that by Karabanow (1999), who whilst drawing on the work of Hochschild (1983), explains that staff members have been shown to create an artificial persona, or a false sense of self through surface acting (Hochschild 1983) when working with young people living in homeless hostels (Karabanow 1999). They explain that within hostel settings, staff are expected by the organisation to present a happy exterior for the benefit of their interactions with the young people, despite potentially harbouring contradictory feelings of frustration and unhappiness within their inner self and thus, their emotions are eventually controlled by the organisation. As can be shown in Amanda's above comment, staff grappled with deep internal feelings of frustration, disempowerment, and helplessness due to the changes experienced in the hostel, yet these needed to be suppressed as outwardly, they were expected to maintain a strong and un-wavering positive attitude when communicating with the young people. This form of emotional labour and faking of emotions is a leading cause of staff burnout, emotional exhaustion, and a drain on cognitive resources (Grandey et al., 2005), yet for staff in homeless hostels, this false sense of self through surface-acting can be even more emotionally challenging, particularly during times of social change as their 'service

encounters' (Grandey et al., 2005) are made more acute by the needs of their clientele and their responsibility to ensure a calm and structured environment.

Crossing over Professional Boundaries

As noted, the staff role is multifaceted in nature and thus presents difficulties (McGrath and Pistrang 2007; Hoffman and Coffey 2008). The findings of this study suggest that difficulties can arise when professional boundaries are blurred, and staff place too much emphasis on the parental aspect of their role, which can lead to an over-attachment either on their part or that of the resident. Some staff members recalled situations where they had recognised themselves struggling to maintain appropriate boundaries, particularly when working with those who were young, lacking a parental relationship and were thus perceived to be vulnerable. The combined challenge of the requirement to build a strong social relationship with a young person, whilst enforcing and maintaining professional boundaries caused significant distress for some, who described the emotional and mental trauma of worrying incessantly outside of the working environment about residents who were experiencing significant personal difficulties. As one staff member recounted:

I think because she had lost her mother, she wanted a bit of love, she said that people in her life had been and gone, been and gone, and I just wanted to take care of her. I wanted her to be ok. I'd worry about her and what she was doing and who she was with when I was at home. She had form for mixing with people who were bad for her.

Laura, Staff Member

As demonstrated here, it appeared that for some staff, it was a challenging task separating their emotional bond with a young person from their professional identity as

a staff member. As previously noted, it was common practice for staff to use terms of endearment when referring to their 'key children,' or to themselves as the 'key mum,' signifying and perpetuating a parental-type relationship reserved especially for those with whom they worked the closest. Interestingly, there was a distinct disparity in gender in relation to which residents engage in this way, for example, female residents interviewed across both groups referred to their 'key mum' during the interview, whereas no male residents used this term. Like findings by Zuffrey (2009), who explained how social workers working with young homeless people believe gender differences affect the staff-resident relationship, it may be that gender was an influencing factor in the relationship dynamic as female residents were seemingly perceived by staff to be more vulnerable and to be in more need of mothering and nurturing, thus reinforcing the gender roles and performances and leading to inequality in service delivery.

To complicate matters further, alongside forming over-attachments to residents, staff provided several examples, of instances where residents became too attached and consequently had difficulty transitioning to independent living, which appeared to be a major stress factor that staff members grappled with. The following two extracts are taken from an interview with a resident and an interview with a staff member. The resident was interviewed shortly before her transition and was discussing her anxiety over her impending separation from her key worker and the staff member was interviewed shortly after the transition had taken place:

I don't know what I'll do when I have to leave. I don't want to leave, I've never had a mum and she's the closest thing I'll ever have, I can tell her anything and she never judges me or anything like that, not like other people in my life.

Amelia, Group B

She told me that she was jealous that I was going to now spend Thursday nights with someone else. But she had been here for nearly two years. She considered it her tv, her chair, I had to explain to her that it wasn't hers, she found that hard.... now, where she's moved to, it's just round the corner from where I live, she knows I live there because she saw me going home one day, so in a joking way for her to know, I've had to say to her 'I don't want you looking over the fence and spying on me', I had to do it in a jokey way but for her, I think it was difficult

Laura, Staff Member

As indicated above, the difficulty with professional boundaries becoming blurred goes beyond the emotional distress staff members can experience, as they can lead to harmful and damaging effects on the young person. Cooper (2012) explains this type of dependency can disempower a service user, who in this case, may suffer when separated from their attached worker.

A primary concern with what Cooper (2012) refers to as an emotional boundary crossing, is the innate power imbalance (O'Leary et al., 2013) ingrained in the staff-resident relationship dynamic and the intensity and invasive essence of the relationship itself. By its very nature, staff have significantly more power and control in the relationship given that residents enter the relationship involuntarily, and in many instances, the young person will be vulnerable and look to their key workers as the only dependable adult in their lives. At the same time, the imbalance becomes more marked as residents often entrust their keyworker with secrets and private details about their lives and past experiences, whereas in contrast, a staff member usually limits personal disclosure (O'Leary et al., 2013; Cooper 2012). Regardless of whether a young person initially desired to develop an attachment to the staff member, they are encouraged to do so by being repeatedly reminded that not engaging with their keyworker violates

their 'tenancy,' which puts them at risk of eviction. By reinforcing the idea that residents must open-up to staff and develop a close bond to remain housed, hostel practices could be argued as laying the groundwork for over-attachment and dependent relationships to foster, with staff members seemingly attempting two contradictory tasks of developing a close social relationship whilst remaining professionally detached (Cooper 2012), not unlike their contradictory roles of friend and rule enforcer (McGrath and Pistrang 2007). Indeed, staff members stated that they had received little formal training on how to manage feelings of over-familiarity and boundary crossing with residents as it was generally expected that they simply would not allow it to originate. As such, rather than being equipped with emotional tools to avoid blurred boundaries, staff implemented coping strategies retrospectively to manage the effects of over-attachments mainly by confiding in colleagues and obtaining advice on how to manage their emotions. One staff member provided the following account of an experience where a resident was being evicted but had no other housing options, due to poor family relationships and weak social networks:

I over-cared then but (staff member) just said to me I'm not going to do much by sitting around getting upset, I wasn't helping the young person by being upset, then it's about me not them ... if you care too much, you are no help.

Sophie, Staff Member

Although the support from colleagues was valuable and appeared to aid staff in reaffirming boundaries, in line with McGrath and Pistrang (2007), Stone (2010), Homeless Link (2018) and Olivet et al., (2010) the findings suggest that staff do not receive sufficient professional training to learn how to cope with the more nuanced aspects and challenges of the role, which in the case of over-attachment, would help protect the safety and wellbeing of not only the residents but themselves (O'Leary et al., 2013). By ensuring that neither party becomes over-reliant on the relationship or too

invested to the point that the dynamic is counterintuitive, staff can ensure the relationship remains stable, consistent, and effective.

Superficial Staff Power

Staff power was found to be more complex, particularly, given that one of the areas of contention between staff and residents was the rule changes and approach to their enforcement. Like Crewe's (2011) writings on prison staff, the responsibilities and level of power that staff members possess and can exert in the hostel can be limited. However, despite their relative powerlessness in relation to high management and their role of simply delivering the message, rather than being involved in decision-making, residents who were frustrated with the changes often vented their dismay and anger towards staff members, who found the precarious situation difficult to manage, although they could understand the rationale behind resident frustrations. As one staff member explained:

Some have kicked off, they come to the office and told us they hate the place, they hate us... I understand they are angry and are just looking to offload that, but our hands are tied, and they don't understand that.

Amanda, Staff Member

Attempting to exert authority over residents without truly believing in the justification of the rules themselves, or having any considerable power or autonomy in their application, proved an impossible and ironic dilemma for staff, who struggled to manage the situation of being criticised by residents for seemingly over-exerting their authority and control, whereas in reality having limited means of power, a matter which they were not able to convey to residents due to the need to falsify their authority to maintain the illusion. Limited options to avoid confrontation with residents due to the mandatory

house meetings and residents entering the staff office, meant there were few places to escape, and conflict could sometimes escalate quite quickly, adding further emotional turmoil and stress to staff. Joniak (2005) noted that tensions manifesting into conflict in drop-in centres for homeless people were impacted by the abilities of staff to exit and avoid the situation. In contrast, staff have more control because they have more options of space to withdraw and can fundamentally delegitimize the voice of clients by imposing sanctions or evictions. However, these findings are somewhat different, as the hostel was routinely reminded by management and funders to aim to operate at a 0% eviction rate, and therefore, the extent of staff members' true power was limited. In addition, as residents would encroach on staff space to express their frustrations towards the changes within the environment, it was the staff who were conversely powerless to withdraw from the situation as they had few options to exit, other than to physically leave the premises, which was difficult due to the staffing issues:

Laura (staff member): They think that I can change things but I can't. They come in here (the office) and shout at me and list their reasons why things are unfair. They make good points but there's not much I can do about it. They see to think I can wave a wand and change things. It's hard when I can't say to them listen mate, I don't like it but I'm being told what to do here, I don't have a say in any of this.

Field Notes, 2016, Staff Office

As the above shows, despite residents' perceiving staff to be power holders in the traditional sense of being the figure of authority, they had both limited decision-making power over changes to hostel provision, and limited sanctioning power and control over the residents, meaning their actual active power was minimal. This was a great source of frustration for the staff, who not only felt disempowered by their inability to influence change but demoralised by being blamed for the changes, despite their lack of control in

the environment.

Self-Legitimacy

Self-legitimacy is a term introduced to describe an individual's confidence and belief in their own authority (Bradford and Quinton 2014), which contrasts with *legitimacy*, which is the term used to describe how *others* view an authority (Tyler 2006). Many notable studies focusing on the self-legitimacy of workers tend to focus on positions within the criminal justice sphere, such as police officer and prison officer (Bradford and Quinton 2014) most likely due to the marked disparities of power relations inherent in these types of roles. Within the hostel, the staff members are unquestionably the 'powerholders,' even if figuratively in reality due to the limit to their real power. Therefore, we may be able to gain a better understanding of the factors involved in influencing the staff members' attitude and approach to their role by applying what research tells us can impact self-legitimacy and examining whether the changing environment may have had a role to play in the shifting of behaviour and values.

Management issues, attitudes and communication breakdown were prominent themes in the staff interviews, with staff referring to recent instances where they felt undervalued and disrespected as their ideas and questions in team meetings were often disregarded or ignored, leaving them feeling invalidated. For example, one staff member described how she had attempted to explain to the new manager in a team meeting that the staff were over-exerted and waking nights was an ineffective policy:

I tried bringing it up in a team meeting, but I was ignored. There's nothing that we do during waking nights that we can't get done during the day, so I don't understand why we must do it. It's bad for us and puts people off applying for the job. I explained all this to the manager and suggested getting more relief workers in for the night shifts, but she said we just had to get on with it. She doesn't do

any though.

Laura, Staff Member

Similar management attitudes have been reported by Peter et al., (2021), who explained how staff members being ignored and having little autonomy can lead to them eventually being reluctant to share how they feel in the team as showing vulnerability could lead to them being deemed incompetent. Similarly, this response by management reflects what Bottoms and Tankebe (2012) explain is one of the central reasons why workers can develop a poor sense of self-legitimacy, as they found that being treated unfairly by management or the wider organisation impacted a police officer's sense of belonging, and so they were ultimately more likely to reject the rules and regulations of that organisation. Of relevance in a hostel context, Tankebe (2018) explained how self-legitimacy can be understood through a triad (consisting of supervisor, colleagues, and clientele) of recognition. It is the social interactions with this triad that helps to construct an individual's self-legitimacy and social identity, with positive interactions being linked to higher attainable levels (Tankebe 2018). The comment relating to feeling ignored and disrespected by management above can therefore be an example of how negative social interactions with (supervisor) management can affect a worker's self-legitimacy. Furthermore, under Tankebe's (2018) triad of recognition, social interactions with colleagues and a positive social relationship leading to establishing group identity and collective power can have positive implications on a staff member's sense of self-legitimacy. This may help explain why staff members experienced feelings of loss and disempowerment once their colleagues resigned, as the fracturing of the collective power affected their confidence in the role and thus their self-legitimacy. As one staff member stated:

I'm trying to do right by the young people and keep going but it's hard. I'm exhausted and it's just one thing after another. My relationships with the

residents aren't as good as they used to be and it's hard getting them to listen because they don't think we listen. I don't feel like I'm helping them like I used to

Sophie, Staff Member

In respect of the newer staff members who vacated their positions, we may also be able to apply Tankebe's (2018) argument that self-legitimacy derives from respect and validation from colleagues. The existing staff, by their own admission, had little respect for the newer members due to their perceived lack of experience and capacity to support the young people, therefore, it is possible that as they were invalidated by their peers, the newer staff members had low levels of legitimacy which in turn weakened their tie to the organisation and commitment to the role, thus leading to their departure from the role.

The studies that focus on the associated effects of a poor sense of self-legitimacy have noted the effects to include poor organisational commitment and approach to rule enforcement and a decrease in self-confidence (Bradford and Quinton 2014). However, importantly, research tells us that if an individual presents themselves in a way which demonstrates that they do not have confidence in their role or their authority, others are less likely to recognise them as legitimate powerholders (Crewe 2009; Tyler 2006; Glenn and Goodman 2015; Wooldredge and Steiner 2016). Therefore, if staff members have little confidence in their authority or possess weak self-legitimacy, they are unlikely to appear as an authoritative figure and thus are less likely to be perceived as legitimate in the eyes of others, leading to a confirmation of their own insecurities. This self-fulfilling prophecy can be detrimental, as the findings of Chapters Eight and Nine have shown that staff legitimacy is one of the most crucial factors in a resident's decision whether to adhere to rules and accept authority (Tyler 2006; Jackson et al., 2010).

In terms of management, it is also worthwhile to consider the self-legitimacy levels of

the new 2016 hostel manager, to examine whether there may be a possible link with her attitude and behaviour in the role. Perhaps the highest visible figure of authority in the hostel environment, new management practices centred around creating a space of control, with rigid rules and regulations which appeared to become more inflexible and draconian the more residents resisted. If we apply the thoughts of Bradford and Quinton (2014), who note that an individual with weak self-legitimacy is more likely to use force and coercion and may be more sensitive to provocation, it is conceivable that the authoritarian management style based on incisive control may be the result of an underlying weak sense of self-legitimacy and lack of confidence in ability. Indicators of the 2016 manager's low levels of self-legitimacy included:

Claire (manager): The residents don't listen to me, probably because they don't really like me. Introducing the new CCTV will mean that they are being recorded, so we can use the footage as evidence, if necessary. They will listen sooner or later.

Field Notes, 2016, Staff Office

It has been argued that police officers will experience more confidence in their role and authority if they feel they are valued and respected by their organisation and the general public (Bradford and Quinton 2014). In the context of this study, it may be argued that the new manager received little respect from 'the public' – the residents, due to her management style and lack of willingness to foster a social relationship or engage in social interactions. Likewise, due to the shift towards a more authoritative environment and the effects of austerity on staffing levels and working conditions, management received little approval or respect from colleagues, who mostly perceived her to be over-zealous with methods of control. This breakdown in the relationship and lack of respect was evidenced further by staff members' complaints concerning the manager's perceived unwillingness to listen or compromise, and thus, she may not have

felt like a valuable member of the team. In a similar vein, if we examine the circumstances through Tankebe's (2018) 'triad of recognition', the manager may be considered to have poor legitimacy by the residents, who reacted to her exertions of power by increasing their levels of resistance and finding ways to show their contempt. Therefore, it would be fair to state that the factors which have been shown to lead to poor self-legitimacy may help explain why management attempted to use more 'forceful' (Bradford and Quinton 2019) and coercive 'hard power' (Crewe 2009, 2011; Wilson 2008) strategies to control those within the hostel, rather than softer interpersonal skills (Nye 1990).

Group and Team Identity

The emotional and practical impact of the loss of staff on the residents has been described in detail in the preceding chapters; however, the loss also fundamentally impacted the remaining staff members who described their frustration at losing long term experienced and knowledgeable colleagues who were 'brilliant' with the young people and 'mentors' to them as individuals. As one staff member stated:

Laura (staff member): The old team were excellent. There was always so much knowledge in the room that any problem you had in the office, they'd experienced it ten times over and had a solution. We don't have that now, there's not as much knowledge so we aren't learning from each other. We have to play it by ear a bit which means it's harder to get things right.

Field Notes, 2016, Staff Office

Others discussed how the situation and rapid staff turnover had negatively impacted their morale and had resulted in feelings of instability and uncertainty in the office,

ultimately leading to decreased productivity. Of particular importance was the perception that the sudden loss of staff fundamentally destroyed the dynamics of their team, in that they no longer had a collective group of well-experienced and knowledgeable team members, who all shared close working relationships and a family-like supportive environment reflective of a space of care (Conradson 2003). As one staff member illustrated:

We used to be a really close team, but we were more than colleagues, we were friends. The atmosphere is so different now, the office is always quiet. It feels like a different place. I don't feel like I have that support around me anymore, I don't have those familiar faces.

Sophie, Staff Member

The above comment draws interesting parallels with the findings relating to the residents as described in the previous chapter, as the loss of colleagues destabilised the staff culture, diminished working relationships and impinged on the sense of community. However, emotional distress and a loss of group identity were not the only effects experienced by staff, as dynamics between residents and remaining staff were also negatively impacted by the departures. Many residents reacted to the losses by verbally venting their anger towards staff members, who felt powerless and unable to offer adequate support when they too felt inadequately supported, thus resulting in a strain on the staff-resident social relationship.

It was evident from the staff comments that a common coping strategy adopted to manage the challenges of the role was the 'share the burden' with other staff members by seeking their support and guidance, a sentiment that has been noted in other studies such as that by Peter et al., (2021). By sharing knowledge, staff were able to improve the quality of their services along with their own practices by drawing on the experiences of

others, which simultaneously strengthened their team bond. Taken together, the findings indicate that a strong team culture and supportive social relationships between staff helped to improve worker self-esteem and unite them as a 'we' rather than 'I,' echoing findings by Ledain (2015). This was illustrated by one staff member interviewed before the staffing changes who commented:

You need to have that support around you. This is a hard job; you never really know what to expect and things can be unpredictable. It's so important that you feel you can speak to the other staff, because in almost every circumstance, no matter how unique it may appear, they would have had something almost identical at one point. Sure, you don't have to do exactly what they did, but you can use what worked for them and build on it to find your own way. Then you're in a position to share what works for you when others come asking.

Amanda, Staff Member

By tapping into the experiences and support from others, staff were able to develop their own resilience, skills, and capabilities whilst also offering their own knowledge to reaffirm their position in the group. In the context of group dynamics, this finding fits with studies that note how workers are more likely to share knowledge with colleagues if they feel respected (Ellemers et al., 2013) and others that note that the concept of sharing is a core component in the construction of social identity (Reis and Palacios 2019). Sharing knowledge can also be considered to be advantageous for the young people, as has been observed in other studies where it was noted that having staff members with a range of experiences gives young homeless people a greater sense of control, as they have a wider variety of advice options to choose from or combine (Centrepont 2018).

Boudreau et al., (2014) found that group identity is critical for organisations as it allowed

workers to have a sense of stability both internally in terms of the organisation and externally in how others view it. In support of this, the staff members in the current study made comments such as:

We don't feel like a team anymore, we used to be so strong. I've lost colleagues, friends and mentors and I feel a bit lost. My support network is broken and it's really impacting my morale and my ability to do the role. It's upsetting.

Sophie, Staff Member

The relevance of productivity in the sense of team performance and the relationship with group identity is explained by Reis and Palacios (2019) who noted that the strength of group identity is a fundamental predictor of team effectiveness and emphasised the importance of the functioning of working teams. In the current study, by disrupting the team structure and dynamic with rapid change and resulting high-staff turnover, the remaining staff no longer had the deep pool of knowledge to access when attempting to overcome challenges or the emotional support of confiding in colleagues who understood the issues they faced without judgement. That is, staff no longer had the shared and collective structure that Reis and Palacios (2019) argue is the core of social and group identity and for this reason, staff members lost their sense of belonging and purpose as a member of the team.

The findings demonstrate the importance for staff working in emotionally challenging roles to have a positive and supportive working environment and a strong social identity as part of the team, which can help mitigate the emotional labour and burnout they can experience being repeatedly exposed to traumatised individuals (Karabanow 1999; Schiff and Lane 2019; Olivet et al., 2010; Stone 2010). However, the findings also demonstrate how social changes and issues such as under-staffing brought on by poor working conditions and austerity (Stone 2010) can alter the team dynamics in such a way that the

group identity and sense of belonging are deemed essential by researchers for effective organisational working (Reis and Palacios 2018) is lost. Olivet et al., (2010) whilst researching staffing issues in the homeless sector, drew similar conclusions, noting that the inherent issues such as turnover and limited resources, can hinder the possibility of team building amongst the staff. It seemed that losing a sense of self within the team was not only detrimental to mutual support, but once the team was fractured, staff members began to lose their collective power as united figures of authority which in turn, weakened their perceived legitimacy (Tyler 2006; Jackson et al., 2010) and self-legitimacy (Bradford and Quinton 2014). Therefore, much like the young people themselves, staff members constructing a social identity as part of the group and establishing a sense of belonging is fundamental and can act as a protective factor against the negativities research report associated with the role (Reis and Palacios 2018; Karabanow 1999; McGrath and Pistrang 2007; Johnsen et al., 2005).

Given what this study and those it references (Reis and Palacios 2019; Ledain 2015; Boudreau et al., 2014) tell us about the role sharing knowledge plays in developing a person's sense of belonging in a team, it would be fair to state that the newer staff members were not in the position to be able to effectively buy into the team with their contributions. Furthermore, the working environment which the newer staff members entered had no clear sense of a team or an inclusive environment, meaning the opportunities to feel part of such a team was limited. This thought accords with Ledain (2015) who noted in their review of the work of Madera, et al., (2012), that a workplace that lacks group identification can lead to high turnover rates and high rates of absenteeism.

Summary

The final part of this chapter examined the findings from the perspective of the staff members working in the hostel and reinforced the crucial role staff members play in the hostel setting. Findings showed that whilst staff members mainly enjoy their job and

supporting the young people, they are often poorly compensated and therefore, those who are attracted to the role are often either lacking in essential experience or professional qualifications. Interestingly, this section highlighted how in line with other research (Karabanow 1999), older staff members who have more life experience and experience working with young people experiencing homelessness can have little respect for younger staff who hold degrees but have minimal life experience as they were deemed to be less likely to adapt and respond to the various needs of the young people. This section also explored the effects of austerity on homeless services and how the immediate implications such as under-staffing and the discontinuation of free services such as counselling, can have detrimental effects on a staff member's level of emotional exhaustion and stress.

The chapter continued to discuss the complex nature of the key worker role and the challenges some staff can experience when attempting to balance the conflicting role of carer and enforcer, a finding which is supported by studies in similar settings (McGrath and Pistrang 2007). Notably, it was suggested that a worker may be less likely to experience this internal conflict if they believe the hostel should implement rigid rules. Although to be clear, this is more an observation than general finding, given the small sample of staff interviewed for this study. The chapter then went on to explore professional boundaries and the negative implications on residents and staff when such boundaries become blurred. Whilst there was a consensus amongst staff that they felt they mostly received adequate training for their role, training specifically relating to enforcing professional boundaries and not becoming overly invested or attached was an area which was often overlooked. In terms of relationship with management post-changes in 2016, staff described how they felt undervalued, highlighting the limited support they received and the distress they experienced as a result of having little autonomy or opportunity to discuss their views.

The penultimate section of the closing chapter of the findings and discussion explored

the self-legitimacy of individuals working in homeless hostels and the factors on which this can be weakened. The self-legitimacy of the manager was also examined as a plausible reason behind the decision to shift towards a more controlling and bureaucratic environment. Finally, the importance of social relationships amongst staff members and the benefits that this dynamic can have on the emotional and physical wellbeing of staff and the wider social environment was explored. It was discussed how having a positive and supportive working environment based on mutual respect can be crucial for wellbeing and morale, enabling staff members to create a sense of belonging and a group social identity which was used as a basis for collective power.

Chapter Eleven:

Conclusion and Recommendations

The purpose of this final chapter is to bring together and summarise some of the key findings and place them within a wider context. In addition, the chapter notes the original contributions of the research and offers some suggestions as to further research topics which could help expand some of the findings of this study and further improve understanding.

The overarching purpose of this study was to provide an in-depth examination of the experiences of hostel staff and young people living in supported accommodation, drawing on symbolic interactionism as a basis to build on the existing knowledge, and better understand the underlying influences on interactions, behaviours and the social system as a whole. Themes of power and control versus care and welfare were prominent in this thesis and the data collected helped to shape our understanding of how power can operate in institutional settings to achieve more favourable outcomes, along with how individuals respond to the exertion of such power. The study explained that previous studies concerning mostly adult hostels have repeatedly argued that hostels function as disciplinary institutions which seek to control and isolate residents who are deemed personally responsible for their situation, by 'correcting' their behaviour and perceived deficiencies (Stark 1994; Williams 1996). These notions of blame often mirror official national and local government policies, which fundamentally aim to control homeless people by regulating space (Mitchell 2003) and restricting free movement between local authority areas (Shelter 2018). Moving beyond the assessment of the hostel as a wholly disciplinary punitive institution, contemporary studies have started conceptualising hostels, their dynamics and cultures as spaces of care and welfare, with genuine empathy and warmth from staff members who are often no longer simply seen as figures of authority, but as a consistent support network (Conradson 2003; Durrant 2014; Johnsen et al., 2005).

When examining the findings of this study as a whole, hostels for homeless youth can be understood to be characteristically complex in nature, where care and control are not

necessarily mutually exclusive concepts and can co-exist to produce a more harmonious environment. However, it was evident that over-zealous rules and regulations designed to restrict the use of space and enforce a routine inhibited empowerment and autonomy and were thus directly counterintuitive to the hostel's aims and ethos. Social control in the later stages of data collection focused on using hard power techniques (Crewe 2011) designed to achieve compliance through direct coercion in an attempt to create a regimented structure in the lives of the young people by enforcing social activities, closing communal areas and restricting visitor access. Alongside restrictive punishments, this control culture limited residents' ability to foster and maintain social relationships with those outside the hostel sphere, thus leaving them vulnerable to a loss of identity and becoming dependent on the institution or becoming shelterized as Stark (1994) cautions against, as detailed within Chapter Three of this thesis.

In response to the inflexibility surrounding rules and the loss of control, residents employed a variety of coping strategies, ranging from efforts to regain power through exhibiting challenging volatile behaviour and resistance, to complete withdrawal from the social and physical environment as a method of self-preservation. Attempts at counter-power negatively influenced the staff-resident and staff-manager relationships, ultimately resulting in further restrictions and surveillance implemented to assert dominance and curb growing resistance, leading to a downward spiral of events. Hostel staff struggled with these tensions, challenging behaviours and negative outbursts from residents, as despite their label as figures of authority, they held little discretionary power themselves. Through excessive use of power techniques and a decline in social relationships, the hostel was reframed as a space predominantly of control, and therefore it became an environment, not unlike a disciplinary institution (Foucault 1977) designed to restrict the movements and correct the behaviour of residents who were under near constant surveillance and held limited power and control over their lives.

In contrast, the early stages of data collection in Bank Hostel under the first manager

presented the hostel as a space which focused more on themes of care and welfare, with positive social relationships and informal interactions underpinning the softer (Nye 1990) social control methods. Interpersonal supportive relationships between staff and residents created a homely environment which was based on reciprocal trust and respect, allowing residents to feel part of a community in a non-judgemental space of refuge. This sense of belonging alongside not wanting to disappoint or upset staff meant most residents self-regulated their behaviour and adhered to rules and policies during this period. Rule infractions did still occur, as is natural within the environment, but flexibility was key and minor violations were often overlooked, thus strengthening the staff-resident bond and preventing difficult behaviours from spiralling into major acts of rule-breaking.

Further, rather than restricting resident power, findings showed that hostel practices which embody elements of shared power, such as where it is distributed amongst the residents through productive means, can enhance feelings of empowerment and boost resident wellbeing and self-esteem. Examples of distributing power were listed by respondents as staff allowing residents control over their day-to-day living space and providing opportunities to safely challenge rules and authority. This demonstrates the need to permit homeless youth to have control over their routines and life choices in institutional settings, as establishing a sense of control provided feelings of stability, pride and consistency.

However, although findings strongly suggest that residents respond more positively when attempting to navigate a setting which resembles a space of care rather than control, that is not to say that strategies of control were not still prevalent or necessary. Offering support to research by Johnsen et al., (2005) and Conradson (2003), this study found that the diverse experiences and potential vulnerabilities of homeless youth mean that some rules and regulations are necessary to ensure their safety, as well as the safety of staff. In this sense, it seemed to promote the welfare of the residents meant

incorporating rules and regulations into the environment but doing so flexibly and respectfully. These methods of control did not necessarily stem from a place of oppression, blame and stereotypes, but from a place of warmth, care and the genuine desire by staff to protect the young people physically and emotionally. Therefore, control within these types of settings can be understood to be more effective by using a combination of soft power techniques such as positive social relationships and interactions (Nye 1990) alongside some hard power techniques (Crewe 2011) such as surveillance and locking the external doors of the building overnight.

Designing a space that embodies elements of both care and control was not only integral for ensuring the wellbeing of residents. Findings showed that staff members who are often characterised as over-worked, underpaid, stressed and burnt out (Karabanow 1999; Bickle 2021; Stone 2010) experienced greater levels of stress when residents were displaying challenging behaviours in response to excessive power exertions from management. Staff demonstrated high levels of regard and warmth towards the young residents, sometimes similar to a parent, and felt deep levels of distress when their social relationships were negatively impacted by the shift in the environment. This research therefore demonstrates that the hostel can be a space of care and control for both residents and staff, the latter of whom often have good intentions and want to protect and support the residents whilst acting as a stable authoritative figure, such as their presence in the communal areas when encouraging interactions between residents.

A number of studies have identified the stressful aspects of support-based roles that can lead to emotional and physical harm in staff members (Bickle 2021; Karabanow 1999; Ravalier 2018; Pasupuleti et al., 2009) and this research adds further weight to this notion. In particular, it was found that staffing issues brought on by funding constraints were a direct source of stress in many cases. Funding constraints and high expectations led to high staff turnover and low staff retention, which impacted the workload of the

remaining staff and negatively affected their team culture and staff identity. Furthermore, under-staffing meant staff often could not take breaks, nor could they leave the office to socialise with residents in the communal areas. The lack of opportunities for everyday interactions and the perceived feelings of rejection experienced by residents led to further barriers in the staff-resident relationship and caused a variety of harmful effects on the staff themselves as well as the wider environment. Finally, the findings clearly show the impact management style and practices can have on staff members and were some of the most significant stressors in the role. Staff identified feeling powerless and undervalued by higher management who refused to listen to their concerns and expected them to get on with the role regardless of the issues they were experiencing. The sense of low self-legitimacy stemming from the above meant that staff were not performing to the best of their ability and struggled to deal with displays of resistance from residents.

Original Contributions

As noted throughout this thesis, hostels that cater for homeless youth are critically neglected in academic research. Of the available studies, rarely, the everyday lives and interactions of both the young people and staff members are explored in sufficient detail to deepen our understanding of the social world and cultures within such environments. Given that homeless young people are understood to have significantly different needs and experiences of homelessness compared to their often-researched adult counterparts, exploring the lived experiences of young people in the hostel sphere is crucial to improving our understanding and developing effective hostel policies and practices that are reflective of this knowledge. This study, therefore, provides an invaluable contribution to this gap in the literature by providing detailed insight into the social relationships within the hostel space and exploring how encounters and social interactions can help or hinder residents' rule perception and rule adherence.

The circumstances that transpired during the data collection which ultimately resulted in interviews being paused for a period of time, allowed for a distinct and significant original contribution to be established. Previous research in hostels (Stark 1994; DeWard and Moe 2010; Durrant 2014; Williams 1996; Hoffman and Coffey 2008; Glenn and Goodman 2015) and other institutional settings (Crewe 2009, 2011) have explored the hostel through lenses of care and control by examining the internal power tensions, staff legitimacy and relationship development. The studies provide information on everyday uses of authority by staff within these institutional environments and generally agree that power techniques play an integral role in interpersonal relations and levels of resistance. However, notably, the existing studies were conducted in static environments, with no discernible shift in dynamics during data collection and consequently no opportunities to directly compare the use of different types of power techniques. In contrast, due to the rapid change in management style during the pause in data collection and incorporating the lived experiences of both residents and staff, this study was able to examine the hostel in what was at first a space that relied more heavily on social relationships and soft power methods to achieve compliance, before returning and exploring the new hard power policies and institutional structure that better resembled a place of control. No other study appears to have been conducted in such circumstances and consequently, has not been able to capture and directly compare the experiences of participants in a single environment shortly before and shortly after such a significant change in power dynamics. Therefore, the findings of this research are invaluable to our understanding of how individuals negotiate, respond to and challenge power mechanisms in institutional settings and how these methods can impact and shape the wider social environment. In addition, the findings offer insight into how individuals respond to social change in an environment depending on how it is managed.

A more specific original contribution is the discussion surrounding the social media habits of the residents and how beneficial and economically friendly these platforms can be to marginalised youth. The study found that the residents routinely used social media

to effectively maintain social relationships and remain integrated with social networks, thus enabling them to feel like other young people. This helped them to maintain an identity separate from 'hostel resident', which in turn protected against becoming over-dependent on the institution. Whilst there is a small body of research on the social media habits of homeless youth (Rice and Barman-Adhikari 2014; Guadango et al., 2013; VonHoltz et al., 2018), we know relatively little about how young people experiencing homelessness use social media and particularly how those who are living in supported accommodation (where there is usually free WIFI to facilitate access) use the internet to communicate and stay connected with the rest of society. This study, therefore, provides some detail to begin to address these fundamental gaps in the research and simultaneously highlights the central role social media plays in the lives of residents, their social relationships, and their methods of navigating their homeless journey whilst protecting their self-identity.

The role of the manager in the homeless hostel is often overlooked within the literature. The findings of this study highlighted the crucial role management can play across all aspects of the hostel, and specifically the central role they play in terms of social dynamics and levels of rule adherence. Interviews revealed that the manager is often viewed by residents as the highest form of visible authority, meaning they were ultimately considered the rule makers and of higher status than other staff members. Through maintaining social relationships with the young people and being emotionally and physically available, findings showed the inequality inherent in the manager-resident relationship dynamic was diminished and residents were more likely to conform to rules. Conversely, the findings strongly indicated a manager who created a physical and emotional distance between themselves and residents was less likely to be respected, trusted and, fundamentally, listened to. The manager's approach to interpersonal relationships with residents can therefore be crucial in shaping the hostel either predominantly as a space of care and wellbeing or one of power and control. This perspective adds another more nuanced layer to our understanding of the complexities

of hostel living and rule compliance and offers an important contribution to the literature as well as informing policy and practice.

This thesis offers significant insight surrounding the working tensions staff can experience within their roles, and the impact broader issues such as financial cuts, and internal issues such as a change in management, can have on levels of burnout and fatigue. The findings demonstrate that staff in the hostel operate best when working as part of - and *feeling* a part of - the staff team, as this is when morale and productivity will be at their highest. Despite the shift to an emphasis on qualifications when recruiting new members of staff, it was clear that the most important aspects of the role are learned from other staff members within the team who share their knowledge and expertise. Although there have been some studies which explore the staff perspective when working with vulnerable youth (Karabanow 1999; Bickle 2021), the relevant literature typically focuses on how staff perceive residents or how they should respond to their needs, rather than gaining a better understanding of the needs and experiences of staff themselves. This study, therefore, provides a valuable contribution as it extends beyond simply examining power tensions in the hostel space and explores the tensions inherent in the role of staff and how this influences the wider environment.

Future Implications for Policy and Practice

This study was undertaken to explore the core themes of power and control versus care and welfare, along with social dynamics within an institutional setting. Given that these themes are inherent within environments that house members of staff and residents, service users, or prisoners, the findings will be of interest to those working within the homeless sector, as well as those in other institutional establishments.

Taken together, the findings of this study provide strong evidence as to how displays of power and control in institutional settings both within the homeless sector and across others, can influence social relationships, interactions, wellbeing and resistance levels.

Data suggests that when power is exerted in a way that is deemed unjust, inflexible and unfair (Tyler 2005) individuals are fundamentally more likely to develop more extreme coping strategies, which may include physical displays of overt resistance. Given that staff within institutions have been shown to experience significant stress and burnout in their roles (Bickle 2021; Karabanow 1999; Pasupuleti et al., 2009) control techniques and institutional practices should be re-examined through the concept of care and welfare to limit resistance and ensure an effective balance is achieved between exerting authority and empowering the individual. Ultimately, care should be taken to construct a physical and social environment that embodies as many characteristics of 'home' and belonging as possible, to provide residents with a safe refuge during their precarious journey through homelessness. This means we must look beyond creating an aesthetically pleasing environment, and towards one that is safe, empowering and controlled collaboratively between staff and residents. The importance of this was reflected in the findings of the research, as residents shifted their perception of Bank Hostel from their home to a prison, simply because of a change in management style and despite the fact the aesthetics and physical surroundings remained the same.

The findings of this study show that the socio-emotional needs and behaviours of homeless youth need to be considered within the wider context of their history and experiences, as exposing residents to high levels of control and restrictions can have salient negative consequences. It is widely understood that many young homeless people have been exposed to early childhood trauma, abuse and neglect and as such, may display challenging behaviours (Homeless Link 2022). The findings indicate that this awareness does not always appear to be considered or at least remembered in practice, as the young people who did not adhere to the rules were viewed by management as problematic and in need of further control methods and surveillance, a dichotomy that is not dissimilar from UK government misgivings around homeless people. The emerging body of research surrounding psychologically informed environments (PIEs) (Turley, Payne & Webster 2013; Centrepont 2019; Keats 2012) and trauma-informed

environments (Homeless Link 2022; Hopper, Olivet & Bassuk 2010) demonstrates the need for staff working with homeless youth to have a good understanding of their support needs and avoid punishments which are simply used to exert control (Hopper, Olivet & Bassuk 2010). The findings of this study illustrate and support that organisations must use other tools to manage the behaviour of their service users beyond simply imposing restrictive measures which may cause re-traumatisation or lead to outbursts of negative behaviour, especially when such behaviour can lead to a person being evicted from the hostel and deemed intentionally homeless.

Contemporary research across institutional settings including both those which are punitive and support-based, advocate that implementing a PIE framework and/or trauma-informed environment can facilitate improvements to social interactions between staff and service users (Kuester et al., 2022), positive social interpersonal relationships (Phipps 2016) and wellbeing (Keats 2012). As such, there is strong evidence to suggest that adopting these approaches is valuable and may help counter the challenges experienced by residents and staff as reported in this study. To bring about changes to how we work with individuals in support-based environments, we need to ensure that services which offer support to homeless youth and other vulnerable people, commit to becoming trauma-informed and have received sufficient training to equip them with the skills and knowledge necessary to create PIEs that meet the aims of the organisation together with the needs of the staff and residents (Turley, Payne and Webster 2013). This is particularly important when staff are already dealing with a multitude of other stress-inducing issues such as understaffing and unrealistic expectations from management, as this research has shown that these issues alone can impact job performance, interactions and ability to appropriately manage challenging behaviours. Further, staff and management must not undermine the hostel ethos of empowering service users even when faced with limited resources. For example, the findings demonstrated that methods which may have been used to counteract staffing issues such as an increase in formal surveillance were counterintuitive, negatively

impacting the staff-resident relationship and causing residents distress and frustration, both of which led to less favourable outcomes. Research has shown that reflective practice among staff can be a useful skill and process to positively influence the service that they deliver and overcome challenges in the staff-resident relationship (Phipps 2016). There was no suggestion that this practice was an aspect of the staff role within Bank Hostel, suggesting that staff may benefit from incorporating this activity into their role.

More broadly, the findings of this study concerning our understanding of how power operates can be applied to other contexts, institutions and support-based settings. Understanding the behaviour and responses to the power of the service users through the findings of this study can help shape and refine practices and policies that are more holistic and effective in maintaining order whilst simultaneously creating a homely environment and sense of community. This is especially true for the findings which centre around the concept of shared power, where residents were able to participate in hostel decisions and appropriately challenge hostel policy, as this was shown to enhance feelings of empowerment in individuals who are typically disempowered and marginalised in wider society (Durrant 2014; Phipps 2016). Although the findings showed that the feel of the environment was more important to creating a sense of home than the physical surroundings, the young people still unsurprisingly wanted to live in an environment with characteristics of home and warmth. Therefore, residents should be consulted when making any changes to the physical environment or layout of the hostel and staff should regularly review whether it is necessary to update the aesthetics to incorporate the preferences of newer young people.

The findings of this study highlight several other critical issues and lessons both for institutions on an individual level as well as UK policymakers. Many of the issues which arose in Bank Hostel in 2016 were the direct result of austerity and its implications on the organisation, with almost all adverse matters being traced back to the cuts to at least

some degree. It is important to remember, as stated in an earlier chapter, that many of the key decisions and changes implemented including the new control methods, appeared to be an attempt to counteract limited staff and resources. For example, surveillance in the form of CCTV apparatus was mainly implemented as under-staffing meant staff could no longer perform informal surveillance through their visible presence in the communal areas, and therefore, the manager felt it necessary to install more formal surveillance to minimise any unruly behaviour. Similarly, the findings of this study suggest that the hard power techniques introduced may have been an attempt to achieve compliance in a cost and time-effective manner (Crewe 2011), despite their limitations long-term. As such, the wider effects of financial cuts to the budget in the homeless sector should be considered carefully or at least mitigated to prevent adverse consequences.

The findings relating to the manager-resident relationship suggest a need for management to potentially take more of an active role in the day-to-day lives of young people and develop a degree of social relationship. The lack of relationship underpinned by feelings of disrespect was one of the main reasons why residents refused to accept the manager in 2016 and legitimate authority and therefore, it must be considered from the perspective of hostels that management may play a more substantial role in general compliance, order, and group dynamics than originally expected. In respect of achieving a controlled environment, it was abundantly clear that a shift towards the hostel as a space of smart and shared power can not only bring about greater adherence but can help empower and shape young people experiencing homelessness into autonomous and confident young adults. The findings of this study recommend that services for homeless youth should consider developing a control model based on the notions of shared and 'smart' power which could improve the quality of future services.

Recommendations for Further Research

Although the findings of this study expand on the existing literature, it also emphasises the need for further research to fully ascertain and understand the complex experiences of homeless youth. Of note in this study, yet not fully explored, was residents' use of social media to develop and maintain the social relationship by creating an online presence. Whilst there is a small but growing body of evidence pertaining to the internet use of homeless people (see Guadango et al., 2013; Rice and Barman-Adhikari 2014), further research relating to how those experiencing homelessness use social media and the internet to maintain or create an identity other than that of a homeless person may be useful in everyday practice.

In terms of the staff-resident relationship, although much is already known about the key role this dynamic plays in the hostel environment, a greater focus could be placed on how the relationship is initially developed and how it can continue to be developed and maintained in the wake of matters such as financial cuts which limit the staff availability and resources. Likewise, whilst gender roles played a very small part in the findings, it was interesting to note that staff members were more likely to use terms of endearment for female residents than males, particularly, and therefore, a further focus of research may examine this notion in more depth, with the inclusion of male staff members, to determine whether there are any additional disparities based on the gender of the staff member.

As noted above, the importance of the manager-resident relationship was a new finding one which requires further exploration to better understand. This dynamic may be typically not as important as this study notes, and it was merely the unusual set of circumstances and dramatic shift in management styles which set off a negative chain reaction. That said, it cannot be ignored that during the first phase of data collection, the manager was repeatedly discussed by residents who valued her support and active 'hands-on' management strategy and as such, further research would be both worthwhile and interesting. Similarly, given the difficulties establishing whether the

levels of resistance were in response to power, change or both, further research pertaining to residents' experiences of managing power and control in supported accommodation is necessary to better inform practice. The potential for smart and shared power to be combined in supported accommodations to yield more effective services and outcomes does not appear to have been mentioned in any previous literature; therefore, a natural progression to examining more closely the use and effectiveness of these types of power could usefully be explored in future research.

Limitations of the Study

There are several important limitations to this study which need to be considered, most of which were brought about by the barriers experienced due to Bank Hostel experiencing a period of significant social change at the time of data collection. However, firstly, given the nature of the selected research method of a case study, the sample size of participants was small and therefore, caution must be applied to the findings as they may not be transferrable to the general hostel, or indeed the homeless population. Unfortunately, the study did not include participants who were in employment, training, or education, as these individuals might have provided a unique perspective to life in supported living; however, the very few who were engaged in the above, opted not to participate or attend the study informational sessions. In a similar vein, the small sample size was especially true in terms of members of staff who participated in this study, as due to unforeseen circumstances and wider hostel issues at hand, only three staff other than the hostel managers were interviewed. Notably, all staff members interviewed were female, which although reflective of the gender disparity amongst the staff at the time of the interviews, perhaps does not provide a full and balanced view of the staff perspective of the role, particularly if as posited by Zuffrey (2009), females take a more maternalistic and stereotypical caring and nurturing approach to the role.

The most important limitation lies in the fact that the second set of data was collected at

a time were emotions of residents and staff were heightened as they struggled to manage feelings of loss and grief stemming from the sudden departure of staff, along with the changes which were continuously being implemented in the environment. As such, it is not entirely clear whether the strong negative reaction to these changes and the exponential levels of resistance were truly the response to 'hard power' techniques, or whether they were the response of a rapid shift in power relations and residents attempting to negotiate their new social position within the hostel. In other words, it is not clear whether the results in the latter part of this study tell us how residents universally react to hard power, or how residents react to their environment changing and having no control over those changes. Although the findings of this study should of course be considered with this in mind, irrespective of whether the resistance and power struggle resulted from the power itself or shifts in the balance of power, the findings still have important lessons for management practices, hostel provision and on a wider scale, the potential impact of austerity. To gain a better understanding of resident's behaviour in the second phase of data collection, it may have been worthwhile returning to the research site after another period of 12 months and exploring the environment after it had time to settle to the new changes; however, given the delays already affecting the study design and the difficulty in regaining contact after the initial pause, it was decided this may be counterproductive.

The scope of this study was further limited in the second stage of data collection by the pool of residents who agreed to participate. As they all belonged to the same social group of sorts, many of the responses in the interviews used similar language and descriptions to describe rules and management, suggesting the responses were potentially reflective of earlier personal conversations amongst residents and the sharing of opinions on certain matters, which may consciously or unconsciously distort the individual's true perspective. Likewise, although bullying was discussed in much depth, those residents who were being targeted did not participate in the study, nor did they attend the information sessions. There are a variety of potential reasons for this,

ranging from disinterest to their apparent preference to avoid those residents who did participate due to ongoing intimidation. Whilst staff members were able to corroborate much of what the participants stated which adds an element of reliability and validity to the findings, this is a weakness in the study, as it would have been useful and insightful to interview the other population of residents and garner an understanding of their experiences of the shift in power and changing environment, which may have been quite different.

References

Abercrombie, N., Hill, S. and Turner, B. (1984). *Dictionary of Sociology*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

- Addo, R. (2018). Homeless Individuals' Social Construction of a Park: A Symbolic Interactionist Perspective. *The Qualitative Report*, 23(9), pp - 2063-2074. Available: <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2018.3301>
- Adler, P. and Adler, P. (1994). Observational techniques. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. Sage Publications, pp. 377–392.
- Allen, J. and Land, D. (1999). Attachment in adolescence. In: Cassidy and Shaver *Handbook of attachment*. New York: Guilford Press, pp 319 - 331.
- Altena, A., Krabbenborg, M., Boersma, S., Beijersbergen, M., van den Berg, Y., Vollebergh, W. and Wolf, J. (2017). The working alliance between homeless young adults and workers: A dyadic approach. *Children and Youth Services Review*. 73, pp 368-374
- Anderson, I. and Quilgars, D. (1997). Addressing the problem of youth homelessness and unemployment: the contribution of foyers. In: Burrows, R. and Quilgars, D. *Homelessness and Social Policy*. Oxtom: Routledge, pp 218-223.
- Anderson, R. (2007). Thematic Content Analysis (TCA) Descriptive Presentation of Qualitative Data. Available at: <https://rosemarieanderson.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/08/ThematicContentAnalysis.pdf>. Last Accessed: 26 December 2021.
- Armaline, W. (2005). "Kids Need Structure": Negotiating Rules, Power, and Social Control in an Emergency Youth Shelter. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 48(4), pp 1124-1148
- Atieno, O. (2009). An Analysis of the Strengths and Limitation of Qualitative and Quantitative Research Paradigms. *Problems of Education in the 21st Century*, 13. pp 13 – 18.
- Auty, K. M., Liebling, A., Schliehe, A., & Crewe, B. (2022). What is trauma-informed practice? Towards operationalisation of the concept in two prisons for women. *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 0(0). <https://doi.org/10.1177/17488958221094980>
- Baker, L (2006). Observation: A Complex Research Method. *Library Trends*, 55(1), pp 171-189.
- Bantchevska, D., Bartle-Haring, S., Dashora, P., Glebova, T. and Slesnick, N. (2008). Problem Behaviors of Homeless Youth: A Social Capital Perspective. *Journal of human ecology*, 23(4), pp 285-293.
- Bao, W., Whitbeck, L. and Hoyt, D. (2000). Abuse, Support, and Depression among Homeless and Runaway Adolescents. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 41(4), pp

408-420.

Bath Spa University. (2014). *An Introduction to Attachment and the implications for Learning and Behaviour*. Available:
<http://www.bathspa.ac.uk/Media/Education/attachment-and-the-implications-for-learning-and-behaviour.pdf>. Last accessed 23rd April 2015.

Beasley, L., Hackett, A. and Maxwell, S. (2005). The dietary habits and nutritional status of residents in young people's homeless hostels. *International Journal of Health Promotion and Education*, 43(1), pp 23-28.

Becker, G. S. (1968). Crime and Punishment: An Economic Approach. *Journal of Political Economy*, 76(2), pp 169–217.

Berens, M. (2015). A Review of Research: Designing the Built Environment for Recovery from Homelessness. *Design Resources for Homelessness* Available at:
http://designresourcesforhomelessness.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/FINAL1_8_2017.pdf. Last Accessed 27 December 2021.

Berridge, D, Biehl, N. and Henry, L. (2012). *Living in children's residential homes*, Department for Education, London

Bhui K, Dinos S, Galant-Miecznikowska M, de Jongh B and Stansfeld S. (2016). Perceptions of work stress causes and effective interventions in employees working in public, private and non-governmenta. *BJPsych*. 40(6), pp.318-325. [Online]. Available at: doi: 10.1192/pb.bp.115.050823. Last Accessed 2 December 2022.

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 10 pt

Bibbings, J. (2018). *Statutory homelessness in Wales is up 58 per cent in a year*. Available: <https://sheltercymru.org.uk/statutory-homelessness-in-wales-is-up-58-per-cent-in-a-year/>. Last Accessed: 16th July 2018.

Bickle, K. (2021). Staff Experiences of Stress and Coping in a Residential Treatment Facility for Youth. *Association for Child and Youth Care Practice*. 27(1), pp.1-13. [Online]. Available at: DOI:10.5195/jycw.2021.17. Last Accessed 2 December 2022.

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri)

Biehl, N. (2014). A Sense of Belonging: Meanings of Family and Home in Long-Term Foster Care, *The British Journal of Social Work*, 44,(4), pp 955–971.

Blake, S., Fradd, A. and Stringer, E. (2008). *Lost Property*. Available:
<http://www.thinknpc.org/publications/lost-property/lost-property-full/?post-parent=4979>. Last accessed 8th August 2016.

Bland, R. (1997). Keyworkers Re-examined: Good practice, quality of care and empowerment in residential care of older people. *British Journal of Social Work*, 27(4),

pp 585-603.

Bricki, N. and Green, J. (2007). A Guide to Using Qualitative Research Methodology. <https://fieldresearch.msf.org/handle/10144/84230>

Bogard, C. (1998). 'The Rhetoric of Domination and Its Strategic Use by Homeless Mothers.' *Sociological Spectrum*, 18, pp 229–62.

Bottoms, A and Tankebe, J. (2012). Beyond Procedural Justice: A Dialogic Approach to Legitimacy in Criminal Justice. *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 102(1), pp 119 - 170.

Boudreau, M., Serrano, C. and Larson, K (2013). IT-driven identity work: Creating a group identity in a digital environment. *Information and Organization*, 24(1), pp 1-24.

Boyatzis, R (1998). *Transforming Qualitative Information*. USA: Sage Publications, pp 1 - 54.

Boyle, F., Palmer, J. and Ahmed, S. (2016). The Efficiency and Effectiveness of the Housing First Support Service Piloted by Depaul in Belfast, Funded by Supporting People: An SROI Evaluation. Belfast

Bowlby, J (1969). *Attachment and loss*. United States of America: Basic Books.

Bradford, B. and Quinton, P. (2014), "Self-legitimacy, police culture and support for democratic policing in an English constabulary", *British Journal of Criminology*, 54(6), pp. 1023-1046.

Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) 'Using thematic analysis in psychology.' *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), pp 77-101.

Brosens, D, De Donder, L, Vanwing, T, Dury, S. and Verté, D. (2014). Lifelong Learning Programs in Prison: Influence of Social Networks on Participation. *Procedia - Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 116, pp 518-523.

Bryman, A. (2008). *Social research methods*: 3rd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.

Buchanan, J., Hughes, C., Thomas, M., Armstrong., Oakley, A., Platt, S., Davies, S., Shinn, D. and Nicholas, G. (2010). *Beyond the rhetoric of youth homelessness*. Available: https://www.barnardos.org.uk/beyond_rhetoric_of_youth_homelessness_-_telling_it_as_it_is_-_full_report.pdf. Last accessed 21st January 2019.

Buehler, R., Patterson, G. and Furniss, J . (1966). The Reinforcement of Behaviour in Institutional Settings. *Behaviour, Research and Therapy*, 4(3), pp 157-167.

Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press

Burrows, R., Pleace, N. and Quiglar, D. (1997). *Homelessness and Social Policy*. London, Routledge.

Busch-Geertsema, V. (2007). *The Role of Hostels and Temporary Accommodation*. Available: http://www.feantsaresearch.org/IMG/pdf/ejh_vol1_article3.pdf. Last accessed 23rd August 2016.

Cahill, O., Holt, S. and Kirwan, G. (2016). Keyworking in residential childcare: Lessons from research. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 65(1), pp 216–223.

Carter, J & Guller, C. (2015). Symbolic Interactionism. *Sociopedia*
Centrepont. (2010). *The changing face of youth homelessness: trends in homeless young people's support needs*. Available:
http://centrepont.org.uk/media/11287/the_changing_face_of_youth_homelessness_-_final_report.pdf. Last accessed 2nd January 2015.

Centrepont. (2019). *What is a Psychologically Informed Environment?*. [Online]. Centrepont. Available at: <https://centrepont.org.uk/about-us/blog/pie-an-introduction-to-psychologically-informed-environment>. Last Accessed 12 November 2022.

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 10 pt

Centrepont. (2021). *A year like no other: Youth homelessness during the COVID pandemic*. Available: <https://centrepont.org.uk/media/4773/a-year-like-no-other.pdf>

Centre For Public Impact. (2019). The Shared Power Principle. Available at: <https://www.centreforpublicimpact.org/assets/documents/shared-power-principle.pdf>

Choy, L. (2014). The Strengths and Weaknesses of Research Methodology: Comparison and Complimentary between Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches. *IOSR Journal of Humanities And Social Science*, 19(4), pp 99 – 104.

Cloke, P., Milbourne, P. and Widdowfield, R. (2002). *Rural Homelessness*, Bristol: Policy Press

Cohen, L and Manion, L (1980). *Research methods in education*. London: Croom Helm

Cohen., L, Manion., L. and Morrison, K. (2007). *Research Methods in Education*. Oxon: Routledge

Collins, P. and Barker, C. (2009). Psychological help-seeking in homeless adolescents. *International Journal of Social Psychiatry*, 55(4), pp 372-384.

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

Cooper, F. (2012). *Professional Boundaries in Social Work and Social Care*, 1 edn., London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Costello, B. and Laub, J. (2020). Social Control Theory: The Legacy of Travis Hirschi's Causes of Delinquency. *Annual Review of Criminology*, (3), pp 21-42.

Crewe, B. (2007). Power, Adaption and Resistance in a Late Modern Men's Prison. *British Journal of Criminology*, 47, pp 256 – 275.

Crewe, B. (2009). *The Prisoner Society*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Crewe, B. (2011). Soft power in prison: Implications for staff-prisoner relationships, liberty and legitimacy. *European Journal of Criminology*, 8(6), pp 455-468.

Crisis. (2012). *Research briefing: Young, hidden and homeless*. Available: <http://www.crisis.org.uk/data/files/publications/Crisis%20briefing%20-%20youth%20homelessness.pdf>. Last accessed 13th December 2014.

Crisis. (2019). Scrap the Act: The Case for Repealing the Vagrancy Act 1824. Available at: https://www.crisis.org.uk/media/240604/crisis0220_vagrancyact_report_aw_web.pdf. Last Accessed: 6 February 2022.

Crisis. (2022). Is it Scrapped Yet? An Update on our Campaign to Repeal the Vagrancy Act. Available at: <https://www.crisis.org.uk/about-us/the-crisis-blog/is-it-scrapped-yet-an-update-on-our-campaign-to-repeal-the-vagrancy-act/>. Last Accessed 7 January 2023

Cronin, C. (2014). Using case study research as a rigorous form of inquiry. *Nurse Researcher*, 21(5), pp 19–27.

Cruwys, T., Genevieve, A., Dingle, A., Haslam, C., Haslam, S., Jetten, J. and Morton, T. (2013). Social group memberships protect against future depression, alleviate depression symptoms and prevent depression relapse. *Social Science and Medicine*, 98(1), pp 179-186.

Cymorth Cymru (2020). *Evidencing the Impact of The Housing Support Grant in Wales*. https://www.cymorthcymru.org.uk/files/3316/0090/3743/Evidencing_the_Impact_of_HSG_in_Wales_2020.pdf

Dandeker, C. (1990). *Surveillance, Power and Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press. pp 37-66.

Deacon., A, Vincent., J. and Walker., R. (1995). Whose choice, hostels or homes? Policies for single homeless people. *Housing Studies*, 10(3), pp 345-363, DOI: 10.1080/02673039508720825

DeVerteuil, G. (2004). Systematic inquiry into barriers to researcher access: Evidence from a homeless shelter. *The Professional Geographer*, 56(3), pp 372-380.

DeWard, S. and Moe, A . (2010). "Like a Prison!": Homeless Women 's Narratives of Surviving Shelter. *The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare*, 37(1), pp 115 - 135.

Draucker., C, Martsolf., D. and Poole, C. (2009) Developing Distress Protocols for Research on Sensitive Topics. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, 23(5), pp 343–350

Docherty, C., K., Andrews, P. and Lerpiniere, J. (2006). *Designing with care - interior design and residential childcare final report. Project Report. Scottish Institute for Residential Child Care*. Available: <http://strathprints.strath.ac.uk/2404/1/strathprints002404.pdf>. Last accessed 21st August 2016.

Dordick, G. (1996). More Than Refuge: The Social World of a Homeless Shelter. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 24(4), pp 373-404.

Douglas, J. D. (1976). *Investigative social research: Individual and team field research*. Sage.

Durrant, J. (2014). *Fallen on hard times: Re-examining the homeless hostel*. B.A. Thesis. University of Cambridge. Available at: <http://www.scgrg.rgs.org/wp-content/uploads/2009/09/17-Durrant-homeless-hostel.pdf>

Easton, J. (2001). *Clients' Constructions of The Keyworker Relationship in Adult Mental Health: A Collaborative Alliance?* Available: <https://lra.le.ac.uk/bitstream/2381/31317/1/U143790.pdf>. Last accessed 9th November 2015.

Edgar, W. and Meert, H. (2005). Fourth Review of Statistics on Homelessness in Europe. The ETHOS Definition of Homelessness.

Ellemers, N., Sleebos, E., Stam, D. and de Gilder, D. (2013). "Feeling included and valued: how perceived respect affects positive team identity and willingness to invest in the team." *British Journal of Management*, 24(1), pp 21-37.

Ellingson, L (2017). *Embodiment in Qualitative Research*. Oxon: Routledge.

Englander, D. (1998) Poverty and Poor Law Reform in Nineteenth-Century Britain, 1834-1914: From Chadwick to Booth 1834 – 1914. Routledge. New York.

Ennett, S. Bailey, S. and Federman, B. (1999). Social Network Characteristics Associated with Risky Behaviors among Runaway and Homeless Youth. *Journal of Health and Social Behaviour*, 40(1), pp 63-78.

Evans, A (1991). *Alternatives to bed and breakfast*. London: National Housing and Town Planning Council. pp 54 - 57.

Eyrich, K., Pollio, D. and North, C. (2003). An exploration of alienation and replacement theories of social support in homelessness, *Social Work Research*, 27(4), pp 222–231. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/swr/27.4.222>

Farrugia, D. (2011). The symbolic burden of homelessness: Towards a theory of youth homelessness as embodied subjectivity. *Journal of Sociology*, 47(1), pp. 71–87. DOI: 10.1177/1440783310380989.

Fitzpatrick, S., Kemp, P and Klinker, S. (2000). *Single homelessness an overview of research in Britain*. Available: file:///C:/Users/Milli/Downloads/jr073-homelessness-research-britain%20(4).pdf. Last accessed 21st August 2018.

Fitzpatrick, S., Quilgars, D. and Pleace, N. (2011). *Ending youth homelessness: Possibilities, challenges and practical solutions*. Available: <http://www.york.ac.uk/media/chp/documents/2011/EndingYouthHomelessness.pdf>. Last accessed 3rd March 2015.

Fitzpatrick, S., Bramley, G. and Johnsen, S. (2013). Pathways into Multiple Exclusion Homelessness in Seven UK Cities. *Urban Studies*, 50(1), pp 148-168.

Fitzpatrick, S., Pawson, H., Bramley, G., Wilcox, S. and Watts, B. (2015). *The homelessness monitor: England*. Available: https://www.crisis.org.uk/media/237031/the_homelessness_monitor_england_2015.pdf. Last accessed 21 June 2019.

Fitzpatrick, S., Pawson, H., Bramley, G., Young, G., Watts, B. and Wood, J. (2021) The Homelessness Monitor: Wales 2021. London: Crisis

Freeman, R. (2003). Social Distance and Discretionary Rule Enforcement in a Women's Prison. *The Prison Journal*, 83(2), pp 191-205. DOI: 10.1177/0032885503254416.

Foucault, M. (1977). Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison. A. Sheridan (Trans). London. Penguin

Fox, L. (2002). The Meaning of Home: A Chimerical Concept or a Legal Challenge? *Journal of Law and Society*, 29(4), pp 580-610. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6478.00234>

Furlong, A. and Cartmel, F. (2007). *Young People and Social Change*, Open University Press, Maidenhead.

Garside, P., Grimshaw, R. and Ward, F. (1990). *No place like home: the hostels experience*. London: Department of the environment, pp 22 - 50.

Garvey, K. (2016). *The government still think that the Bedroom Tax is fair play*. Available: <http://blog.shelter.org.uk/2016/01/the-government-still-think-that-the-bedroom-tax-is-fair-play/>. Last Accessed: 16th July 2018.

Gasior, S. (2015). "Youth Homelessness: The Impact of Supportive Relationships on Recovery". *Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository*. <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/3233>

Gerlitz, J, Joyce, R, Gadermann, A, Hubley, A, Ma Zhu., S, Stowe. and M, Palepu., A. (2017). Observations from the field: interviewers' experiences interviewing and retaining homeless and vulnerably housed participants in longitudinal health research, *Journal of Social Distress and Homelessness*, 26(2), pp 128-137, DOI: 10.1080/10530789.2017.1349598

Gibbs, G (2007). *Analyzing Qualitative Data*. London: SAGE Publications, pp 38-56.

Glenn, C. and Goodman, L. (2015). Living With and Within the Rules of Domestic Violence Shelters. *Violence Against Women*, 21(12), pp 1481-1506.

Grandey, A., Fisk, G. and Steiner, D. (2005). Must "Service With a Smile" Be Stressful? The Moderating Role of Personal Control for American and French Employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(5), pp 893 – 904. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.90.5.893

Green, N. and Turner, M. (2017). Creating Children's Spaces, Children Co-Creating Place. *Journal of Childhood Studies*, 42(3), pp 27 – 39. DOI: 10.18357/jcs.v42i3.17892

Green, C. (2018). Young children's spatial autonomy in their home environment and a forest setting. *Journal of Pedagogy*, 9(1), pp 65-85. DOI: 10.2478/jped-2018-0004

Greve, J. (1991) *Homelessness in Britain*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Goffman, E. (1957). Alienation from interaction. *Human Relations*, 10, pp 47–60. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001872675701000103>

Goffman, E (1961). *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*. United States: Anchor Books.

Golten, A. (2015). *Unsuitable: People's experiences of temporary accommodation in Wales*. Available: <http://sheltercymru.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Unsuitable-People%E2%80%99s-experiences-of-temporary-accommodation-in-Wales.pdf>. Last accessed 23rd August 2016.

Gov. Wales. (2015). *Housing (Wales) Act 2014*. Available: <http://gov.wales/topics/housing-and-regeneration/legislation/housing-act/?lang=en>. Last accessed 23rd August 2016.

Guadango, R, Muscanell, N. and Pollio, D. (2013). The homeless use Facebook?! Similarities of social network use between college students and homeless young adults. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 29(1), pp 86-89.

Heale, R. and Forbes, D. (2013). Understanding Triangulation in Research. *Evidenced Based Nursing*, 16(4), pp 98.

Heineman, V. (2010). *Relationships Beget Relationships: Why Understanding Attachment Theory is Crucial to Program Design for Homeless Youth*. Available: <http://cahomelessyouth.library.ca.gov/docs/pdf/HYP-Report.pdf>. Last accessed 9th January 2015.

Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*, Transaction Publishers, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Hochschild, A. (1983). *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Hodson, C. (1998). Homeless youth in London: I. Childhood antecedents and psychiatric disorder. *Psychological Medicine*, 28(6), pp 1379-1388.

Hoffman, L. and Coffey, B. (2008). Dignity and indignation: How people experiencing homelessness view services and providers. *The Social Science Journal*, 45(2), pp 207-222.

Homeless Link. (2013). *Preventing homelessness for the next generation*. Available: <http://www.homeless.org.uk/sites/default/files/site-attachments/No%20Excuses%20Report%202013.pdf>. Last accessed 13th December 2014.

Homeless Link. (2014). *Young and Homeless 2014*. Available: <http://www.homeless.org.uk/sites/default/files/site-attachments/201411%20-%20Young%20and%20Homeless%20-%20Full%20Report.pdf>. Last accessed 10th January 2015.

Homeless Link. (2014). *Young and homeless research*. Available: <http://www.homeless.org.uk/facts/our-research/young-and-homeless-research>. Last accessed December 29th, 2014

Homeless Link. (2018). *The Future Hostel. The role of hostels in helping to end homelessness*. Available: https://www.homeless.org.uk/sites/default/files/site-attachments/The%20Future%20Hostel_June%202018.pdf. Last Accessed 4th August 2018

Homeless Link. (2022). *A Basic Introduction to Trauma Informed Care*. [Online]. Homeless Link. Available at: <https://homeless.org.uk/knowledge-hub/a-basic-introduction-to-trauma-informed-care/>. Last Accessed 2 December 2022.

Hoolachan, J. (2015). *An Ethnographic Exploration of the Substance Use of Young People Living in Temporary Homeless Accommodation*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Stirling.

Hoolachan, J. (2016). Ethnography and homelessness research, *International Journal of Housing Policy*, 16(1), pp 31-49, DOI: [10.1080/14616718.2015.1076625](https://doi.org/10.1080/14616718.2015.1076625)

Hopper, E., Bassuk, E. and Olivet, J. (2010). Shelter from the Storm: Trauma-Informed Care in Homelessness Services Settings. *The Open Health Services and Policy Journal*, 3(2), pp 80-100

Hopper, E., Olivet, J and Bassuk, E. (2018). Trauma-Informed Care for Street Involved Youth. In: Kidd, S., Slesnick, N., Frederick, T., Karabanow & Gaetz, S. (Eds). *Mental Health & Addiction Interventions for Youth Experiencing Homelessness*. Canada: Canadian Observatory on Homelessness Press. pp.45-58.

Hughes J., Clark S. and Wood W. (2010). Youth Homelessness: The Relationships among Mental Health, Hope, and Service Satisfaction. *Journal of the Canadian Academy Child Adolescence Psychiatry*, 19(4), pp 274–283.

Hutson, S. and Liddiard, M. (1990). Youth Homelessness in Wales. In: Cross, M. and Wallace, C. *Youth in Transition: The Sociology of Youth and Youth Policy*. Hampshire: The Falmer Press. pp 164 – 181.

Hutson, S. and Liddiard, M. (1994). Youth Homelessness: The Construction of a Social Issue. London: Macmillan.

Hutson, S. and Stirling, T. (2000). Accessing Social Housing. In R. Smith, T. Stirling and P Williams (eds) *Housing in Wales: the policy agenda in an era of devolution*. Coventry. pp 141-158.

Hwang, S. (2001). Homelessness and health, *CMAJ*. 164(2), pp 229 – 233.

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri)

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 10 pt

Hwang, S, Maritt, K., Chiu, S, Tolomiczenko, G, Kiss, A, Cowan, L. and Levinson, W. (2009). Multidimensional Social Support and the Health of Homeless Individuals. *Journal of Urban Health*, 86(5), pp 791–803.

Idowu, O (2016). Criticisms, Constraints and Constructions of Case Study Research Strategy. *Asian Journal of Business and Management*, (4)5, pp 184 – 188.

Iveson, M. and Cornish, F. (2016). Re-building bridges: homeless people's views on the role of vocational and educational activities in their everyday lives. *s. Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 26(3), pp 253-267.

Jackson, E. (2015). *Young Homeless People and Urban Space: Fixed in Mobility*. Routledge.

Jackson., J, Tyler., T, Bradford., B, Taylor. and D, Shiner, M. (2010). Legitimacy and procedural justice in prisons. *Prison Service Journal*, (191), pp. 4-10.

Johnsen, S, Cloke, P. and May, J. (2005). 'Day centres for homeless people: Spaces of care or fear?', *Social and Cultural Geography*, (6)6, pp 787-811.

Johnsen, S, Fitzpatrick, S. and Watts, B. (2018), 'Homelessness and social control: a typology' *Housing Studies*, pp. 1-21. DOI: 10.1080/02673037.2017.1421912

Johnsen, K., Whitbeck, L. and Hoyt, D. (2005). Predictors of social network composition among homeless and runaway adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*, 28(2), pp 231-248.

Johnstone, M., Parsell,C., Jetten, J., Dingle, G. and Walter., Z. (2016). Breaking the cycle of homelessness: Housing stability and social support as predictors of long-term well-being, *Housing Studies*, 31(4), pp 410-426. DOI: 10.1080/02673037.2015.1092504.

Joniak, E. (2005). Exclusionary Practices and the Delegitimization of Client Voice How Staff Create, Sustain, and Escalate Conflict in a Drop-In Centre for Street Kids. *American Behavioural Scientist*, 48(8), pp 961-988.

Joseph Rowntree Foundation. (1995). *Housing vulnerable single homeless people*. Available: <http://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/files/jrf/h153.pdf>. Last accessed 1st May 2015.

Karabanow, J. (1999). When Caring Is Not Enough: Emotional Labor and Youth Shelter Workers. *Social Service Review*, 73(3), pp 340-357.

Katuna, B. and Glasberg, D. (2014). Rules vs. Rights? Social Control, Dignity, and the Right to Housing in the Shelter System. *Societies Without Borders*, 9(1), pp 25-47.

Kealy, L. (1998). *Young people and homelessness in Wales*. Available:

http://www.youthworkwales.org.uk/creo_files/upload/files/Homelessness.pdf. Last accessed 23rd August 2016.

Keats, H. (2012). Psychologically Informed Services for Homeless People: Good Practice Guide.

Kemp, P., Lynch, E. and Mackay D. (2001). *'Structural trends and homelessness: a quantitative analysis'*, New York, Praeger Publishers.

Kenway, P. and Palmer, G. (2003). *How Many, How Much*, Crisis, New Policy Institute

Kidd, S. (2007). Youth Homelessness and Social Stigma. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 36(3), pp 291 - 299.

Kisley, S., Parker, J., Campell, L., Karabanow, J., Hughes, J. and Gahagan, J. (2008). Health impacts of supportive housing for homeless youth: A pilot study. *Public Health*, 122(10), pp 1089–1092.

Koller, S., Raffaelli, M. and Carlo, G. (2012). Conducting research about sensitive subjects: The case of homeless youth. *Universitas Psychologica*, 11(1), pp 55-65.

Krohn, M. and Massey, J. (1980). Social Control and Delinquent Behavior: An Examination of the Elements of the Social Bond. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 21(4), pp 529–544.

Krusenvik, L. (2016). Using Case Studies as a Scientific Method: Advantages and Disadvantages. <http://www.diva-portal.se/smash/get/diva2:1054643/FULLTEXT01.pdf>. Last Accessed 7 September 2019

Kuester, L., Freestone, M., Seewald, K., Rathbone, R and Bhui, K. (2022). Evaluation of Psychologically Informed Planned Environments. [Online]. Ministry of Justice. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/ministry-of-justice/about/research>. Last Accessed 25 November 2022.

Lawrence, P. (2016). The Vagrancy Act (1824) and the Persistence of Pre-Emptive Policing in England since 1750. *British Journal of Criminology*, 57(3), pp – 513 – 531. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azw008>

Ledain, S. (2015). Exploring the role of social identity in building engaging workplaces: a systematic review.

Lemos, G. and Durkacz, S. (2002). *Dreams Deferred*. Available: <http://www.lemosandcrane.co.uk/supportactionnet/resources/LC%20-%20Dreams%20deferred.pdf>. Last accessed 8th August 2016.

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 10 pt

Lignon, M. (2021). Criminalising Rough Sleeping and Begging Part 2. Centre for Crime and Justice Studies. Available at: <https://www.crimeandjustice.org.uk/resources/criminalising-rough-sleeping-and-begging-part-2>. Last Accessed 13 February 2022

Llamau. (2015). *140,063 young people in Wales experienced homelessness last year*. Available: <http://www.llamau.org.uk/news/i/805/>. Last accessed 23rd August 2016.

Llamau. (2015). Study of the Experiences of Young Homeless People (SEYHoPe): Key findings & implications. Cardiff: Llamau

Llamau. (2018). *What is Youth Homelessness?*. Available: <https://www.llamau.org.uk/what-is-youth-homelessness>. Last accessed 16th July 2018.

Local Government Ombudsman. (2013). *No place like home: Councils' use of unsuitable bed & breakfast accommodation for homeless families and young people*.

Mackie, P. (2015). Homelessness Prevention and the Welsh Legal Duty: Lessons for International Policies. *Housing Studies*, 30(1), pp 40-59.

Maguire, M. and Delahunt, B. (2017) Doing a Thematic Analysis: A Practical, Step-by-Step Guide for Learning and Teaching Scholars. *Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 9(3). DOI: <http://ojs.aishe.org/index.php/aishe-j/article/view/3354>

Maitland, T. (2015). *How can we promote positive social networks in hostels?* Available: <http://www.homeless.org.uk/connect/blogs/2015/aug/27/how-can-we-promote-positive-social-networks-in-hostels>. Last accessed 24th August 2016.

Maitra, D. (2019). Prisons, the 'Problem of Order' and Maintaining Control within the Penal System. *Worldwide Journal of Multi-disciplinary Studies*, 1(5), pp 7-12.

Mallet, S. (2004). Understanding Home: A Critical Review of the Literature. *The Sociological Review*, 52(1), pp 62-89. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.2004.00442.x>

Marcus, A. (2003). Shelterization Revisited: Some Methodological Dangers of Institutional Studies of the Homeless. *Human Organization*, 62(2), pp 134-142.

Martjin, C. and Sharpe, L. (2005). Pathways to youth homelessness. *Social Science and Medicine*, 62(1), pp 1 - 12.

May, J, Cloke, P. and Johnsen, S. (2006). Shelter at the margins: New Labour and the changing state of emergency accommodation for single homeless people in Britain. *Policy & Politics*, 34(4), pp 711-729. DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.1332/030557306778553150>.

McCarthy, L. (2013) Homelessness and identity: a critical review of the literature and theory. *People, place and policy online*, 7(1), pp 46-58.

McQueen, R. and Knussen, C. (2002). *Research Methods for Social Science: A Practical Introduction*. Prentice Hall, US

Mead, G.H. (1934). *Mind, self and society: From the standpoint of a social behaviorist*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press

Meade, M. and Slesnick, N. (2002). Ethical Considerations for Research and Treatment with Runaway and Homeless Adolescents. *The Journal of Psychology*, 136(4), pp 449-463.

Mental Health Foundation. (2006). *Making The Link Between Mental Health and Youth Homelessness*. Available: http://www.mentalhealth.org.uk/content/assets/PDF/publications/making_the_link.pdf?view=Standard. Last accessed 4th February 2015 .

Merriam, S. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation*. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

McCarthy, B. and Hagan, J. (1992). "Mean Streets: The Theoretical Significance of Situational Delinquency Among Homeless Youths." *American Journal of Sociology*, 98(3), pp. 597-627

McGrath L. and Pistrang, N. (2007). Policeman or Friend? Dilemmas in Working with Homeless Young People in the United Kingdom. *Journal of Social Issues*, 63(3), pp 589-606.

McKellar, A. and Kendrick, A. (2013). Key working and the quality of relationships in secure accommodation. *Journal of Residential Child Care*, 12 (1), pp 46-57.

Miles, M. (1979). Qualitative data as an attractive nuisance: The problem of analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24(4), pp 590-601.

Milbourne, P, Hughes, R. and Hartwell, S. (2006). *Homelessness in rural wales*. Available: <http://www.walesruralobservatory.org.uk/sites/default/files/Rural%20Homelessness%20Report.pdf>. Last accessed 9th November 2015.

Mitchell, F. (2012). *Using the social work relationship to promote recovery for adolescents who have experienced abuse and neglect*. Available: <http://using-the-social-work-model-to-promote-recovery-for-adolescents-who-have-experienced-abuse-and->

neglect.pdf. Last accessed 24th August 2016.

Monfort, J. (2009). *Family life: the significance of family to homeless young people*. Available: http://centrepoint.org.uk/media/11651/long_version_final.pdf. Last accessed 24th April 2015.

Moore, J. (2007). Polarity or Integration? Towards a Fuller Understanding of Home and Homelessness. *Journal of Architectural and Planning Research*, 24(2), pp 143-159.

Muckleston, D. (2019). *Using thematic analysis, explore, through the viewpoint of homeless sector workers, whether the homeless population are receiving adequate help/* (Dissertation). Manchester Metropolitan University. Manchester.

Murphy, K., O'Shea, E. and Cooney, A. (2007). Quality of life for older people living in long-stay settings in Ireland. *Journal of Clinical Nursing*, 16(11), pp 2167–2177. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2702.2006.01865>.

Mutkins, E., Brown, R and Thorsteinsson, E. (2011). *Stress, depression, workplace and social supports and burnout in intellectual disability support staff*. *Journal of Disability Research*. 55(5), pp.500-510. [Online]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2788.2011.01406.x>, Last Accessed 2 December 2022.

Nassor, A. and Brugger, A. (2000). *Centrepoint Factsheet Series 1999/2000*. London: Centrepoint

National Assembly for Wales (2018). *The Welsh Government's Supporting People Programme*. <https://business.senedd.wales/documents/s75680/Committee%20Report%20-%20The%20Welsh%20Governments%20Supporting%20People%20Programme%20May%202018.pdf>. Last Accessed 23rd January 2022.

Neale, J. (1995). *The Role of The Supported Hostel Accommodation In Meeting The Needs Of Homeless People*. Doctor of Philosophy. University of York. Available at: <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/14343248.pdf>. Last Accessed 8th August 2018.

Neale, J. (1997). Theorising Homelessness. In: Burrows, R., Pleace, N. and Quilgars, D *Homelessness and Social Policy*. Oxon: Routledge, pp 36 - 48.

Neale, J and Stevenson, C. (2013). A qualitative exploration of spatial needs of homeless drug users living in hostels and night shelters. *Social Policy and Society*, 12(4), pp 533-546. DOI: 10.1017/S1474746413000195

Neale, J. and Stevenson, C. (2015). Social and recovery capital amongst homeless hostel residents who use drugs and alcohol. *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 26(5), pp 475-

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 10 pt

483.

Newman, C. (2014). To Punish or Protect: The New Poor Law and the English Workhouse. *International Journal of History and Archeology*, 18, pp 122-145.

Nye, J. (1990). Soft Power. *Foreign Policy*, 80, pp 153–171. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/1148580>

Nye, J. (2009). Get Smart: Combining Hard and Soft Power. *Foreign Affairs*, 88(4), pp 160–163.

Office of National Statistics. (2011). *Population Estimates for The United Kingdom, March*. Available: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/bulletins/2011censuspopulationestimatesfortheunitedkingdom/2012-12-17>. Last Accessed: 4th September 2018.

O'Grady, B and Gaetz, S. (2009). *Street Survival: A Gendered Analysis of Youth Homelessness in Toronto*. Available: <https://homelesshub.ca/sites/default/files/3.4%20OGrady%20and%20Gaetz%20-%20Street%20Survival.pdf>. Last accessed 25th January 2022.

O'Leary, P., Tsui, M. and Ruch, G. (2013). The Boundaries of the Social Work Relationship Revisited: Towards a Connected, Inclusive and Dynamic Conceptualisation. *British Journal of Social Work*, 43, pp 135-153.

Olivet, J., McGraw, S., Grandin, M. and Bassuk, E. (2010). Staffing challenges and strategies for organizations serving individuals who have experienced chronic homelessness. *The Journal of Behavioral Health Services and Research*, 37(2), pp 226-238.

Oliver, V. and Cheff, R. (2012). The Social Network Homeless Young Women, Social Capital, and the Health Implications of Belonging Outside the Nuclear Family. *Youth and Society*, 46(5), pp 642-662.

Pable, J (2013). Case Study Methodology and Homelessness Research, 11(7), pp 70 – 74.

Pasupuleti, S., Allen, R., Lambert, E and Tolar, T. (2009). The Impact of Work Stressors on the Life Satisfaction of Social Service Workers: A Preliminary Study. *Administration in Social Work*. 33(1), pp.319-339. [Online]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03643100902988141>. Last Accessed 2 December 2022.

Patton, M (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods*. India: SAGE Publications.

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 10 pt

Peled, E., Spiro, S. and Dekel, R. (2005). My Home is Not My Castle: Follow-Up of Residents of Shelters for Homeless Youth. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 22(3), pp 257–279.

Peters, L., Samuel, V. and Hobson, C. (2021). Shining a light on the experiences of staff working with young homeless people: A grounded theory study. *Children and Youth Services Review*. 121. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2020.105843>

Phipps, c. (2016). "Living here has changed me": Resident and staff perceptions of Psychologically Informed Environments for homeless people. D.Clin.Psy. Thesis. University College London. London.

Quilgars, D, Johnsen, S. and Pleace, N. (2008). *Youth homelessness in the UK A decade of progress?* Available: <http://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/files/jrf/2220-homelessness-young-people.pdf>. Last Accessed: 1st March 2015.

Quilgars, D. (2010). *Youth Homelessness*. Available: <http://www.feantsaresearch.all2all.org/IMG/pdf/ch09.pdf>. Last Accessed 3rd February 2015

Ravalier, J. (2019). Psycho-Social Working Conditions and Stress in UK Social Workers. The British Journal of Social Work. 49(2), pp.371-390. [Online]. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjsw/bcy023>. Last Accessed 2 December 2022.

Raven, B. (2008). The Bases of Power and the Power/Interaction Model of Interpersonal Influence. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 8(1), pp 1-22.

Ravenhill, M. (2003). 'The Culture of Homelessness: An ethnographic study'. P.h.D Thesis, London School of Economics, London

Reeves, C (2016) Everyday life in UK Probation Approved Premises for sex offenders. In: *Experiencing Imprisonment: Research on the experience of living and working in carceral institutions*. Routledge Frontiers of Criminal Justice. Routledge, London, pp 451-471.

Reeves, C. (2016). The Meaning of Place and Space in a Probation Approved Premises. *The Howard Journal of Crime and Justice*. 55(1-2), pp 151-167. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/hojo.12162>

Reis, D. and Puente-Palacios, K. (2018). "Team effectiveness: the predictive role of team identity", *RAUSP Management Journal*, 54(2), pp. 141-153. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1108/RAUSP-07-2018-0046>

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), Bold, (Asian) Chinese (China)

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 10 pt

Reppond, H. and Bullock, H. (2019). Reclaiming “good motherhood”: US mothers’ critical resistance in family homeless shelters. *Feminism and Psychology*, (30)1, pp 100-120.
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959353519870220>

Rice, E. and Barman-Adhikari, A. (2014). Internet and Social Media Use as a Resource Among Homeless Youth. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 19. pp 232–247.

Riggs, E. H. and Coyle, A. (2002). Young people’s accounts of homelessness: A case study analysis of psychological well-being and identity. *Counselling Psychology Review*, 17(3), pp 5- 15.

Robinson. P. (2008). *Working with Young Homeless People*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers. pp 11-48.

Robinson, J. (2003). Youth Homelessness and Social Exclusion: A Methods from Margin Approach, PhD Thesis, University of Waterloo, Ontario

Robson, B. (2015). *What the rest of Britain could learn from the way Wales is tackling homelessness*. Available: <https://www.jrf.org.uk/blog/what-rest-britain-could-learn-way-wales-tackling-homelessness>. Last accessed 23rd August 2016.

Roos, V. and Du Toit, F. (2014). Perceptions of effective relationships in an institutional care setting for older people. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 40(1), pp 1-9

Rose, A. and Davies, B. (2014). *The Lives of Hidden Households in Unsupported Temporary Accommodation in England*. Available at: https://www.ippr.org/files/publications/pdf/not-home_Dec2014.pdf. Last Accessed: 10 July 2018

Ruspini, E. (2002). *An Introduction to Longitudinal Research*. London. Routledge, pp 1-3.

Rutledge, K. (2015). Families and the Build Environment. Their Perceptions and Needs When Experiencing Homelessness. *Design Resources for Homelessness*. Available at: http://designresourcesforhomelessness.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Spotlight_families-1.pdf. Last Accessed: 26 December 2021

Saunders, B. (1986). *Homeless Young People in Britain*. London: Bedford Square Press, pp 31 - 64.

Schiff, J. and Lane, A. (2019). *Community Mental Health Journal*, 55(3), pp 454-462.
DOI: 10.1007/s10597-018-00364-7.

Schwan, K., French, D., Gaetz, S., Ward, A., Akerman, J. and Redman, M. (2018). Preventing Youth Homelessness: An International Review of Evidence. *Wales Centre for Public Policy*

Shah, N., Parker, A. and Waldstrom, C. (2016). Examining the Overlap: Individual Performance Benefits of Multiplex Relationships. *Management Communication Quarterly*, pp 1 - 34.

Shelter. (2012). *Homelessness figures up 18%*. Available: [Shelter.org.uk/news/previous_years/2012/march_2012/homelessness_up_18](https://shelter.org.uk/news/previous_years/2012/march_2012/homelessness_up_18). Last accessed 16th July 2018.

Shelter. (2015). *A brand-new start: homelessness and the Housing (Wales) Act*. Available: <https://sheltercymru.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/A-brand-new-start-homelessness-and-the-Housing-Wales-Act.pdf>. Last Accessed: 2nd February 2021.

Shelter. (2017). *More than 300,000 people in Britain homeless today*. Available: https://england.shelter.org.uk/media/press_releases/articles/more_than_300,000_people_in_britain_homeless_today. Last Accessed: 16th July 2018.

Shelter. (2018) *Local Connection*. Available: https://england.shelter.org.uk/housing_advice/homelessness/local_connection. Last Accessed: 13 February 2022

Shelter. (2020). *Intentional Homelessness*. Available: <https://sheltercymru.org.uk/get-advice/homelessness/help-from-the-council/what-will-the-council-check/intentional-homelessness/>. Last Accessed: 4th January 2022

Skoog, G. (2007). *Changing Rules - Developing Institutions A Synthesis of Findings*.

Smith, J. (2005). Housing, Homelessness, and Mental Health in Great Britain. *International Journal of Mental Health*, 34(2), pp 22-46.

Smith, J, Gilford, S. and O'Sullivan, G. (1998). *The Family Background of Young Homeless People*. UK: Family Policy Studies Centre, pp 10-15.

Snow, D. and Anderson, L. (1991). Researching the Homeless. In: Feagin, J, Orum, A, Sjoberg, G *A Case for the Case Study*. United States: The University of North Carolina Press, pp 148 - 173.

Somerville, P. (1992). Homelessness and Meaning of Home: Rooflessness and Rootlessness? *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 16(4), pp 529 – 539.

Sparks, R., Bottoms, A. and Hay, W. (1996). *Prisons and the Problem of Order*. Oxford University Press. Oxford

Stark, L. (1994). The Shelter as a Total Institution. *The American Behavioural Scientist*, 37(4), pp 553

Stevenson, C. (2014). A qualitative exploration of relations and interactions between people who are homeless and use drugs and staff in homeless hostel accommodation. *Journal of Substance Use*, 19(1), pp 134–140.

Stone, M. (2010). *Homeless not Voiceless. Learning from young people with experiences of homelessness in the Northeast*. Barnardos.
http://www.barnardos.org.uk/what_we_do/who_we_are/in_your_region/northeast/north_east_about/north_east_research.htm

Tabner, K. (2013). *Beyond Homelessness Final Report 2013. Developing Positive Social Networks: Research into the Application and Effects of a Networks Approach in Tackling Homelessness*. Available at: https://lx.iriss.org.uk/sites/default/files/resources/beyond-homelessness-final-report-2013_low-res.pdf. Last Accessed: 26 December 2021

Tankebe, J. (2018). In their own eyes: an empirical examination of police self-legitimacy. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, 43, pp 99–116. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01924036.2018.1487870>

Tavecchio, L., Thomeer, L. and Meeus, W. (1999). Attachment, social network and homelessness in young people. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 27(1), pp 247–262.

The Big Issue. (2022). *Peers vote to scrap the Vagrancy Act in controversial government bill*. Available: <https://www.bigissue.com/news/housing/peers-vote-to-scrap-the-vagrancy-act-in-controversial-government-bill/>. Last Accessed: 6th February 2022

Tessier, S. (2012) From Field Notes, to Transcripts, to Tape Recordings: Evolution or Combination? *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*, 11(4), pp 446 – 461.

[Turley, C., Payne, C and Webster, S. \(2013\). Enabling features of psychologically informed planned environments. \[Online\]. British Library. Last Updated: NOMS. Available at: https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/enabling-features-of-psychologically-informed-planned-environment. Last Accessed 2 December 2022.](https://www.bl.uk/collection-items/enabling-features-of-psychologically-informed-planned-environment)

Tyler, T. (2006). Psychological perspectives on legitimacy and legitimation. *Annual Review Psychology*, 57(1), pp 375–400.

Utting, D. (2009). *Contemporary Social Evils*. Bristol: The Policy Press, pp 64 - 73.

Field Code Changed

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 12 pt, Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 10 pt

- Van Der Ploeg, J. and Scholte, E. (1997). *Homeless youth*. London: Sage, pp 1-12.
- VonHoltz L., Frasso R., Golinkoff J., Lozano A., Hanlon A. and Dowshen, N. (2018). Internet and Social Media Access Among Youth Experiencing Homelessness: Mixed-Methods Study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 20(5). DOI: 10.2196/jmir.9306.
- Wallich. (2005). *The Stigma of Rural Homelessness in Wales*. Available: <http://www.drugsandhousing.co.uk/The%20Stigma%20of%20Rural%20Homelessness%20in%20Wales.pdf>. Last Accessed: 9th February 2015.
- Wardhaugh, J (2000). *Sub City: Young People, Homelessness and Crime*. London: Routledge.
- Warnes, A., Crane, M. and Coward, S. (2013). Factors that Influence the Outcomes of Single Homeless People's Rehousing. *Housing Studies*, 28(5), PP 782-798, DOI: 10.1080/02673037.2013.760032
- Wenzel, S, Holloway, I, Golinelli, D, Ewing, B, Bowman, R. and Tucker, J. (2012). Social Networks of Homeless Youth in Emerging Adulthood. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 41(5), pp 561-571.
- Welsh Government. (2015). *The Supporting People Programme in Wales – Factsheet*. Available: <https://gov.wales/topics/housing-and-regeneration/services-and-support/supporting-people/publications/spfactsheet/?lang=en>. Last Accessed: 23rd July 2018
- Welsh Government. (2017). *Extra £10m to support Welsh Government mission to end youth homelessness*. Available: <http://gov.wales/newsroom/firstminister/2017/171217-extra-10-million-to-support-wg-mission-to-end-youth-homelessness/?lang=en>. Last Accessed: 6th April 2018.
- Welsh Government. (2018). *New homelessness legislation*. Available: <https://gov.wales/topics/housing-and-regeneration/services-and-support/homelessness/new-homelessness-legislation/?lang=en>. Last Accessed: 16th July 2018.
- Welsh Government. (2018) *Supporting People*. Available: <https://gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2019-03/supporting-people-programme-practice-guidance-2018.pdf>. Last Accessed 3rd January 2022
- Welsh Government. (2021). *Renting Homes Wales*. Available: <https://gov.wales/housing-law-changing-renting-homes>. Last Accessed: 20 January 2022.

Wiles, R. and Boddy, J. (2013). Introduction to the Special Issue: Research Ethics in Challenging Contexts. *Methodological Innovations Online*, 8(2), pp. 1–5.
DOI: 10.4256/mio.2013.009.

Williams, J. (1996). Geography Of the Homeless Shelter: Staff Surveillance And Resident Resistance. *Urban Anthropology and Studies of Cultural Systems and World Economic Development*, 25(1), pp 75-113.

Williams, M. (2010). Can we measure homelessness? A critical evaluation of ‘Capture–Recapture’. *Methodological Innovations Online*, 5(2), pp 49 - 52.

Wilson, E. (2008). Hard Power, Soft Power, Smart Power. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 616, pp 110–124.

Wooldredge, J. and Steiner, B. (2016). The Exercise of Power in Prison Organizations and Implications for Legitimacy. *The Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology*, 106(1), pp 125 - 165. Last Accessed: 8th August 2018

Yin, R (1989). *Case Study Research*. 2nd ed. USA: Sage Publications, pp 3 - 27.

Yin, R (2009). *Case study research: design and methods*. India: SAGE Publications.

Zuffrey, C. (2009) Making Gender Visible. Social Work Responses to Homelessness: *Journal of Women and Social Work*, 24(4) pp 382-393.

Appendix 1

Youth Homelessness

Participant information sheet

Introduction

My name is Natalie Roberts, and I am a Postgraduate student at Bangor University, I am conducting a study on the effects of homelessness on young people, and you are being invited to take part. Before you decide whether or not to take part it is important to understand what taking part will involve. Please take the time to read the following information prior to signing the consent forms.

What is the purpose of this study?

The purpose of this study is to discover the effects of homelessness on young people, including how it effects their day to day lives and how it effects things such as employment, relationships, and education.

Do I have to take part?

Participation is completely voluntary, and it is up to you to decide whether or not to take part. The decision will not affect any services or support that you receive. If you do choose to take part you will be required to complete two consent forms before the study begins, one relating to your participation and one which requests permission to tape record the interview. If you choose to not take part in this study or choose to withdraw at any time, this **will in no way affect the support you receive in (hostel name)**

What will happen if I decide to take part?

You will be invited to take part in a private and confidential interview to discuss things such as your experiences, your background, employment, experiences with support services, and relationships. You do not have to answer any questions you are not comfortable with and can end the interview at any time. I will be conducting the interviews within (hostel name) at a time and day that is convenient for you. To compensate you for your time, you will be provided with a £5 gift card.

Will taking part in this study be kept confidential?

Yes. Your contact details will be stored on a **confidential** database. The information you share will be treated **in confidence**. You **will not** be identified in any reports or

publications. However, if you share information that is suggestive of risk to yourself or others, this will need to be shared with staff.

What will happen if I don't want to carry on with the study?

You are free to withdraw from the study at any time without giving a reason. If you decide to withdraw your decision will not affect any support or services that you receive. You will still receive the £5 gift card even if you withdraw from participation.

Who is organizing and funding the research?

The study is being organized by myself, Natalie Roberts, in collaboration with Bangor University.

What happens if I have any concerns about this project?

If you have any concerns about any aspect of this study please contact, Julia Wardhaugh, Senior Lecturer in Criminology and Criminal Justice. Her telephone number is (withdrawn)

Contact for further information:

If you would like further information, please contact either myself, Natalie Roberts by email ([withdrawn](#)) or you can contact Bangor University on the telephone number above.

Next steps:

If you decide that you would like to take part, please complete the enclosed consent forms.

Thank you for taking time to read this information.

Appendix 2

CONSENT FORM

Please tick the boxes that apply to you.

I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet for this study ☐

I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time without giving a reason ☐

I understand that my contact details will be stored on a **confidential database** ☐

I give my consent to participate in this study ☐

Name: _____

Address: _____

Post code: _____

Telephone number: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Appendix 3

PARTICIPANT CONSENT TO RECORD RESEARCH INTERVIEW

To be completed prior to interview.

Please tick the boxes that apply to you.

I agree for this research interview to be recorded and for the recording to be used for the purposes that have been explained to me.

☐

I understand that all the information I provide will be treated as strictly confidential.

☐

Name: _____

Signature: _____

Date: _____

Interviewer signature: _____

Appendix 4
Themes

Theme

<u>Pathways to homelessness/childhood/other</u>	Formatted: Font: 16 pt
<u>Social relationships outside of homelessness</u>	Formatted: Centered
<u>Barriers created by hostel living/homelessness</u>	Formatted: Font: 16 pt
<u>Care/soft power/shared power methods</u>	Formatted: Centered
<u>Control/hard power</u>	Formatted: Font: 16 pt
<u>Staff challenges</u>	Formatted: Centered
<u>Staff - other</u>	Formatted: Font: 16 pt
	Formatted: Centered
	Formatted: Font: 16 pt
	Formatted: Centered
	Formatted: Font: 16 pt
	Formatted: Centered
	Formatted: Font: 16 pt
	Formatted: Centered

Coding frame

No:	Code
1	Attitude towards other residents
2	Background
3	Balancing multiple roles
4	Barriers to staff-resident relationship development
5	Barriers to maintaining outside social relationships
6	Becoming homeless
7	Bullying and hierarchy
8	Changing dynamics
9	Childhood
10	Communication
11	Communal areas post-changes
12	Communal areas pre-changes
13	Community
14	Comparison to pre-changes
15	Conflict
16	Contribution
17	Coping
18	Expressing frustration - changes/rules
19	Feeling heard
20	Flexible rule enforcement
21	Formal interactions
22	Funding cuts/impact on residents
23	Funding cuts/impact on staff
24	High workload
25	Hostel life - general
26	House meetings - post changes
27	House meetings pre-changes
28	Maintaining identity
29	Maintaining identity - barriers
30	Informal interactions
31	Justification of rule violation
32	Legitimacy/self-legitimacy
33	Low staff availability - residents
34	Low staff availability - staff
35	Mental health issues
36	New staff

Formatted Table

37	Negative interactions
38	Office space - positive
39	Office space - negative
40	Over-attachment
41	Over-worked
42	Physical safety
43	Poor transport
44	Positive interactions
45	Prison reference
46	Privacy - maintaining
47	Privacy - intrusion
48	Remoteness
49	Relationship construction
50	Relationships with outside services
51	Residents with complex needs
52	Resistance
53	Respect and trust - development and maintenance
54	Rigid rule application
55	Rule adherence - post-changes
56	Rule adherence - pre-changes
57	Rule perception - post-changes
58	Rule perception - pre-changes
59	Rules - post-changes
60	Rules - pre-changes
61	Sanctions
62	Self-regulation
63	Sense of belonging
64	Shared decision making
65	Shared power
66	Social activities
67	Social activities - enforced
68	Social media
69	Social relationships between residents post-changes
70	Social relationships between residents pre-changes
71	Social relationship with family
72	Social relationships with friends
73	Social relationship with management pre-changes
74	Social relationship with management post-changes
75	Social relationships with staff post-changes
76	Social relationships with staff pre-changes
77	Spatial regulation

78	<u>Staff attitude to role</u>
79	<u>Staff influence on residents</u>
80	<u>Staff interactions with each other</u>
81	<u>Staff interactions with management</u>
82	<u>Staff training</u>
83	<u>Staffing issues</u>
84	<u>Stories and experiences</u>
85	<u>Substance abuse/use - pre-homelessness</u>
86	<u>Substance abuse/use - during homelessness</u>
87	<u>Surveillance - formal</u>
88	<u>Surveillance - informal</u>
89	<u>Team culture</u>
90	<u>Team identity</u>
91	<u>Team support</u>
92	<u>Teamwork</u>
93	<u>Voice at the table</u>
94	<u>Well-being</u>

Formatted: Font: (Default) +Body (Calibri), 14 pt, Bold