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ABSTRACT

The thesis describes an investigation into the influence of statutory funding on a voluntary service agency, using an approach not previously found in the literature. Over three years an in-depth case study was undertaken of a parent-led organization established on the basis of a range of short-term statutory funding, intended to provide a variety of services to people with a mental handicap and their families. In the exploration of the influence of statutory funding on organizational structure and process several methods of data collection were used i.e. documentary evidence; observation; informal discussions; interviews with service users and providers. The thesis considers both actual and potential statutory funding sources, since the search for long-term funding proved at least as influential upon the organization as the sources of short-term statutory funding already obtained. The opportunity to compare over time two major sources of short-term statutory funding revealed differences in influence on the organization not shown in previous studies. Overall, different dimensions of organizational structure were influenced by statutory funding in complex and inconsistent ways, contrary to the simple, generalized picture often presented in the literature; relatively few formal constraints were exercised by the sources of short-term statutory funding. Consideration of process in terms of planning, service delivery and monitoring showed some formal constraints were applied to service delivery by the sources of statutory funding obtained, while the great freedom given regarding planning and programme monitoring had long-term repercussions on service delivery. The thesis permits a systematic exploration of the ways in which seeking and obtaining statutory funding limited the organization's independence regarding decision-making on structure and process. The claim that the low level of accountability required by statutory funders safeguards voluntary agency independence was not substantiated.
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CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

The thesis presented describes an investigation into the influence of statutory funding on the organizational structure and process of a voluntary sector service delivery organization created on the basis of short-term funding from statutory sources. The thesis demonstrates the complex and inconsistent way in which the formal constraints applied by sources of statutory funding influenced different dimensions of organizational structure, while formal constraints limited the process of implementation/service delivery to a greater extent than the processes of planning and monitoring. Different sources of short-term statutory funding differed in certain ways in their effects on structure and process. The thesis also shows the need to examine the influence of the considerable freedom which may be permitted to a voluntary organization by its sources of statutory funding. The importance of studying the influence on the voluntary organization of the search for continuation funding is also demonstrated, given the major repercussions for structure and process of the pursuit of potential sources of long-term statutory funding, to replace the existing sources of short-term statutory funding.

The nature of the statutory-voluntary relationship and the effects on voluntary agencies of seeking and acquiring statutory funding are issues of long-standing which have achieved increased prominence over the last decade. There are considerable problems in defining the characteristics of voluntary organizations, and it is not proposed to examine these here. Brenton (1985a) has described the difficulties of arriving at a totally satisfactory definition of voluntary organizations in the face of present-day realities. She offers as criteria:-

"...a formal organization, constitutionally separate from government, self­
governing, non-profit-distributing...and of public benefit." (Brenton, 1985a p.9).

However, stressing that the 'self-governing' requirement is essential, she observes that this feature should be a matter of watchful anxiety, given the extent of financial dependence on government among many voluntary organizations which she documents in her study.

In the nine years since the Charles Handy Working Party for Improving Effectiveness in Voluntary Organizations (1981) there have been significant developments in the statutory funding of voluntary organization, shaped at
national level by Government policies on employment, urban renewal, 'care in the community', local authority finance, and expanding the role of the voluntary services. Their impact was not foreseen in the Handy Report, the recommendations of which were based on consideration of a range of issues excluding the relationships of voluntary organizations with their funding sources.

During the 1980s, in Britain, there were many expressions of concern and arguments on the need for caution with regard to the short-term statutory funding of voluntary organizations by such agencies as the Manpower Services Commission (MSC) and the Urban Aid Programme. The reservations voiced often echoed those already expressed by commentators on the statutory funding of the voluntary sector in general, in both Britain and North America. However, as the literature survey in Chapter 2 shows, there are also major disagreements among observers as to the effects of statutory funding on the voluntary organizations seeking and obtaining it. In 1985, when the research commenced on which this thesis is based, the implications of the availability of short-term statutory funding for the new service delivery organizations created thereby remained to be fully explored.

A substantial investigation into the effects of the receipt of government grant-aid on voluntary organizations was undertaken for the Policy Studies Institute (Leat et al., 1986). Some general conclusions were drawn from a survey of 144 organizations, concerning the effects of such statutory funding on the income obtained from non-statutory sources, the employment of paid staff, the involvement of volunteers, the development of other projects and the independence of recipient organizations. The authors emphasized their inability to do justice to the differences between various sources and forms of statutory funding and their effects on different types of organizations over varying periods of time.

The Beech House Project\(^1\) offered an opportunity not available to large-scale surveys such as that outlined above, i.e. a long-term intensive study of a project created on the strength of short-term statutory funding and still dependent on a range of sources of such funding.

---

\(^1\)Beech House' is a pseudonym and is not intended to refer to any voluntary sector service delivery organization of that name.
The Beech House Project was established in mid-1983 by a local parent-run society in the field of mental handicap. The aim was to create a service delivery organization to support families caring at home for a relative with a mental handicap. The services first provided by the paid staff were a holiday playscheme; information/welfare rights advice; domiciliary home care and sitting-in; a shoppers' creche. This range was soon extended to include a pre-school playgroup, daycare for adults and short-term respite care. During the research other services were introduced, existing services expanded, and some services were withdrawn. Throughout, volunteers continued to provide social and leisure activities, as they had prior to the creation of the Project.

The developments in service provision were made possible by the availability of a number of sources of short-term statutory funding. The Society obtained funding initially from Urban Aid, the Urban Policy Subcommittee of the County Council, and the Manpower Services Commission Community Programme. Joint finance became an additional source of funding from January 1985, and a large charity agreed to support the salary of a manager for a minimum period of two years, commencing February 1985. Chapter 4 provides a more detailed account of the background to and development of the Beech House Project.

The writer had access to the Project through her employment as an independent research worker, also funded by the charity, to study and evaluate the Project for a period of three years, from February 1985. Thus, Beech House offered an opportunity to consider, over this time, the influence on a voluntary service delivery organization of seeking and obtaining different forms of statutory funding derived from different sources. Unlike much of the existing literature it was not necessary to rely on a 'snapshot' investigation, or on the statements of founders and managers on what they believed to be the influence of statutory funding on their organization. It would also be possible to compare the different forms of short-term statutory funding to see if the influence exerted upon the Project varied according to the source of funding.

While 'learning difficulties' and 'special needs' are now preferred terms among professional practitioners, the parents and the Society continued, during the research, to use the term 'mental handicap'. For the sake of consistency, therefore, this thesis follows the same convention.
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A framework of analysis was employed which permitted a systematic examination of the influence of statutory funding on the organization as a whole, i.e. by considering funding in relation to organizational structure and process. Such an approach has not featured explicitly in the available literature on the influence of statutory funding on voluntary agencies. As Chapter 2 indicates, much of this literature is very general and impressionistic and lacking in clearly defined terms. Some studies have usefully focused on selected aspects of structure and/or process, but have thereby offered only a partial picture of the influence of statutory funding on voluntary agencies.

The framework of analysis used in this thesis is outlined in Chapter 3. The three interrelated aspects of process are defined, i.e. planning, implementation/service delivery, and monitoring. Three dimensions of organizational structure, also interrelated, are specified, i.e. complexity, formalization and centralization. The writer has found a similar, albeit more elaborate, approach to the examination of organizational structure in a recent study of the management of voluntary and non-profit organizations (Butler and Wilson, 1990). However, these authors focus not upon the influence of statutory funding on voluntary organizations but on major charities' responses, in terms of structure and strategy, to operating in an increasingly competitive environment.

Chapter 5 looks in some detail at the financial resources of the Beech House Project and the formal accountability requirements of the various sources of statutory funding. This is an essential preliminary to any attempt to understand the ways in which the receipt of statutory funding can affect structure and process, especially where multiple funding renders the financial situation highly complex.

Chapter 6 describes the organizational structure of Beech House and the structural changes observed during the research.

Chapters 7-10 examine the influence of seeking and obtaining short-term statutory funding on organizational structure (Chapter 7), on the processes of planning (Chapter 8), implementation/service delivery (Chapter 9) and monitoring (Chapter 10). The thesis considers not only the influence of formal accountability in terms of fiscal monitoring and programme monitoring, but also the influence of other formal requirements such as rules on staff recruitment and on the clientele to be
served. The thesis shows the need to consider not only the formal constraints described above, but also the influence upon structure and process of the substantial freedom from formal constraint permitted to the Project by its statutory funding sources. The thesis further demonstrates the need to study the influence upon the Project of the search for continuation funding, in addition to the influence of statutory funding received. The availability of potential sources of long-term statutory funding had major implications for Beech House, given that decisions were taken on structure and process which were judged likely to enhance the chances of obtaining such funding.

Chapter 11 summarizes the research findings. Chapter 12 discusses the benefits of using a long-term case-study approach, and the concepts of structure and process, in the exploration of the influence of statutory funding on a voluntary sector service delivery organization. The implications of the research findings for the independence of the organization are considered. Given the relevance of the research for other 'instant' service delivery organizations created in a similar way, proposals for discussion on practical issues are offered to both funding and receiving organizations.
CHAPTER 2 - LITERATURE REVIEW

DEVELOPMENTS IN THE STATUTORY FUNDING OF THE VOLUNTARY SECTOR IN BRITAIN

The debate on the proper relationship between the state and the voluntary sector in the provision of social services intensified during the 1980s. A number of writers in the field remind us that this debate has been proceeding since at least mid-Victorian times (Brenton, 1985a; Johnson, 1981; Knapp et al., 1988; Leat et al., 1986; Mellor, 1985; Ware, 1989). However, the nature of the debate has changed. Brenton, considering the earlier controversy and contrasting the 'extension ladder' and 'parallel bars' models of the statutory-voluntary relationship presented by Sidney and Beatrice Webb, comments:

"Nowhere in this philosophical debate about special roles and separate spheres was it envisaged that the lines should become blurred through the subsidization from public funds of the activities of the voluntary charities and the consequent transformation of voluntary bodies in some degree or another into agencies of the state." (Brenton, 1985a, p.17).

She notes that Lloyd George's budget of 1914 included for the first time estimates for grants to organizations providing welfare services, e.g. maternity and child care. After the Second World War, and the advent of the Welfare State, statutory funding of voluntary agencies was retained:

"Emphasis was still laid on the use of voluntary associations. Indeed some forms of help could only be provided by the state or local authorities through grant-aiding such bodies." (Forder, 1969, p.8).

Thus, for example, the National Assistance Act of 1948 allowed local authorities to employ voluntary organizations as their agents in the provision of welfare services. The Wolfenden Report (1978) gave an extensive list of the Acts of Parliament permitting government departments to make grants to voluntary organizations. The Report advocated an expansion of both the voluntary and informal sectors. In considering the sources of funding likely to be available to support voluntary sector expansion, Wolfenden concluded that greater reliance on statutory funding would be required.

Wolfenden envisaged a pluralist model of service provision, with a partnership between the statutory and voluntary sectors. In addition, the Report proposed a dispersal of power in a mixed social economy, with the state allowing other
institutions to play a greater part in planning and implementation. The role here of voluntary sector bodies, as advocated by Wolfenden, has been explored by Leat, Smolka and Unell (1981).

Post-Wolfenden, the debate on 'welfare pluralism' was vitalized by the writings of Gladstone (1979), Hatch (1980) and Hadley and Hatch (1981), focussing attention on the issue of the replacement of statutory welfare provision by voluntary action. The dangers of wholesale advocacy of welfare pluralism and expansion of the non-statutory sector as the answer to the 'failures' of the welfare state have been identified by Webb (1981). Recently it has been argued that the focus on statutory funding of the voluntary sector encouraged by the 'pluralist' debate should be widened to include private giving, especially corporate giving (Wilson, 1989). However, with the recent publication of two Government White Papers, one on community care, ('Caring for People', 1989), the other on the supervision of charities ('Charities, a Framework for the Future', 1989), the issue of statutory funding of the voluntary sector remains prominent.

It has been argued that the broader debate on statutory-voluntary relationships has become increasingly dominated by issues concerned with statutory funding of the voluntary sector (Leat et al., 1986). Among the reasons offered for this interest in the funding issue are: government expenditure cuts; contracting out of service delivery; the questioning of statutory dominance in welfare provision and the involvement of voluntary organizations in the execution of a range of central government policies such as urban renewal, offenders and unemployment.

Some observers have emphasized the overall increase in real terms in public sector support for voluntary organizations (Posnett, 1987; Knapp et al., 1988; Brenton, 1985a and 1985b; Leat et al., 1986), noting the emergence of forms of public subsidy of the voluntary sector, such as the Manpower Services Commission's Community Programme, as part of this general trend. Webb and Wistow (1987) refer to the involvement of the voluntary sector in the government's unemployment measures, contrasting the increased flow of central government cash to the voluntary sector...'especially directed at the reduction or masking of unemployment', with the pressures on local authorities to cut back on grant-aid support for voluntary organizations.
There are, however, many difficulties involved in generating estimates of voluntary sector income in Britain and the extent of public sector support received (Falush, 1977; Posnett, 1983; Leat et al., 1986; Austin and Posnett, 1979; Knapp et al., 1988). These include the failure of charities to lodge copies of their annual accounts with the relevant authorities, the availability of 'hidden resources', and the need to consider a wide range of income sources when calculating estimates. The Charities Aid Foundation, which has produced annual figures on charity income for the past twelve years, has made frequent references to the associated problems. However, Barker (1988) has described the changes in research methods designed to make the Charities Aid Foundation statistics as comprehensive and accurate as possible. The claim that public sector funding of voluntary organizations has grown substantially in real terms is supported by the figures published by the Charities Aid Foundation (Charities Aid Foundation, 1983, 1984, 1986, 1987, 1988, 1989), and by the work of Posnett (1987).

Posnett's examination of trends in real income of the voluntary sector between 1975 and 1985 (see Appendix VIII) shows a steady increase in the proportion of total income derived from statutory grants (from 7.3% in 1975 to 10.9% in 1985) and from fees (34.1% to 60.7%). Knapp et al. (1988) note that a substantial part of the increase in revenue from fees is accounted for by increased government contracting with voluntary organizations. Using Charities Aid Foundation statistics on the income of the 400 largest trusts and fund-raising organizations, together with samples of other registered charities, and charities newly registered, Posnett considers the income of registered charities between 1980 and 1985 (Appendix VIII). Overall, income increased by 73.5% in nominal terms, with grants from statutory bodies showing the greatest increase (138%). Posnett found that for the sample of newly-registered charities, grants from statutory bodies represented their largest single source of income in 1985. This he describes as 'striking confirmation of the trend towards increased reliance on statutory funding'.

Since 1986 Charities Aid Foundation annual statistics have presented information on four sources of statutory grant-aid i.e. central government departments; quangos/non-departmental public bodies; local authorities and health authorities. Prior to this, separate figures on health authorities were not provided.

The available statistics show that between 1979-80 and 1984-85, central government grant aid to voluntary organizations increased in real terms by 57.8%, to over £224
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million. This compares with the estimate of £37.3 million for 1976-77 suggested by the Wolfenden Committee.

The central government grant aid given in 1984-85 was, however, less than one-sixth of government funding mediated by quangos. The MSC was particularly prominent here. The short-term funding of special employment schemes by the MSC commenced in 1972. By 1981-82 the funding of such schemes had grown to £95 million. In 1984-85 the total had increased to over £414 million, equivalent to 97% of all payments made to voluntary organizations by local authorities.

The Urban Programme, designed to sponsor on a short-term basis innovative projects to meet economic, environmental and social needs in urban areas, was introduced in 1969. In 1985, a Department of the Environment report described the Urban Programme as the largest single source of Government support of the voluntary sector apart from Manpower Services Commission funding. Grants had increased nationally from £18 million in 1979 to £76 million in 1985. The report stressed that few of the voluntary schemes funded ceased to exist when their Urban Programme funding time expired. Most were taken up by local authority main programme funding. Local authorities contribute 25% of the cost of Urban Programme projects, central government the rest. Hodson, writing in Charity Statistics 1983-84 (Charities Aid Foundation, 1984), contrasted the Urban Programme favourably with Manpower Services Commission funding...

"...there is increasing concern that MSC mainly distorts rather than supports voluntary organizations. The Urban Programme has been the only secure base for many of the new projects offering advice, services or self-help opportunities to people in urban areas." (Hodson, 1984).

In 1984-85, the Charities Aid Foundation produced conflicting findings on the total amount of local authority support for voluntary organizations. They found the proportions of the total income of the top 200 charities derived from local authority grants declined from 10.7% to 8.3%. A second survey of local authority payments to voluntary organizations showed an increase of 15% in real terms on the previous year, to approximately £440 million.

The information on health authority funding of the voluntary sector provided by the Charities Aid Foundation shows that in 1984-85 the support given by English health authorities at approximately £6.5 million was insignificant compared with that given by local authorities. Fifty-three per cent of payments to voluntary
organizations by English health authorities were made through joint finance, first introduced in 1976, and designed to support local authority schemes which benefit the health service (Wistow, 1986). 1984-85 was the first year voluntary organizations could apply for short-term joint finance grants directly, gaining representation on Joint Consultative Committees for the first time. The Charities Aid Foundation suggests that only a small proportion of joint finance was reaching the voluntary sector, i.e. 4.8% in 1982-83, increasing to 6.1% in 1984-85. In 1986 the NCVO report 'A Stake in Planning' speculated whether the involvement of voluntary sector representatives on JCCs would result in a greater proportion of joint finance being devoted to voluntary sector schemes (NCVO, 1986). The report stressed that certain levels of funding which are marginal in terms of the scale of statutory services could be very significant in the pattern of local voluntary sector funding.

Charity Trends (1988) showed that for the U.K. as a whole in 1986-87 total funding of voluntary organizations by health authorities remained low (£25.2 million) compared with central government and local authority funding, but this represented a substantial increase of 32.2% in real terms on the £18.3 million for 1985. A 32% increase in the number of joint finance grants made gave the voluntary sector £8.2 million. In 1989, Charity Trends noted that the upward trend was maintained, albeit at modest levels, with the total value of payments rising to £33 million and joint finance grants of over £10.5 million.

However, with regard to other forms of statutory support for the voluntary sector, Charity Trends (1989) provides evidence of a tailing off of central government funding (see Appendix IX). Although the current figure of almost £293 million represents an increase of over 90% in real terms from the level of government support ten years ago, Davis Smith (1989) suggests in his Commentary that in real terms central government funding of voluntary groups is now static or even falling. The same is said to be true of support from non-departmental public bodies. In 1987/88 quangos gave over £920 million to the voluntary sector (with over £560 million of this going to the Community Programme1 compared with £480 million in 1986-87) but the level of increase in real terms is described as insignificant. In contrast, the decline in local authority funding noted in Charity

---

1 The extent to which the replacement of the Community Programme by the Employment Training Scheme may have influenced voluntary sector funding by the MSC is unknown at the time of writing.
Trends (1988), and attributed by Unell (1988) to the special problems following abolition of the GLC and metropolitan counties, appears to have been reversed, at least temporarily, with local authority support at about £500 million. Mocroft (1989) remarks on the unpredictable impact of the poll tax. He suggests, though, that the effects of any crisis in local government finance may be countered by the implementation of Griffiths’ (1988) community care policies and contracting-out of care, meaning an increased role and increased funding for the voluntary sector.

Charity Trends (1987) noted that traditionally, central government support for the voluntary sector was via funding national bodies and innovative work at local level, with the expectation that the funding of local projects would eventually be taken on by local authorities. While the Urban Programme had increased the flow of central government funds to voluntary bodies, local authorities still played a role, in mediation and sponsoring voluntary applications. The report remarked on the unease which had greeted the move of central government beyond its traditional role, bypassing local government to develop a more extensive and direct involvement with the local voluntary sector, through a range of special projects designed to meet centrally determined priorities. Now, Charity Trends (1989) refers to the 'cat and mouse' approach of government to the funding of the voluntary sector, criticizing the stagnation in public sector funding of voluntary organizations at a time when government is looking to the voluntary sector to take an expanded role in the provision of welfare and other services to the community. Leat (1989) concludes that fees and charges are becoming an increasingly important element of voluntary sector finance. Davis Smith (1989) goes on to argue that this trend is likely to continue for the next few years as the government legislates to increase the role of the voluntary sector in the direct provision of services:

"This trend offers opportunities for the voluntary sector to take on the running of major services. However, it also brings with it dangers, not least an erosion of the independence of voluntary organizations." (Davis Smith, Charity Trends, 1989 p.5).

However, Leat stresses that in the available figures, income from fees and charges was the largest single source of income for only 13% of charities. Grant programmes remain a major source of support for the voluntary sector.
THE CONSEQUENCES FOR RECEIVING ORGANIZATIONS OF THE AVAILABILITY OF STATUTORY FUNDING

The developments in funding outlined above have not only reinforced concern for the relationship between the state and the voluntary sector, and for the future of service provision in general. There has also been a growing awareness of the need to establish the consequences of the availability of statutory funding for the individual organizations which receive it (Scott, 1986; Addy & Scott, 1987; Harris, 1986; Jordan, 1987; Knapp et al., 1988; Leat et al., 1986). Harris (1986) notes the anxiety within the voluntary sector about the practical implications of resource-dependence on governmental agencies, together with the high expectations of voluntary agencies held by politicians at all points of the ideological spectrum. She comments:

"There is a theme underlying much of the welfare debate literature - that the voluntary sector can succeed where the state has failed; and that it can remain immune from the management and administrative problems (such as remoteness, inflexibility, insensitivity and inefficiency) that are seen to beset state-run welfare agencies...the public policy debate is underpinned by assumptions about the organizational characteristics of voluntary agencies. Clearly, we need to know more about the internal workings of voluntary organizations." (Harris, 1986 p.11).

However, she goes on to assert that there are few publications which can throw light on how voluntary agencies in Britain really work. The dearth of research on the management issues and organizational problems of voluntary organizations in general is also stressed in Billis (1984a) and Harris and Billis (1986), while Knight (1984) has noted the lack of formal research in Britain as a guide to management practice in voluntary organizations. Wright (1986) asserts that lack of organizational understanding accounts for the superficiality of much social policy relating to the voluntary sector.

In Britain, the Handy Report (1981), 'Improving Effectiveness in Voluntary Organizations', was undertaken for the National Council for Voluntary Organizations and led to the establishment there in 1982 of the Management Development Unit, to perform a brokerage function rather than act as a provider or manager of services (Wright, 1984). The Report identified a wide range of problems in the management of voluntary organizations but no specific reference was made to the relationship of the voluntary organization with its funding sources. Indeed, one of the bases of the Report was a Gallup survey on
management problems in voluntary organizations which specifically excluded finance from consideration. However, the nine years since the publication of the Handy Report have, as shown above, seen significant developments in the statutory funding of voluntary organizations, shaped at national level by Government policies on employment, urban renewal, 'care in the community', local authority finance and the expansion of the role of the voluntary services.

These developments have permitted not only the expansion of national voluntary organizations such as the National Association for the Care and Re-Settlement of Offenders and Age Concern, but also the creation of what may be termed 'instant organizations'. Mutual aid/self-help groups at local level have been able to use short-term funding from various sources, but particularly that made available through the MSC Community Programme, to transform themselves virtually overnight into employers responsible for the provision of services by paid staff. The precise extent to which such services have been created is not known, though experience suggests it has been considerable. Much recent British writing has been specifically concerned with the impact of government funding of voluntary activity through MSC special employment schemes. This material is mostly impressionistic, generated by participants in the voluntary sector and by those with a consultancy role (for example, Heginbotham, 1986; Hartley-Brewer, 1985; Etherington and Townsend, 1985; Maguire, 1986; Walsh, 1985). The experiences they report are, though, a useful adjunct to the few examples of empirical research available on the implications for the receiving organizations of MSC funding (Addy & Scott, 1987; Jordan, 1987) together with the MSC's own report 'Value for Money in the Community Programme' (Normington et al., 1986).

The implications of the availability of such short-term government funding for the new voluntary service delivery organizations created thereby remains a particular organizational issue deserving exploration. The discussion of relevant literature below is not confined to accounts of British experience. A number of references to other countries, mainly the United States, are included. Harris and Billis (1986) rightly draw attention to the terminological problems raised by the use of such literature. As Pifer (1975a) indicates, the term 'non-profit organizations', for example, can refer in the United States not only to voluntary sector welfare agencies but to a range of other organizations which can be classed as non-profit

---

5The National Council for Voluntary Organizations was unable to provide any statistics; the MSC did not have such information either.
seeking, such as religious institutions, trades unions, political parties, private museums and social clubs. There are also differences between Britain and America with regard to the scale of responsibility for welfare provision. Brenton (1985a) observes that strong antagonism in the U.S.A. to the direct role of the state ensured that voluntary sector organizations acquired a greater role in welfare provision, acting as agents of the state, than was the case in Britain.

Utting (1982) says that purchase of service has become a subject of lively controversy in the U.S.A., due not least to the growth in this form of agency relationship permitted by the Title XX amendments to the Social Security Act in 1974. This legislation provided a 75% rate of re-imbursement to states from the federal government for approved programmes, with state and local welfare departments authorized to buy services from independent agencies.

There are American commentators who discuss concerns over the impact of government funding on the voluntary sector in terms very similar to those found in British writings (see for example: Kramer, 1981 and 1987; Salamon, 1987; Manser, 1972 and 1974; Brilliant, 1973; Hartogs and Weber, 1978; Sharkansky, 1980; Rosenbaum, 1981; Pifer, 1975a; Adler, 1988).

In recent years, though, a concern with the implications for U.S. non-profit organizations of cuts in government funding has also become apparent, given the enthusiasm of the Reagan administration for major reductions in federal domestic spending in areas where non-profit organizations had been traditionally active (Dobkin Hall, 1987; Skloot, 1987; James, 1983; Hoogland De Hoog, 1985; Kramer, 1987; Adler, 1988). Horder asserts that under President Reagan the distinction between the not for profit and commercial sectors became less clear....

"Entrepreneurs have successfully argued in the courts that grants to voluntary organizations make for unfair competition in the market place. This emphasis on market forces, combined with public spending cuts means that grants have to be replaced with fees for service if the agency is to survive. Voluntary organizations look more and more like businesses...." (Horder, 1988).

There are case studies of American voluntary service agencies which, from the descriptions of the agencies' funding and development, seem to offer sources of data worthy of consideration when exploring the implications of the provision of
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The discussion which follows is not confined to literature which is specific to voluntary organizations. Some reference is also made to writers who draw on their research experience in industrial/commercial and other fields. Harris and Billis (1986) chose to exclude 'most of the general organization and management literature' when creating their bibliography on 'Organizing Voluntary Agencies', restricting the material selected to that which was 'specifically concerned or was closely associated with these kinds of agencies'. However, this writer believed such a strategy to be inappropriate for the research in hand. It seemed premature to choose to ignore sources of material which might offer ways of achieving insights into the development of the voluntary organization concerned (Handy 1988). Distrust of 'hierarchy', 'bureaucracy' and 'structure' are, it has been claimed, fairly widespread in the voluntary sector in Britain (Handy, 1988; Handy, 1983; Harris, 1985; NCVO Management Development Unit, 1984; Wright, 1986). Yet Gerard (1983) classified half of the 298 charities surveyed in the Gallup study of 1978 as predominantly hierarchical in management style and organizational structure, the remainder being predominantly participative. Brenton (1985b) claims that there is a distinct tendency within the voluntary sector even for quite new bodies to adopt hierarchical/pyramidal forms of organization and authoritarian styles of management. It therefore seems a pity if an enthusiasm for the development of new, collective, collaborative forms of organization, however understandable this may be, precludes the exploration of a wide range of literature by those seeking to further the understanding of existing organizations in the voluntary sector. As Webb and Wistow (1987) have emphasized, it is important to distinguish the terms 'management', 'hierarchy' and 'bureaucracy' in their technical sense, from their pejorative connotations. Albrow (1970) offers a useful reminder of the confusions surrounding the term bureaucracy, with two incompatible concepts - bureaucracy as administrative efficiency and bureaucracy as administrative inefficiency - competing for space in twentieth century theory.

The 'bureaucratization' of voluntary agencies is only one of the issues relating to the receipt of statutory funding which has been identified by commentators. Kramer (1987) for example, says it is widely held that among the dysfunctional consequences of agencies receiving public funds are dependency, co-optation, goal deflection and a dilution of advocacy and autonomy, as well as the loss of
voluntaristic character through increased bureaucratization and professionalization. Salamon (1987), in terms similar to those used by Kramer, identifies three particular fears within the philanthropic community regarding government support for non-profit organizations. Firstly, bureaucratization and professionalization result in a loss of the flexibility and local control that are considered the voluntary sector's greatest strengths. Secondly, agency 'missions' may become distorted by 'vendorism', in the pursuit of available government funding. Finally, there may be loss of 'autonomy' or 'independence' with regard especially to the advocacy role of the voluntary agency. Salamon also notes the tendency to portray a mythical golden age of voluntary organization purity, corrupted by the receipt of government funds.

Rosenbaum (1981), also writing with reference to the USA, views government funding of voluntary agencies as a threat to historically valued pluralism and diversity, limiting the ability of the voluntary sector to continue serving in an independent, innovative role. Volunteer participation declines and paid staff are left...

"...in the position of hustling government support on terms dictated by government and in accordance with government definitions of social needs and conditions." (Rosenbaum, 1981)

However, Sharkansky (1980) acknowledges that possibilities for diversity in social services delivery can be achieved through the US government contracting to voluntary agencies, though he also draws attention to the challenge to voluntary agency autonomy which is constituted by government funding.

In Britain, Knapp et al. (1988) examined evidence for the existence of a number of popular rationales for statutory funding of voluntary organizations and considered the effect this funding may have upon the characteristics identified in these rationales, e.g. innovation, advocacy, participation, flexibility.

Brenton (1985a) has reservations on the recent expansion of statutory funding of the voluntary sector. She observes a dependence which carries with it the risk of loss of identity, multiple changes of direction, and a loss of independent voice. She links this issue to the debate on 'welfare pluralism', and claims there is disquiet in the voluntary sector about the growing financial dependence on government, in an ideological climate where the rhetoric of 'partnership' is a
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euphemism for a radical transformation of the established patterns of responsibility in the welfare state. Brenton sees the increased support from central funds as part of a continuing official strategy of detraction of statutory provision and voluntary sector idealization. (Brenton, 1985b)

Overall, a wide range of issues are raised in the literature, all the more confusing because of the variations in the language used and the lack of clear definition of terms. There is also disagreement on the extent to which fears about the effects of statutory funding of the voluntary sector are justified. However, it is possible to distinguish four main themes in the literature. The interrelationships between these are considerable and will become apparent. First, there is discussion of the extent to which changes in organizational 'structure' (e.g. 'formalization', 'professionalization', 'centralization', 'bureaucratization') are the inevitable consequence of government funding, together with consideration of the effects of such structural change on the operations of the voluntary organization. Secondly, there is particular emphasis on organizational goals, i.e. on the policy decisions regarding the goals to be pursued by the voluntary organization and the problems of retaining integrity when the organization is dependent wholly/largely on government funding. Thirdly, many writers draw attention to issues of implementation of agency goals in terms of the delivery of services. There is particular interest in the ways in which government funding may influence the human resources available - i.e. paid staff and volunteers - and the demands made upon them. There is some, though lesser, comment on other service delivery issues. Finally, there is much stress on accountability to government funding sources and the demands on the voluntary organization in terms of the monitoring thus required.

Each of these four areas of concern has implications for the independence of voluntary organizations, though it is 'accountability' which perhaps provokes most comment on this issue. Before considering the views expressed in the relevant literature, it is useful to note that a number of commentators have reservations about the use of the term 'independence'. Hatch and Mocroft (1983) see the concept of voluntary organizations' 'independence' as illusory. As soon as voluntary organizations and local authorities enter into a relationship to their mutual benefit they each gain the ability to influence the other and thereby lose some 'independence'. Debate on the nature and balance of the exchanges between voluntary organizations and statutory authorities would, they say, be more to the
point. Hatch and Mocroft also stress that, in theory, financial independence of statutory authorities enables a voluntary organization to choose its own work priorities and to take a critical stance towards the statutory authorities. However, their research indicated that the 'true independents' did not in practice use their independence to be critical to any great extent, and they were not infrequently isolated and moribund.

Salamon (1987) sees the notion of independence as misleading. The voluntary sector is dependent on private funds if not on public funds and historically, he says, private funds have often come with strings every bit as onerous and threatening to agency independence as any government has devised. Salamon's own survey of 3,400 non-profit organizations found social services and advocacy organizations serving minorities and the poor felt corporations did not support them. Young (1987) argues that rejection of public support leads to the substitution of donor preference as a source of influence and possible difficulty. Kramer (1981) suggests that such funding sources as wealthy donors, and community and professional groups can also constrain an agency's independence.

Leat (1986) argues that the alternative to greater dependence on one source of income may not be independence but greater dependence on some other (possibly less attractive) source of income. The following discussion on the impact of statutory funding is presented with these reservations in mind, accepting that the concept of 'independence' is not absolute, but relative. Forms of income other than statutory funding can act as constraints, and voluntary organizations remain dependent on their environment and operating systems for the supply of the necessary resources (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978).

1. The Impact of Statutory Funding on Organizational Structure
This discussion is presented in the awareness that the material used raises terminological problems. The writers referred to rarely define their terms and organization theorists might well differ over the justification for discussing certain issues under the heading of 'structure'. For example, Handy (1988) insists that 'governance' should not be considered in terms of 'structure' but as a participation system. Within the literature on the voluntary sector, however, references to structure in relation to this issue are common. Other organization theorists employ frameworks of analysis that seem to permit discussion of governance in terms of structure (Hendrick, 1987; Carter, 1983; Checkland, 1972). In order to discuss the
available literature in a coherent way, avoiding underlying problems of terminology, material is included here which deals explicitly or implicitly with matters of complexity, formalization and centralization defined by Hendrick (1987) as the three dimensions of organizational structure.

There is considerable agreement in the literature that statutory funding, though it may not be the sole cause of structural change in voluntary agencies, has nevertheless substantially encouraged such change. There is concern over increasing complexity and formalization within the voluntary agency and for the impact of statutory funding on governance.

Kramer (1987) suggests that most voluntary agencies become more bureaucratic and professionalized over time in their struggle for identity and a domain, subject to the 'characteristic bureaucratic pressures towards ritualism, conformity and insularity'. The larger and more complex they become, the less distinguishable they are from their governmental or profit-making counterparts. Public fiscal policies in the USA during the last twenty years, says Kramer, through making funds available to non-governmental organizations, have contributed to the blurring of differences among social service agencies and they have all become more entrepreneurial, political, bureaucratic and professional. Addy and Scott (1987) make the same point, in their study of the impact of MSC funding on the voluntary sector in Britain. They argue that increasing dependence on large-scale MSC funding binds the non-statutory sector firmly into state provision and service delivery, while the structure and processes of the non-statutory sector increasingly resemble those of corporate bodies. However, they also acknowledge that the 'formalization processes' they observe may be as much/more to do with the receipt of grant-aid from whatever source:-

"Many of at least the larger agencies were becoming more hierarchical and specialized before MSC intervention because of their use of state and private funding. It may be that the MSC has speeded up these developments in ways which have been both dramatic and seemingly out of the control of the voluntary agency" (Addy and Scott, 1987 p.30).

Salamon (1987) sees a tendency in the United States to ascribe more of the apparent bureaucratization and professionalization of non-profit organizations to government support than is probably justifiable. He argues that increasing professionalization is a general trend in the social services, health and education, while many private funders increasingly expect sound financial management on
the part of non-profit organizations. Rosenbaum (1981) similarly notes the general emphasis on professional management and organizational efficiency.

Rosenbaum (1981) is among the most severe critics of the structural changes attributed to government funding. He sees the 'enormous administrative burden of applying for, and accounting for, government funds' as having accelerated the trend to bureaucratization in terms of the specialization and professionalization of administrative tasks, to the point where it threatens the flexibility and freedom of voluntary organizations. For Rosenbaum, the growth of bureaucracy in voluntary institutions has chilling implications.

His concern is not shared by Kramer (1981, 1987) or Salamon (1987). Both raise the possibility of inefficient management in the voluntary sector, and of insufficient formalization and professionalization. The work of Hartogs and Weber (1978) offers a perspective rejected by Rosenbaum, i.e. that voluntary agencies may need more 'bureaucratization', not less. Their study of 148 voluntary agencies in New York identified major problems of financial management within voluntary agencies receiving government funding, particularly in the small agencies; their 'most dramatic finding' was that agencies spend more than they can afford. They argue that the enemy to survival is not from without, i.e the government, but from within the agency's own management practices. They concluded that bureaucratized management is what some agencies need to develop sound management practices:-

"Stricter management organization of programme delivery, i.e. the bureaucratization of social services, will be much more effective than the now prevalent management by crisis solution. It will also be the basis for improved capability in dealing with the government bureaucracy". (Hartogs and Weber, 1978 p.18).

The need for formalization of procedures in voluntary agencies also emerges from two British studies (Abrams et al., 1981; Hadley et al., 1975). Abrams et al. surveyed over 1,000 Good Neighbour schemes, noting the paradox that such schemes exist to provide informal care, but that they can only do so on the basis of competent formal organization. They concluded that the need is for a type of formal organization that will permit aims to be clarified, helpers to be mobilized and tasks to be assigned, yet will not compromise the basic informality that renders such schemes distinctive. Hadley et al.'s evaluation of Task Force, established to use young volunteers to provide a visiting service to the elderly,
came to similar conclusions. The first director's orientation is described as pursuing maximum quantity of help rather than quality of relationships, with the focus on expansion of the organization. Hadley et al. observed that while there was rapid growth, funded by local authority grant-aid, little information on service provision was collected/recorded, there was a lack of system for the selection, assessment and allocation of volunteers, and no method of assessing the relative need of the clients:

"It may be that such informal methods can work well enough in small organizations with small case loads. In larger organizations...more formalized procedures are required" (Hadley et al., 1975 p.163).

Problems of the tension between informality and formality, stressed by Abrams et al., are also identified by Billis (1984b), expressed in terms of the conflict between 'self-help' and 'service' in his study of the Riverside Association. This was a self-help group for one-parent families which underwent rapid growth on the strength of various unidentified 'funding sources'. The Riverside case is presented by Billis as an example of a voluntary organization coming to occupy an 'ambiguous zone' between the private world of self-help and the more bureaucratic world of service (Billis, 1984a; Billis, 1984c).

In the United States, Van de Ven (1980) studied the development of 14 new child care organizations in Texas, created on the basis of government funding. He concludes that formalization of procedures in the early stages of implementation is strongly correlated with decreases in implementation obstacles...

"The structuring of rules, policies and procedures decreases employees' misunderstanding of their jobs because it specifies the role behaviour expected of them." (Van de Ven, 1980, p124)

Tichy (1980) observed the rapid development in New York's South Bronx of the Martin Luther King Health Centre, a project funded by federal grant-aid. He concludes that a need developed for rationalization, the creation of systems and procedures, which was hindered by the experimentation, creativity and entrepreneurial leadership required in the start-up phase. Similar arguments on the entrepreneurial role in the development of organizations have been presented by Kimberley (1980a), Schein (1985), Gerard (1983), Miles and Randolph (1980).

Studies such as those identified above do suggest that the demands of service delivery, certainly on a large scale, generate an impetus in voluntary agencies for
the development of formalized procedures and organizational complexity, with implications for centralization. This contrasts with the assertion of Hatch (1980) when he extols the virtues of voluntary agencies, undertaking work of a personal/caring character, unconstrained by the responsibilities of many statutory agencies for applying regulations and allocating resources between many competing claimants. However, the development of voluntary agencies into large-scale delivery services, encouraged by the availability of short-term statutory funding, means that the constraints relating to the application of regulations and the allocation of resources between competing claimants may well become apparent. Webb (1984) suggests that if voluntary organizations take responsibility for large areas of basic service provision, they may be forced to accept the same preoccupation with equity which produces many of the 'bureaucratic' characteristics of statutory services. Brenton (1985b) goes further, maintaining that the lesson from other countries which utilize voluntary agencies for social service delivery is that requirements for public accountability and comprehensive coverage tend to dictate bureaucratic form and rationality; voluntary agencies tend to demonstrate all the attendant defects of the statutory services in Britain.

It is the structural changes accompanying rapid growth in service provision, permitted by MSC Community Programme funding, which prompt Addy and Scott (1987) to question the transformation of voluntary organizations into large-scale delivery agencies. These they see as unable to embody the essential characteristics of voluntary action, i.e. non-statutory, non-professional, participative, empowering lay people and exploring unrecognized need.

Addy and Scott (1987) are among those concerned not only with the relationship between structural change and service delivery but also with the impact of statutory funding on the structure of governance in the voluntary agency. Knapp et al. (1988), discussing the benefits of participation offered by voluntary agencies, suggest that public agencies may require a hierarchical governance structure as a condition for funding. Expansion due to government funding, they argue, also brings the need for formalized systems of governance and the possible evaporation of many of the original participative benefits offered by mutual aid organizations. Goulding and Goulding (1983) express concern that the acquisition of grant-aid from the MSC and other sources such as charities can render a voluntary agency virtually independent of the community, replacing unpaid volunteers with paid
staff and encouraging a 'bureaucratic type of structure' with a further degree of insulation of the decision-makers from the community.

Those specifically concerned with the influence on the voluntary sector of the MSC Community Programme have voiced similar reservations about the governance of voluntary agencies. Wright et al. (1985), and Addy and Scott (1987) share anxieties about the decline of the role of management committees vis-a-vis paid staff. Addy and Scott observe a diminution of local voluntary control, arguing that some agencies have expanded to the point where they are manager-led, out of control of their management groups or boards, tending to lose sight of the original aims and increasingly dominated by the need to perpetuate their contractual relationship with MSC. They advocate experimentation with different, more participative structures, to build up lay power, rather than producing 'hierarchical systems to deal with staff turnover, organizational turbulence and shifting goal-posts'.

Grayson (1985), while agreeing that voluntary organizations need new forms of structure, is concerned not with participative opportunities for volunteers but for Community Programme employees. He says that the MSC accounting and monitoring procedures almost guarantee organizational and institutional conservatism, with few examples of Community Programmes adopting more adventurous employer styles incorporating collective or co-operative principles or 'worker involvement'.

In the United States, Rosenbaum (1981) regrets the 'disturbing signs of change in governance patterns precipitated by government funding', including the decreased levels of Board member participation in agency governance, and the declining need to seek donations of money and volunteer time from the public and thus remain in contact with the local community and responsive to changing community needs. Similar views on the role of management boards in governance are expressed in Kramer (1987), Adler (1988) and Powell and Friedkin (1987). Handy (1988) offers an interesting contrast to the views outlined above:-

"It is when the membership organization becomes a service organization that the rights of other stakeholders have to be thought of, the clients, the funding agencies, the community at large. At this stage there is pressure to bring representatives of the group into the governing process. So little by little the representative democracy gives way to stakeholder democracy, with a council or management committee made up of representatives of all the stakeholder groups...". (Handy, 1988, pp133-34).
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It is the perceived failure of voluntary organizations receiving statutory funding to develop this form of governance, which exercises so many writers.

2. The Impact of Statutory Funding on Organizational Goals
Whatever the arguments against the use of 'goal-seeking' models of organizations (Billis, 1984d; Checkland, 1972; Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978) the language of goals, aims, objectives and missions is commonly employed in the literature relating to the receipt of statutory funding by voluntary organizations. There are major anxieties that the attainment of such funding can deflect voluntary organizations from their original purposes, or restrict the choice of programme to one acceptable to the funding agency. However, there are some expressions of optimism to be found amongst the relevant material, British and American.

The possibility that in order to obtain or retain a grant an organization will tailor its activities into a form likely to be attractive to statutory authorities is raised by Gladstone (1979), Johnson (1981) and Leat et al. (1986). Knapp et al. (1988) see as the greatest danger of public funding that policy advocacy groups may cease to be independent of government. The possibility that funding can be withdrawn should the voluntary organization's activities offend the funding authority is illustrated by the case of the National Association of Citizen's Advice Bureaux, the subject of government investigations in 1983 following allegations of improper political activities by its employees (Brenton, 1985a; Mellor, 1985; Harris and Billis, 1986). Saxon-Harrold (1986) suggests government funding agencies can constrain voluntary organizations with a commitment to social reform, even community education. Manser (1972 and 1974) has described the limitations on voluntary agencies' advocacy role in the USA in terms of 'Manser's law', i.e. "An agency's freedom and effectiveness in social action or advocacy are in inverse proportion to the amount of money it receives."

Jackson (1983), reporting on a British grant-giving initiative, queries the value of the short-term funding (two years' duration) to be provided by the Home Office Voluntary Services Unit, given the lack of innovation demonstrated by the projects seeking funding. Examples of the development of new approaches or the application of tried approaches to new situations were rare. Jackson suggests that it is the uncertainty of future funding which inclines groups to pursue traditional and reliable projects rather than risk scarce resources on new, ambitious ones.
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Rice (1975), writing of the American experience, asserts that agencies on the alert for new sources of support tend to follow government trends and the world of social welfare, public and voluntary, becomes more unitary and less independently varied. Pifer (1975b), commenting on the growing phenomenon of government by grant and contract in the United States, observes a lack of financial security for recipient organizations. The need for constant renewal of specific projects he sees as encouraging frequent changes of direction induced by Washington's concerns of the day, rather than deliberate courses set by the organizations' boards of trustees. Powell and Friedkin (1987), making a similar observation, suggest that such influences can work quietly, a shift to acceptable mainstream approaches from controversial ones ensuring a change of mission; too late it is realized that legitimacy has been eroded, purpose neglected.

The proposition that goal-displacement may be related to the demands of the funding relationship was examined by Berg and Wright (1980) in their study of four social work programmes in the USA. They found that in each case a move from block-grant funding to service-based funding was accompanied by demands for changes in the definition of the client population served and for the professionalization of staff. Two of the programmes eventually closed, their funding terminated because they were unable to accept the required changes in goals. The two remaining programmes did make the adjustments demanded. Thus, this is not a case of voluntary agencies choosing to change their goals and activities as a means of enhancing their chances of obtaining or retaining grant-aid, in response to the perceived expectations of the funding bodies. Rather, it shows voluntary organizations complying with explicit demands for changes in goals made by a new funding source. As Berg and Wright conclude, this represents a direct reaction to the conditions associated with the funding process, rather than a deliberate process that involved a reconsideration of agency goals. Their research offers an example of differences in goals between the funding source and the recipient voluntary agency. Their comparison of two different forms of statutory funding indicates a situation more complex than the many references simply to 'statutory funding' would suggest. There is a need to examine the particular arrangements which relate to the various forms of statutory funding available.

This is a point made by Leat, Smolka, and Unell (1981) in their study of the role of local authority funded Councils of Voluntary Service and Rural Community
Councils. They conclude that local authority funding appears on balance to constrain rather than encourage innovation, planning and independence. However, they warn that the advantages and disadvantages that might attach to central government funding depend very largely on the particular procedures and provisos attached to such funding.

Saxon-Harrold (1986), on the basis of a postal survey of 75 top directors/administrators of voluntary organizations, concludes that a high level of dependence on central government funds demands a strategy for selecting and pursuing goals which is co-operative, with co-optation and joint ventures involving statutory funders and/or other voluntary organizations. Wortman (1983), with reference to North America, argues that strategic management in most voluntary and non-profit organizations is almost non-existent; goals are frequently short-term and ill-defined and planning efforts mostly elemental.

The development of difficulties between funding agency and recipient because of lack of clarity of objectives is discussed by Leat et al. (1986). They accept that detailed specifications and controls by the funding agency may threaten the independence of the voluntary organization. But, they argue, lack of clarity about what can and cannot be controlled and specified is equally threatening to independence.

The development within organizations of confusion and conflict over goals is also illustrated in the literature. The possibilities for divisions on these issues between volunteers and a paid 'professional' staff are identified by Search (1984) and Wright et al. (1985). There are also a number of empirical studies which offer evidence of the consequences of grant-aid in terms of the problems which later developed over the goals to be pursued, i.e. Billis (1984b); Glendinning (1986); Tichy (1980); Hadley et al. (1975). In each case the voluntary organization had experienced rapid growth, permitted by grant-aid, with differences arising over the emergence of new goals and perceived goal deflection/displacement. Hadley et al., for example, describe the rapid expansion of Task Force on the basis of local authority funding. The social education of volunteers and community action became accepted official goals, an extension of the original intention of providing a clearing-house service for the supply of volunteer help to old people. The problems arose of what priority to give the different aspects of Task Force work. Staff members came to value the new goals, yet the clearing-house function...
remained the way the organization earned most of its income and the goal of giving aid to old people was always given priority in the public image.

Harris and Billis (1986) see coping with organizational growth as a greater problem than sheer survival for voluntary agencies:

"Sadly we have numerous examples of agencies where funding has been snatched up without due consideration being given to the way in which some kinds of funding can distort original purpose. Thoughtless growth can alter the fundamental equations upon which the agency was established. It can alter the relationship between members and elected committees, between paid staff and membership and between volunteer and paid staff. Finally, it can change the nature of the agency's output. Agencies can find themselves delivering services which are in fact very different from their declared objectives." (Harris and Billis, 1986 p.2).

Leat, Smolka and Unell (1981) noted, in their study of Councils of Voluntary Service and Rural Community Councils, the possibility of over-anxiety to produce tangible results within the first year of grant-aid, as a basis of subsequent funding. The effect of this, they say, may be significantly to divert the project's goals in the direction of tangible short-term outcomes rather than the less easily measured, less quickly achieved goals the project was originally designed to achieve.

Much of the writing specifically concerned with MSC funding of the voluntary sector in Britain has been highly critical of the influence of this source of grant-aid on the organization's goals. The arguments relate both to the explicit demands which may be made of the recipient organization, with regard to changes in goals, and the ways in which pressures for goal deflection/displacement are implicit in the funding situation.

Rix (1985) claims that voluntary agencies have demonstrated a growing tendency to forget their original purpose; goals become subverted and subordinated to those of the MSC. Growth becomes a goal in its own right and the business of maintaining a large organization creates ever-increasing management problems. Addy and Scott (1987) suggest that many voluntary agencies were encouraged by the availability of MSC funding to develop ambitions to provide services of a type and/or scale which could not possibly be undertaken by volunteers. The issue is not merely the employment of paid staff, but the introduction of tasks which require a paid staff for their fulfilment.
Hartley-Brewer (1985) has argued that the constraints applied by the MSC on the kind of work done within Community Programme projects (i.e. they must be service and not policy or financially oriented) can hit the voluntary sector particularly hard, severely hampering a scheme’s potential benefit and natural development and discouraging innovation. Walsh (1985) complains in stronger terms that an organization’s core beliefs and central approach to its work can easily come under pressure from the MSC to change, sometimes against the direct wishes of the organization.

In contrast Doogan (1985) and Simpson (1985) offer generally favourable verdicts on two particular experiences of Community Programme schemes. Project aims are seen as not incompatible with Community Programme involvement, both writers stressing the need to invest time in the relationship with the MSC. Jordan (1987), having reviewed the advantages and disadvantages of the Community Programme, concludes that although the advantages had not been exploited to their full potential they offered a means of providing genuinely preventive projects in health and social care, to complement the role of hard-pressed state agencies. Because the Community Programme was free to explore areas of care which would not be undertaken by statutory or voluntary organizations, says Jordan, it could adopt 'an innovatory and creative response to social needs'. However, he casts doubts on the justification of the aims of Community Programme schemes, with his description of projects conceived and proposed in a piecemeal way, frequently badly-planned and over-lapping. The lack of an organized system for investigating need, and the inexperience of voluntary organizations is compounded, claims Jordan, by the lack of funding for researching or piloting the need for projects:

"Many projects are therefore based on hunches, anecdotal evidence, or are simply 'off the top of the head'; others are just made up as they go along." (Jordan, 1987 p.16).

He thus implies that the goals of the organization may be hastily and/or inadequately formulated, focussing here on the lack of provision for prior planning. It is interesting that his comments are reminiscent of those of Pettigrew,
relating to the establishment and long-term viability of specialist units set up within commercial firms:

"Fundamental questions about identifying client needs, predicting a mix or range of potential clients, the distinctive competence of the unit, its location, type of leader and internal staff mix tended to receive only passing attention in the haste to set up the new unit and get on with its first task". (Pettigrew, 1975).

Jordan's criticisms of the nature of projects proposed and funded had been anticipated by the MSC's own report 'Value for Money in the Community Programme' (Normington, Brodie and Munro, 1986). This observed that some Community Programme projects were marginal to the needs of the local community.

The highly critical tone of much of the literature discussed above stands in marked contrast to the more optimistic observations of Wolfenden (1978) and Judge (1982), in Britain, and Hartogs and Weber (1978), Kramer (1981 and 1987), and Salamon (1987) in the USA.

The Wolfenden Report does acknowledge that problems can arise where the objectives of a project are interpreted differently by those funding it and those carrying it out...

"Such conflicts are not easily resolved, but they may be obviated by clarification of objectives at the outset and steps to ensure that funders are kept fully informed of the implications of changing circumstances." (Wolfenden, 1978 p.162).

The Report also considered whether the need to acquire funding might dispose voluntary organizations to adapt their work in order to enhance their chances of obtaining money. A Home Office Voluntary Services Unit submission to the Committee suggested that when a voluntary organization is funded largely from government sources its income from voluntary sources is likely to decrease and its ability to experiment and follow separate policies is correspondingly diminished. However, the Report, after considering the effect of grant-aid, statutory and otherwise, upon the independence of voluntary organizations, decided that an organization with an excellent cause to put forward is not likely to be diverted from its course because of the difficulty of obtaining funds.
Judge (1982) considers the implications of an expansion in Britain of Purchase of Service Contracting (POSC), i.e. contracting-out of services by public authorities, commonly practiced in the USA but described by Judge at this time as 'in its infancy' in Britain. Elsewhere, Judge has emphasized that although the relative level of expenditure on POSC is smaller than in the United States it can be substantial, with some Social Services Departments making extensive use of voluntary organizations (Judge and Smith, 1983).

The research on POSC in Britain, undertaken by Judge, showed none of the representatives of voluntary agencies interviewed suggested that their involvement with public agencies reduced their autonomy in any way. Some thought it crucial, in this respect, to use their own funds to reduce the charges made to local authorities (see also Kramer, 1981).

Judge quotes in support of his arguments the work in the USA of Hartogs and Weber (1978). They studied 148 agencies in New York, all in receipt of government funds distributed by the intermediary agency, the Greater New York Fund. The reason for the study was the concern of practitioners and volunteers that the services rendered by voluntary agencies were being displaced, changed, destroyed, by the influx of government funds. The authors stress that they found nothing to support the fear that government funding leads to the disappearance of an agency's core programme, though the format and manner in which the programme is developed must conform to government requirements. Also, they say, funding may 'tend to skew' the kinds of initiative and creativity that agencies develop in terms of new programmes.

They conclude that government and the voluntary sector complement each other's work and that government funding is not in itself a factor likely to destroy voluntarism. Indeed, this funding has helped voluntary agencies maintain existing services and extend services to segments of the population which they could not previously afford to reach. The threat to voluntarism, according to Hartogs and Weber, is to be found in the voluntary agencies' problems in managing government funds, particularly the subsidizing of the costs of service provisions out of the agencies' own reserves and operating budgets. This is attributed by Hartogs and Weber not to the desire to retain autonomy expressed by Judge's respondents, but to the inability of many voluntary agencies to determine their true overhead costs, leading to ineffective contract negotiations with government, and inadequate
reimbursement. Brilliant (1973) also sees dangers in a developing acceptance of the underwriting of federal programmes by the voluntary sector.

Kramer (1981), on the basis of his survey of 80 voluntary agencies in Israel, the Netherlands, Britain and the USA, argues that goal displacement in terms of voluntary agencies designing programmes at variance with their stated goals, priorities and policies, in order to obtain government funds, is the exception rather than the rule. However, he does acknowledge that the development of new programmes and methods by voluntary agencies is highly dependent on government finance and, to a lesser extent, philanthropic foundations, with these funding sources having a major influence in shaping the character of the new programmes and methods that are developed by voluntary agencies.

He also makes reference to the possibility that voluntary agencies may be deflected from their advocacy role by involvement in service provision on the basis of government funding:

"...most of the public support for voluntary agencies and most of their influence are derived from their legitimacy, credibility and expertise as service providers. While it may be unwise to call for exclusive concentration on advocacy, there is justification for greater stress on this function." (Kramer, 1981, pp.261-262).

In spite of these admissions, Kramer (1987) continues to argue against the conventional wisdom that 'he who pays the piper calls the tune', claiming that the impact of government funds in controlling organizations is much less than is commonly believed. Salamon (1987) expresses similar views; quoting both Kramer and Hartogs and Weber he argues that there is little empirical evidence of dilution of the advocacy role of the voluntary organization, or of distortion of the voluntary agency's mission by 'vendorism'. Such views are at considerable variance with those of the critics of statutory funding described earlier in this section, especially the deep reservations expressed by some of the commentators on the role of the MSC in funding voluntary sector activities in Britain during the 1980s.

3. The Impact of Statutory Funding on Implementation/Service Delivery
An area of particular concern to observers of the MSC's role in the funding of British voluntary agencies has been that of the impact of MSC funding on service delivery, given the implications of this funding for staffing. The direct constraints applied by the MSC to employee selection and length of contract are
seen to have consequences for the availability of certain skills. Dissatisfaction has been expressed with the length of placement (twelve months for the great majority of non-supervisory staff) and the attendant discontinuities of service (Heginbotham, 1986; Hartley-Brewer, 1985; Leat et al., 1986; Everatt, 1985; Jordan, 1987). Hartley-Brewer's comment is typical:

"...most caring tasks require a relationship of trust and substance to be developed with people who may be under stress or be highly demanding, which often takes considerable time...Community Programme placements, under the current time limit, cannot be used without noticeably disregarding the need for consistency, dependability and trust...".

The lack of management and supervisory skills in the employees recruited to such posts are also stressed by Heginbotham (1986); Addy and Scott (1987); Jordan (1987). Heginbotham criticizes the tendency of MSC schemes not to provide reasonable central administration costs. Walsh (1985), similarly concerned, argues that it is no solution to direct resources from other parts of the organization to subsidize the Community Programme. Addy and Scott (1987) give an extreme example of the particular problems of financial management which can arise in the course of rapid expansion of a voluntary sector service delivery organization. Age Concern, Salford, obtained £1 million of MSC funds in less than 3 months in 1983, expanding from one paid worker in 1981 to 300 employees in 1983. However, 'creative use' of the MSC funding led to over-commitment, lack of financial control, eventual bankruptcy and the dismissal of the chief executive in 1987. The MSC's own report (Normington et al., 1986) acknowledged such issues, accepting the need for improved training of managers and supervisors.

The drain on the MSC-funded voluntary agency in recruiting, training and supervising new staff only to have to repeat the process when they leave, is emphasized by Heginbotham (1986), Hartley-Brewer (1985) and Walsh (1985). Walsh draws attention to the ability of the MSC to directly constrain the voluntary organization's approach to training by insisting on a particular supervisor-trainee ratio as a condition of funding; in the particular case he describes this entailed a dilution of the existing ratio to a level which the organization found unacceptable on safety grounds and in terms of its own standards of effective management and control of trainees.

The impact on staff of employment on Community Programme projects is a focus for critical comment (Walsh, 1985; Heginbotham, 1986; Hartley-Brewer, 1985;
Everatt, 1985; Addy and Scott, 1987; Maguire, 1986; Jordan, 1987; Grayson, 1985). There is emphasis on the effects on paid staff of discontinuities in supervision, problems of morale and motivation, the predominance of low-paid, part-time jobs. Heginbotham and Grayson both identify a tendency for staff to be exploited. Grayson suggests that voluntary agency employers expect 'commitment' from their Community Programme employees, expressed in the form of working longer hours than those they are paid for. Heginbotham argues that in general, in voluntary agencies insecurely funded on a short-term basis, there is a danger when spare money does appear that voluntary bodies will take on more staff rather than use the money to improve wages and conditions of service. He is critical of management committees which fail to recognize their responsibilities as employers and do not take this role seriously. The possibilities for strained relationships between MSC-funded staff and their management committees are frequently noted by commentators. Jordan (1987) and Addy and Scott (1987) also raise the possibility of problems in the relationship between MSC staff and volunteers generally.

Employees on Community Programme schemes may well have been aware of the disadvantages discussed above. However, as indicated by Everatt (1985), Maguire (1986) and Jordan (1987), they may also have obtained considerable job-satisfaction and welcomed the opportunity offered by work-experience in the voluntary sector. Etherington and Townsend (1985) suggested an improved and extended scheme for a three-year employment/training provision in social services work, which was aimed at eliminating many of the drawbacks for employees presented by the Community Programme. Those writing most recently on the replacement of the Community Programme by the Employment Training Scheme have not seen in the latter any remedy for the deficiencies of the programme it is replacing (Jervis, 1987; Simmonds, 1988).

Concern for the implications of grant-aid for the human resources involved in service delivery is not confined to critics of Britain's MSC Community Programme. Other writers who adopt a more general approach are also concerned, for example, about the availability of skills in administration, financial and personnel management in voluntary organizations which, through grant-aid, statutory and other, have responsibilities for sizable budgets and the employment of paid staff.
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The work of Hartogs and Weber (1978) previously mentioned, emphasized the need for financial management skills on the part of those responsible for managing government funds. Wright et al. observe the impact of increased statutory involvement on management bodies in terms of financial responsibilities:

"...a committee that would have a hard time agreeing to open a window can end up obscurely responsible for literally millions of pounds of government money." (Wright et al., 1985).

Emphasis on the need for administrative skills in delivering voluntary services is also to be found in the work of Hartogs and Weber. British studies which lead to the same conclusion include Hadley et al. (1975) and Abrams et al. (1981).

Van de Ven (1980), who undertook a longitudinal study of 14 early childhood development organizations in Texas, conducted over several years, is exceptional in the attention paid to the behaviour and performance of these agencies from their inception, on the basis of statutory funding, during the planning phases and through the early years of implementation. He stresses the need for skills in prior planning, and in the formulation of policies and procedures, to counter problems of implementation. Van de Ven also advocates beginning on a small-scale basis as this:-

"provides the opportunity to evaluate, modify or improve the design of the new programme before having to cope with the administrative burden of managing a large-scale operation". (Van de Ven, 1980, p121)

This research appears particularly relevant to the situation of service delivery programmes newly created on the strength of government funding, such as the MSC Community Programme permitted.

The lack of management skills on the part of management committee members is remarked upon by the report 'Working Together - Partnerships in local social services' issued by the Association of County Councils, National Council for Voluntary Organizations and the Association of Metropolitan Authorities (1981)...

"Management committees are often the most truly voluntary element in voluntary projects. They are, in many cases, able to devote only limited time to their management functions. Their skills, though formidable in some spheres, may be lacking in others. In undertaking substantial grant-aided projects they enter into commitments for which they may sometimes be ill-prepared...". (Working Together, 1981 p18)
The possibility of lack of management skills on the part of committee members is also identified as a problem by Heginbotham (1986 and 1987); Harris and Billis (1986); Billis (1984b); Leat, Smolka and Unell (1981), Goldsmith (1988) and Strachan (1984). Wooller (1988) argues that the professional voluntary sector has a responsibility to see that lay management committee members acquire appropriate skills. Young (1987), in his comparative study of executive leadership in non-profit, commercial and government organizations in the USA, comments on the tendency of boards of trustees in non-profit organizations to appoint as paid managers people with no formal management training, who learn to manage by trial and error. Leat, Smolka and Unell (1981) made similar observations about secretaries of Councils of Voluntary Service and Rural Community Councils in Britain. Young concludes that the non-profit sector needs not only to recruit talent but to recognize management "as a critical area of activity in non-profit organizations, and an activity that requires adaptation and development of an appropriate mix of skills and perspectives, some of which are more commonly associated with other sectors" (Young, 1987). He sees the non-profit organization's executive leader resembling a government bureau chief dealing with higher administration, given the need to cope (unlike commercial ventures) with regulatory agencies that control the funding and the certification of services financed or overseen by government. To avoid 'government entanglement' the executive leader must cultivate the trustees and large donors and enhance the image of a socially responsible agency.

Young also identifies particular personnel management problems where volunteers as trustees may expect altruistic motivation from paid staff and demonstrate reluctance to use reward schemes. This, says Young, creates basic problems in delivering coherent goals for the organization from which performance criteria can be derived. The public view of non-profit sector workers is influential, he argues; paid staff must be seen to pursue service objectives uncorrupted by selfish financial objectives. Search (1984) describes a similar situation in British charities. Goldsmith (1988) regrets the increase he observes in unionization of voluntary sector paid staff. While accepting that management in the voluntary sector has often been bad or at least patronizing, he rejects arguments about the 'exploitation' of staff, claiming no-one in a charitable organization can possibly benefit by 'exploiting' the staff. In contrast, the criticism of Heginbotham (1986) regarding
the reluctance of voluntary sector employers to spend money on improving staff conditions rather than on direct service, is echoed by Young:-

"In social agencies and charities...in many instances trustees and volunteers exert considerable pressure to keep personnel costs down and devote as many dollars to direct service as possible, though this may not always be the most productive long-run practice." (Young, 1987).

The commonly-held thesis that the employment of paid staff means a decline in volunteer effort, though it receives some support from Richardson and Goodman (1983), is challenged by Leat et al. (1986). Their study of 144 local voluntary organizations concluded that organizations receiving high statutory funding employ more paid staff and more volunteers compared with those receiving lower grant aid. However, while Richardson and Goodman are referring specifically to members of self-help organizations which have used grant-aid to employ a paid staff, it is not clear precisely what type of volunteer effort is being reported and measured in the survey undertaken by Leat et al..

A concern with the potential for strain between paid staff and volunteers, particularly where volunteers have management responsibilities, is found among general commentators and not only among critics of MSC involvement in the voluntary sector in Britain (Billis, 1984b; Wooller, 1988; Heginbotham, 1987; Harris, 1983; Billis and Harris, 1986; Search, 1984; Glendinning, 1986; Wright et al., 1985; Tichy, 1980; Kramer, 1981 and 1987). Reference here to the literature on organizational culture can be illuminating (Schein, 1985; Pettigrew, 1979; Handy, 1976 and 1988) though an awareness of the divergent interpretations of this concept (Bryman, 1984) is useful. Wright et al. suggest that with the employment of professional staff a new culture of 'activism' collides with the older 'philanthropy'. Glendinning describes a similar contrast in his study of a rapidly developing organization for the residential care of people with a mental handicap.

The concept of organizational culture, although it receives no explicit reference, seems relevant to the distinctions drawn by Billis (1984a and 1984b) between the 'self-help' and 'service' images held by participants in the Riverside group of one-parent families. Butler and Wilson (1990) acknowledge the 'cultural problem' which accompanies voluntarism; they describe the 'individualistic culture' of employees in voluntary organizations at odds with the management styles now found in voluntary organizations which are trying to develop and innovate their
strategies. Yet, they argue, the moral overlays of altruism and voluntarism are so pervasive the question of motivating staff largely becomes irrelevant.

The literature on implementation/service delivery in statutory-funded voluntary organizations is dominated by such human resource issues as the experience of employment on MSC-funded programmes, the need for and availability of particular skills in the paid staff and volunteers, and the strains which can develop between these two groups. There is relatively limited reference to other constraints on service delivery in terms of the conditions applied to the receipt of grant aid. For example, Young (1987), above, comments on the need for certification of services. Johnson (1981) stresses that the funders' insistence on the payment of certain salary levels to staff can have considerable impact on the activities of an organization. Wolfenden (1978) acknowledged that the attachment to government grants of controls on salaries, hours of work and holiday periods may be seen as undesirable interference by recipients. Salamon (1987) notes the regulatory provisions that may be attached to US government programmes, i.e. facilities must sometimes be certified and guidelines on client/staff ratios, employment practices, provisions for handicapped people, must be adhered to.

Such formal constraints on service delivery, though they attract less attention in the literature than issues of the demands on the available human resources, should not be overlooked. Similarly, the possibilities that the availability of statutory funding may influence an organization's recruitment and deployment of staff should be considered. The choice of a particular pattern of staffing, or a decision to increase the numbers of volunteers used, may be made as a means of enhancing the chances of obtaining or retaining grant-aid. The possibility that the physical resources available for service delivery are influenced by statutory funding also deserves attention. The experiences of users of voluntary services supported by statutory funding would also appear to be highly relevant, yet commentators have largely ignored this as an area for research. The issues identified here seem largely disregarded in the existing literature.

4. Impact of Statutory Funding in Terms of Accountability
Of the four topics particularly prominent in the literature relevant to the statutory funding of voluntary organizations it is that of 'accountability' which attracts most comment in relation to the effects on independence or autonomy. The
confusions surrounding the concept of accountability are acknowledged by some writers (e.g. Leat et al., 1986; Kramer, 1981; Brilliant, 1973; Hatch, 1980; Hatch and Mocroft, 1983). To Kramer (1981) the popularity of the concept of accountability in the human services is exceeded only by the lack of agreement about its meaning.

The Wolfenden Report used the term 'accountability' strictly in the financial sense of auditing accounts, referring to 'responsibility' when discussing the need to monitor the effectiveness of a service in terms of how well the job is done. Others distinguish between financial/fiscal monitoring and programme monitoring, describing both as forms of accountability (Kramer, 1981; Leat, 1986; Judge, 1982; Hatch, 1980; Leat et al., 1986). Kramer offers a minimal definition of answering to those who control a necessary scarce resource. This, he says, involves an obligation to report how the organization is discharging its significant fiscal responsibilities in appropriate detail so that decisions can be made. Berg and Wright (1980) refer to accountability as including:

"...all of those procedures and processes that are designed to monitor programme performance and expenditure for the purposes of providing feedback to the funding source. Accountability may involve, therefore, a range of techniques including both process and outcome evaluations, information storage and retrieval, formal accounting systems, cost-effectiveness or efficiency measures etc. (Berg and Wright, 1980).

Berg and Wright confine their discussion of accountability to those formal requirements of the funding body for monitoring of expenditure and programme performance. Other commentators discuss such accountability to the funding source as only one aspect of this issue. Leat et al. (1986) for example, like Kramer (1981), draw attention to the 'multiple constituencies' of voluntary organizations, i.e. their members, various funders, clients etc. Wright et al. (1985) also refer to 'multiple accountability', including the community as part of a similar list. Hatch (1980) includes responsibilities for relationships with clients in his definition of accountability. Hatch and Mocroft (1983) stress the influence of accountability to professional peers, an issue also noted by Kramer (1981). Goulding and Goulding (1983) emphasize accountability to the local community, while Mellor (1985) adds responsibility for staff. There is, it seems, an application here of a definition of accountability in the broader sense of responsibility or commitment to key groups involved in the organization's operations, where there may be no formal expression of accountability requirements.
While the present discussion is concerned with the application by funding sources of formal accountability in terms of fiscal and programme monitoring it is appropriate to note the concern of some commentators regarding to the possibility of conflict due to 'multiple accountability' (Leat et al., 1986; Wright et al., 1985; Kramer, 1981).

Issues of reconciling responsibilities for local accountability with accountability to funders exercise some writers in Britain who have focused specifically on the Community Programme (Maguire, 1986; Addy and Scott, 1987; Hartley-Brewer, 1985). For Manser (1974), writing with reference to the USA, the whole issue of accountability is characterized by a clear conflict in values, with the concerns of the voluntary organization for quality of life, community control, user choice, involvement of clientele, accessibility of services, set against management concerns for efficiency, low unit costs, effectiveness in terms of outcome. Wright et al. (1985) suggest there may be conflict between the kind of evaluation the organization needs for itself and that needed for its funders.

The possibility that diversification of funding sources protects the voluntary organization from loss of independence due to statutory funding is raised by a number of commentators (Goulding and Goulding, 1983; Kramer, 1981 and 1987; Leat et al., 1986; Wolfenden, 1978; Knapp et al., 1988; Rosenbaum, 1981; Butler and Wilson, 1990; Saxon-Harrold, 1986). However, the discussion of multiple accountability above is a reminder that the acquisition of funding from a range of different sources can bring its own problems. Knapp et al. (1988) stress that multiple sources of income require multiple negotiations and multiple sets of regulations, such that multiplicity can itself quickly constrain and divert. Leat et al. (1986), Rosenbaum (1981) and Wright et al. (1985) offer similar arguments. Leat et al. observe that even when diversification is possible (and this is not an option equally available to all organizations) diversification alone does not necessarily create independence:-

"...one may be as dependent upon the last £1,000 or five per cent of income as on the first £25,000 or 50% of income. Independence is in large part a matter of knowing what the terms of the bargain are and rather less a function of precise sums of money or percentages of income." (Leat et al., 1986 pp. 137-138).

A sanguine view of the issue of accountability to government funding sources is prominent in the literature, with the work of Kramer much-quoted in support of
claims that the threat to independence from accountability requirements is far less than has been popularly supposed. To Kramer (1981) the obligation to report how the organization is discharging its service and fiscal responsibilities in appropriate detail does not necessarily impair an agency's freedom, although he sees that red tape and reporting requirements may be costly nuisances and may deflect agency resources. He distinguishes this reporting back, essential to accountability, from restrictions on agency functioning which might limit autonomy. His research, based on the reports of the executive leaders of 80 voluntary organizations in four countries, showed it was felt there were few instances of unacceptable government requirements imposed on service programmes, governance and administration. Kramer (1981) concluded that voluntary agency autonomy is seldom compromised by the accountability requirements of governmental funding sources. More often, there is a low level of regulation and a closeness based on mutual dependency. Here, he seems to be equating autonomy with the lack of formal accountability requirements:-

"Perhaps the most noteworthy condition mitigating any substantial challenge to the freedom of the voluntary agency is the low level of accountability demanded by government." (Kramer, 1981 p.162).

Government bureaucrats lack incentive and capacity for requiring stricter forms of accountability, argues Kramer. They lack sufficient personnel for close monitoring and are in any case dependent on what is in most cases a monopoly on service delivery. His views contrast with those of Berg and Wright (1980) who claim that strict accountability can be required by government, involving forms of reporting back which do limit agency freedom. On the basis of their research into two forms of funding relationship, they conclude that a funding agreement which is both service-based and demands strict and ongoing accountability (e.g. extensive information-gathering and analysis routines) will tend to limit the degrees of freedom available to the agency:-

"In other words, agencies which operate within such relationships will be forced to adjust their internal structures and processes in order to conform to the expectations of this domain consensus. On the other hand, programmes that operate with funds provided on a block-grant basis with minimal accountability requirements will be more likely to retain their control over their operations and operational goals." (Berg and Wright, 1980).

Kramer (1981), however, listing the available sources of government funding in order of potential control by government, argues that payments for service
generally involve fewer measures of control than grants and are less likely to threaten autonomy. Accordingly, he places grants at the top of the list, followed by subsidies, payments for service, contracts for purchase of service, third-party payments for service and vouchers.

It is noteworthy that Kramer was reliant, in his research, on the reports of the executive leaders of charities for handicapped people, located in metropolitan areas; in the case of Britain, all were national charities. Berg and Wright examined the histories of four different voluntary service organizations over a number of years, though regrettably they provide no information on the research methods employed. Their work remains a useful reminder of the need to look closely at the particular arrangements attached to funding, given that different forms of statutory funding can require different forms of accountability.

Kramer's arguments on the low level of accountability demanded by government receive considerable attention in the literature, with support coming from a range of sources. Salamon (1987) agrees with Kramer that the instruments for accountability and control available to government have been far weaker than is assumed. However, while he describes performance criteria as difficult to fashion and apply, he acknowledges that governments have thereby often resorted to reporting procedures that increase the burdens on agencies without providing governments with an effective means of oversight. There is considerable agreement with the claim that the type of reporting back which has been required by government has been inappropriate, with fiscal monitoring often emphasized, though far from universal, and programme monitoring confined to counting numbers of users and quantities of services (Hartogs and Weber, 1978; Leat et al., 1986; Judge, 1982; Hoogland DeHoog, 1985; Leat, 1986). In Britain, the MSC's own report on the Community Programme scheme made the point forcibly:

"A lot of time and work goes into the appraisal, monitoring and evaluation of projects; in the process a lot of information is collected. But much of the effort is devoted to the means of providing (employee) places and to the correctness of the financial system rather than to what the project has achieved." (Normington et al., 1986 p.39).

There is also support for Kramer's argument that the statutory funding bodies themselves lack sufficient resources for close monitoring of recipients (Leat, 1986; Glennerster, 1985; Brenton, 1985a), together with claims that insufficient resources for monitoring/evaluation are made available to the voluntary organizations in
receipt of statutory funding (Graycar, 1983; Leat et al., 1986; Leat, 1986; Hoogland De Hoog, 1985).

Leat et al. (1986) found few of the voluntary organizations in their study mentioned loss of independence as a disadvantage of receiving statutory funding. Like Kramer, Leat et al. relate this to the low accountability required, which they describe as generally symbolic, taking the form of 'going through the motions'. Judge (1982) drew similar conclusions from his research, describing the monitoring which does take place as often only a token attempt to appreciate what is happening on the ground. However, Leat (1986) sees evidence of increasing demand by statutory bodies for written obligations and closer accountability, a trend she expects to develop further if a more formal and extensive policy of voluntary sector provision is adopted in Britain. Groves and Mellett (1988), describing plans for government grants to Welsh voluntary bodies to be related to identified programmes laid down by the authorities, provide support for this prediction. Holroyd (1988) sees impetus for change in the Griffiths Report (1988), which will, he suggests, bring a greater role for the voluntary sector probably at the expense of local government. Precise targets, highly specific objectives and a defined method of meeting objectives are seen as inhibiting the voluntary sector. However, to avoid ill-defined, duplicated, poor value services local government needs a corporate approach to assessing performance and evaluating outcomes, complemented by self-audit within the voluntary sector. Gutch and Young (1988) see self-audit and mutual audit by organizations as viable complements to the external audit which increasingly will be imposed upon voluntary organizations in an era of contracting.

Leat et al. (1986) suggest that voluntary organizations may see no need for monitoring and evaluation of their work. Hatch (1980) found no 'searching interest' on the part of the voluntary organizations in forms of accountability other than financial. Three years later, Hatch and Mocroft (1983), comparing voluntary organizations in Suffolk and Islington, found these organizations did not see the need to monitor their own performance, while the majority were not made accountable to their local authority funders by routinized administrative procedures for monitoring effectiveness and efficiency. The local authorities tended to rely on informal monitoring mechanisms, i.e. local community networks, membership of management committees by councillors and officers acting in a private capacity. Monitoring by such means can have limitations, say Hatch and
Mocroft; it does not provide an incentive for rigorous questions about ends and means, about whether all recipients need services, whether there are alternatives more cost-effective than existing service patterns.

The implications of many of the foregoing comments on the forms of accountability required by government funding sources are that, while independence may not be threatened by the low accountability attached to funds received, there are problems accompanying such lack of accountability. As Leat observes:

"The (relative) independence of the voluntary sector is an important principle but should not blind us to the fact that in practice the price of that principle may sometimes be low or variable standards, gaps and inequities in provision." (Leat 1986).

Kramer (1987) claims that accountability requirements which emphasize performance monitoring and evaluation can be beneficial to a voluntary agency that seeks to improve its efficiency and the effectiveness of its service programme. A similar implication can be found in the research of Hadley et al. (1975) on the development of Task Force. They observe that the grant-aiding bodies on whom Task Force depended for its income, i.e. local authority departments, were mainly interested because the organization could mobilize large numbers of volunteers and they themselves were short of staff. These attitudes reinforced Task Force's concern with quantity rather than quality of relationships. There was a lack of 'qualitative scrutiny'. Time for evaluation of voluntary work by the local authorities was limited. Rough and ready measures of assessment were used, reminiscent of those later identified by Hatch and Mocroft (1983), i.e. the impressions of social services staff, the absence of negative feedback, and Task Force's own limited data on its work, and aura of competence. The authors conclude:

"...this fairly informal and undemanding relationship between the local authorities and Task Force has probably influenced the managerial process and priorities within the latter." (Hadley et al., 1975 p.167).

Leat et al. (1986) observe some willingness within the voluntary sector to conspire with the statutory sector in the view that the voluntary sector can perform
miracles. This they attribute to the desire of voluntary organizations for recognition and funds:

"A clearer, more open specification of the degree of influence which is expected in return for grant aid is, in our opinion, a more relevant and realistic safeguard to the independence of the voluntary sector than an emphasis on diversification of sources of funding." (Leat et al., 1986 p.137).

They conclude with a plea for greater clarity and honesty on the part of voluntary organizations about what can be achieved over a period and at what cost. They acknowledge that organizations would have to make effective and efficient use of grant aid in order to drive clearer, harder bargains with statutory funders, but what counts as efficient and effective work would be a matter for mutual agreement between parties. Kramer (1981) sees contracts for purchase of service, with mutual expectations worked out in the bargaining process, as one of the best means for balancing the value of a voluntary agency's independence and government's need for accountability. Gladstone (1979), arguing for statutory support of voluntary bodies without statutory control, proposes the development of non-statutory agencies to help voluntary bodies conduct self-audit or self-review.

Pleas for 'balance' between independence and accountability are widely found in the relevant literature (Rice, 1975; Knapp et al., 1988; Hatch, 1983; Brilliant, 1973; Rosenbaum, 1981; Mellor, 1985; Johnson, 1981; Labelle, 1983; Leat, 1986; Wolfenden, 1978). Salamon's view is typical:

"...government's need for economy, efficiency and accountability must be tempered by the non-profit sector's need for a degree of self-determination and independence of governmental control; but that sector's desire for independence must in turn be tempered by government's need to achieve equity and to make sure that public resources are used to advance the purposes intended." (Salamon, 1987).

COMMENT

The foregoing review of relevant literature shows the available figures indicating a rapid growth in statutory funding of the voluntary sector in the past decade in Britain, most notably through the provision of direct, largely short-term funding by quangos/non-departmental public bodies, by-passing local authorities. It also indicates the paucity of empirical research relevant to the issue of the impact of the availability of such funding on the service delivery organizations which have
received it. This is particularly the case with regard to those 'instant organizations' newly-created on the basis of such funding.

That there is widely-felt concern for and interest in the general issue of statutory funding of the voluntary sector is not in doubt. There is no lack of quantity of material. A variety of approaches is evident; they include impressionistic first-hand accounts, case studies, extensive surveys, and reviews of the existing literature used as the basis for general conclusions about the effects of statutory funding on voluntary organizations. No clear picture emerges from all this material, indeed there appears to be substantial disagreement with regard to the themes particularly prominent in the literature.

Many writers criticize what they perceive as the effects of statutory funding on organizational structure, especially those observers of MSC funding of the voluntary sector in Britain. There is a particular concern with the influence of statutory funding on the role of volunteers in governance. Some commentators query the extent to which the 'bureaucratization' and 'formalization' of voluntary agencies can be attributed merely to the acceptance of statutory funding. Some studies suggest that problems arise because of the lack of such structural developments, given the involvement of voluntary organizations in service delivery on a large scale. There are indications of the need for appropriate prior planning here.

Consideration of the writing on the impact of statutory funding on organizational goals reveals a substantial body of criticism with, for example, fears of goal-deflection or goal-displacement and loss of the advocacy role. This is particularly apparent among British commentators on MSC funding, with the suggestion here also that the goals of Community Programme projects could be hastily or inadequately formulated, with a lack of prior research and planning. More generally, there are a number of writers who draw attention to the problems of goals to be pursued in situations of rapid growth. However, some writers express considerable optimism on the issue of organizational goals, offering forceful rejections of the argument that the acceptance of statutory funding jeopardizes the mission of the voluntary agency. There are, though, reminders of the existence of different forms of statutory funding, and of the need to examine the particular arrangements involved when considering the constraints funding sources may place on the voluntary organization. Also noteworthy are the suggestions that lack of
clarity of objectives can lead to conflict both within voluntary organizations and between voluntary organizations and their funding bodies, as much of a threat to the independence of the voluntary organization as detailed specifications and controls by the funding agency.

The issue of the impact of statutory funding on service delivery generates in the literature a particular concern with implications for staffing. There is a general emphasis on the need for management/supervisory/personnel and financial management skills. Van de Ven (1980) is exceptional here in the stress placed on the need for skills in prior planning, the formulation of policies and procedures, in new service delivery organizations. Among commentators on the Community Programme in Britain there are anxieties about the quality of care which can be provided by a perpetually changing staff group with a constant need for training. Problems of management committees adapting to the role of employer are raised more generally in the literature, together with the possibility of tensions between paid staff and volunteers. The limited attention paid in the literature to the direct constraints on service delivery due to the conditions attached to grant-aid was noted, for example, restrictions on the staff-user ratio.

Much comment is devoted in the literature to the issue of accountability, especially in relation to the effects on independence/autonomy of accountability to statutory funding sources. The distinction between fiscal monitoring and programme monitoring is commonly made. Some writers discuss accountability only in terms of the formal arrangements applied by funding sources. Others emphasize the multiple nature of accountability, here adopting a use of the term which implies the existence of responsibility to key groups other than funders, even given an absence of formal requirements. Views conflict on the extent to which diversification of funding sources protects the voluntary organization from loss of independence due to statutory funding. A number of commentators, apparently equating freedom with lack of accountability, see little or no threat to autonomy given the general absence of formal accountability requirements made by statutory funding bodies. There are conflicting and somewhat inconsistent views here, too, with reminders of the need to look closely at the different kinds of accountability which may attach to different forms of statutory funding, and of the possibility that problems (for example in standards of service and inequities in provision) can accompany lack of accountability.
There is apparent in the literature a failure to explore systematically the different origins of the impacts of statutory funding on the receiving organization. The distinction between fiscal and programme monitoring is found in the literature, while there are also acknowledgements that other formal restrictions can be applied which act as constraints on the receiving organization. This group of formal constraints, conditions on the receipt of grant aid, should be distinguished from the impacts which can be attributed to the pursuit of policy chosen in the attempt to obtain/retain funding. Here, decisions are taken within the voluntary organization to adopt policies thought likely to impress the existing/potential funder. Intermediate between compliance with formal conditions and strategic choice are the responses of those within the voluntary organization to referred influences of the receipt of statutory funding, for example, the pressures due to multiple funding for skills in administration and financial management, or to the demands of supervising a constantly-changing staff.

The existence of at least these three types of impact can be derived from the available literature. The distinctions tend to be submerged in discussions of the effects of statutory funding on 'goal-displacement' or 'governance', and especially the predominance of concern with the relationship between 'independence' and formal accountability. However, an awareness of these distinctions in type of impact would seem advisable in the interests of clarity and systematic consideration.

Any conclusions about the applicability of previous research to the particular case of voluntary sector service delivery organizations created on the basis of short-term statutory funding must be drawn with caution. Much of the available material derives from surveys. While these have the advantages of scale and the opportunity to debunk popular myths, they offer a composite picture, with the reader often unable to establish the origins of the various voluntary organizations included. The agencies in receipt of statutory funding may have been agencies which existed prior to the acquisition of funding, as well as those newly created on the strength of such funding. Kramer (1981) identifies all the British voluntary organizations he studied as national charities, thus rendering doubtful the justification for generalizing his findings to the experiences of local self-help groups moving into service delivery. Also, the consideration together in surveys of new and long-established organizations assumes differences in development are unimportant, an assumption which is unjustified, argue Kimberley, Miles and
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Associates (1980). The relationship of the particular history of a voluntary agency to its response to dependence on short-term yet substantial statutory funding remains to be investigated.

Surveys may also conceal differences in the types of statutory funding received by voluntary organizations. The literature review suggested that the procedures and conditions attached to statutory funding can vary according to the particular source of that funding. In exploring the impact of statutory funding on a voluntary organization such variations could prove to be significant. Where a voluntary organization is simultaneously in receipt of two or more different sources of statutory funding, it is important to establish what differences in impact there may be and whether the combination of funding itself has consequences for the receiving organization. Leat et al. (1986), commenting on their survey of 144 organizations, emphasized their inability to do justice to the differences between the various sources and forms of statutory funding or to their effects on different types of organizations over varying periods of time. Kramer (1987) advocates case-studies of different modes of government funding and their impact on inter-organizational relationships, on advocacy and on clientele.

The writer identified some examples of British case-studies which might be thought to contribute to the exploration of such issues. Billis (1984b), Glendinning (1986), Goulding and Goulding (1983), provide scant evidence on the sources and nature of the funding acquired by the individual organizations they studied. Hadley et al. (1975) offer a partial exception, but here the aim of the study was to provide an evaluation of the service, rather than a systematic study of the funding relationship. This work is nevertheless a source of useful insights into the possible influence of accountability to funding sources on voluntary service management and service delivery. American writings provided more relevant case-study material, with examples of rapid growth of new organizations on the basis of government funding, and of different patterns of accountability to funding sources (Berg and Wright, 1980; Van de Ven, 1980; Tichy, 1980; Kimberley, 1980b).

Some research into the issue of voluntary sector 'independence' relies on asking executive directors/chairpersons whether they feel this has been jeopardized by the receipt of statutory funding (Judge, 1982; Saxon-Harrold, 1986; Leat et al., 1986; Kramer, 1981). The limitations of this approach are noted by Wright (1986). In his review of Leat et al. 'A Price Worth Paying' (1986), he advocates a fuller approach,
involving ways of investigating a whole range of organizational questions: the possible stretching and exhaustion of voluntary management procedures with the change and re-distribution of responsibilities; the impact of professional administration on traditional forms of membership and management; the changing balance between functions, with some becoming 'peripheral and project-based victims of permanently insecure funding cycles'. The exploration of such issues would benefit from the opportunity to observe and document the operations of voluntary organizations over an extended period, studying the experiences and responses of a range of parties, not merely those at the centre of decision-making and policy-formulation. The contribution service users might make to the debate on the influence of statutory funding on service delivery in the voluntary sector seems to have been largely overlooked in previous research.

Much of the relevant literature, British and American, especially that derived from surveys using one-off questionnaires or interviews, can offer only 'snapshots' of organizations in receipt of statutory funding. Leat et al. (1986) note the need to examine the effects of statutory funding on different organizations over varying periods of time. Kramer (1987) recommends longitudinal studies, using a life-cycle model, of the origin, growth and change - and possible decline - of voluntary agencies, to learn how different types of agencies adapt to changing circumstances in their environment, and to find why some organizations succeed better than others. The approach advocated by Kramer had previously been forcefully argued by Kimberley, Miles and Associates (1980) and Pettigrew (1979). Kimberley (1980a) for example, criticizes the 'static orientation' in the literature of organizations, regretting the absence from most research and writing of the dynamic quality of organizational life. Dunkerley (1988) offers a similar argument, describing the emphasis in organizational analysis as largely upon describing and analyzing contemporary phenomena with scant regard being paid to how present characteristics may have emerged from past happenings. Van de Ven (1980) argues, on the basis of a range of case studies, that the conditions under which an organization is born, and the processes followed in its initial development, have important consequences for its structure and performance in later life.

The research which will be described in this thesis is an example of a long-term case-study, which provided the opportunity to observe and record the precise ways
in which a voluntary service delivery organization, created on the basis of short-term statutory funding, responded to dependence on that funding.
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SUMMARY

Part (I) of Chapter 3 considers the use of the single case study, identifying the advantages of this approach and criticisms which it may attract. Part (II) discusses the framework of analysis employed, identifying the research questions to be addressed. Part (III) describes the ways in which the data was obtained in the attempt to provide answers to these questions. Part (IV) outlines some methodological issues encountered by the writer during the research.

PART (I): THE SINGLE CASE STUDY

Beech House gave an unusual opportunity for a major, long-term, in-depth study of a voluntary organization, allowing consideration of the ways in which seeking and obtaining statutory funding influenced the organization. It was possible to closely compare the impacts upon the organization, over time, of two sources of short-term statutory funding. The formal constraints attached to the two sources of funding were not unique to Beech House. The MSC applied the same rules and regulations to other recipient organizations. The County's joint finance authorities were responsible for the allocation of funds to other voluntary organizations under the same arrangements as those applied to Beech House. In this crucial respect, at least, Beech House can be seen as representative of other voluntary organizations receiving funding from these sources.

The use of a single in-depth case study provides a test of the generalizations frequently offered in the literature on statutory funding of the voluntary sector. The findings are shown (Chapters 11 and 12) to justify this approach, given the extent to which such generalizations are challenged, and the insights gained into relatively neglected aspects of the statutory funding issue.

Bryman (1988b) describes the tendencies of researchers in the quantitative tradition to disparage studies based on one or two single cases as unrepresentative and of unknown generality. However, as Bryman points out, survey research is not immune from similar accusations, given the tendency to draw samples from...
localities rather than on a national basis. Where surveys and multiple case studies are able to generalize their findings, they may do so on the basis of relatively superficial data, for example, Saxon-Harrold's discovery that 29 of the 75 voluntary organizations she surveyed rated the MSC as having 'a lot' of influence on strategic decision-making (Saxon-Harrold, 1986). The Beech House study, unlike a number of major surveys on voluntary organizations, was not confined to seeking the views of the chief executive, director, or chairperson. It was possible to gather material on the views of participants from all sectors of the organization, together with service users. The latter group has been widely over-looked in studies of the impact of statutory funding on the voluntary sector. Their experiences of the services funded by statutory sources are surely highly relevant to any exploration of how seeking and obtaining statutory funding for voluntary action affects the delivery of services to users. As Chapter 3 shows, below, the Beech House study permitted a wide range of people and activities to be studied, using a variety of methods of data collection.

Case studies are also criticized on the grounds of the development in the researcher of a false sense of certainty about his/her own conclusions (Goode and Hatt, 1952). The writer tried to remain constantly aware of this danger, and of the need to rely on data rather than intuition in the formulation of conclusions. She was able to discuss the data and its interpretation with the research director, who was involved with the Project as a member of the Executive Committee as well as overseeing the progress of the research. Key individuals in the Society and the Project had the right to correct any factual inaccuracies in the material which provides the basis for this thesis.

The issue of lack of opportunity for replicability is also raised with regard to the use of case studies in social research (Bryman, 1988b). Certainly the particular situation at Beech House during the research cannot be replicated; the people, the funding, the environment in which the Project operates have all now changed substantially. The same problems could apply to any attempt to replicate a major survey. However, the framework of analysis used in the Beech House research can be applied to other voluntary service delivery organizations, for purposes of comparison. To accept lack of replicability as sufficient argument for eschewing this type of case study would be to lose access to a source of valuable information on the influence of statutory funding on voluntary organizations which could not be obtained in any other way.
PART (II): FRAMEWORK OF ANALYSIS

A study which takes as its focus the influence of statutory funding on a voluntary sector service delivery organization created on the strength of such funding, clearly embodies the assumption that an understanding of the context of the organization is crucial to an understanding of the organization's activities. As Pfeffer and Salancik have argued with reference to organization theory:-

"Most current writers give only token consideration to the environmental context of organizations. The environment is there, somewhere outside the organization, and the idea is mentioned that environments constrain or affect organizations. Somehow, the things to be managed are usually within the organization, assumed to be under its control and often have to do with the direction of low level hired personnel. When authors get down to the task of describing the running of the organization the relevance of the environment fades. Yet, the idea that organizational actions are socially constrained means that part of the explanation for behaviour can be found in the social context." (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978, pp.257-258).

It is therefore interesting to find that Handy's guide to the effective functioning of voluntary organizations (Handy, 1988) offers recommendations on motivating individuals, designing structures and systems, with barely a reference to the relationships with the funding sources essential for survival.

Gamm (1983), in his study of voluntary health organizations in North America, describes the conduct of inter-organizational relations as an essential part of management. He emphasizes the need to focus more attention on the environmental side of organization - environment relations, considering the goals and activities of a number of organizations as they relate to a focal organization or collectivity of organizations. Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) see the key to organizational survival as the ability to acquire and maintain resources. Such perspectives seem particularly appropriate to the voluntary sector service delivery organization dependent on short-term statutory funding sources for its continued operation. Accordingly, in the attempt to explore how such resource-dependence can influence organizational design and behaviour, a framework of analysis was required which would permit a systematic examination of the interrelationships between those constituents of its environment relevant to the organization's acquisition and use of financial resources (see Fig. 3.1). Those constituents with the power to influence the operation of the Project and/or its continuation will have their own, possibly conflicting, goals to pursue. These may or may not be
Figure 3.1: The Context of the Project
made explicit to other constituents and may or may not be compatible with the goals formally espoused by the Project and the Society which created it.

The Context of the Project

An early step in the research is the identification of the constituents of this complex network of interrelationships, each constituent influencing and being influenced by other constituents. Three levels of context are distinguished in Fig. 3.1:-

(i) The immediate context of the service delivery organization ('the Project'), i.e. the Society which initiated the Project and the Society's elected representatives; the inner circles represent these constituents of the environment of the Project. The nature of the Project-Society relationships needs to be established, together with the respective relationships of the long-established Society and the new Project with the external context.

(ii) Local level:- Here it could be anticipated that the network would comprise individuals, groups and organizations including, for example, those with the power to give or withhold financial support; statutory service departments (officers and practitioners); local politicians; other voluntary organizations. The identification of the relevant constituents would be a necessary preliminary to consideration of the relationships of the respective constituents with the Society, with the Project and with each other.

(iii) National level:- The Society/Project may have direct dealings with organizations at national level. It is also possible that, for example, well-publicized Project events involving nationally known individuals could raise awareness of the organization within the local community. An awareness of the national context is important, albeit impossible to examine in any detail given the scope of the research. The network of interrelationships operates in a climate set nationally by Government policies on unemployment, on the National Health Service, on joint finance, urban renewal, care in the community and expanding the roles of voluntary social services and private care agencies vis-a-vis state provision. Legislative changes, for example, could influence the way in which the Project is able to acquire and use government-provided financial resources.
In addition to the foregoing, a framework of analysis is required which permits the systematic intra-organizational examination of the influence of statutory funding on a Project which has been created on the strength of short-term statutory funding. The literature review suggested that certain aspects of the structure and process of voluntary organizations had attracted particular attention. The influence of statutory funding on the choice of goals, for example, was a popular issue, yet explicit emphasis on other aspects of the planning process, such as the design of policies and procedures, was sporadic. Discussion of changes in structure, attributed to the impact of statutory funding, tended to be general in nature and lacking precise definition. Although clear statements are made linking changes in structure and process to statutory funding (Addy and Scott, 1987; Berg and Wright, 1980), attempts to explore this relationship systematically are not generally found. An exception is Van de Ven (1980) who, in his study of the application of formalized procedures as a condition of government funding, uses structure and process as the basis for a systematic examination of child-care agencies. Here, though, he restricts attention to one dimension of structure, i.e. formalization, rather than considering complexity and centralization. These structural dimensions all attract some attention in the literature on voluntary sector funding, though the terms themselves are often absent, submerged in general discussions of 'bureaucratization'.

Analysis in terms of structure and process is seen by Checkland (1972) as appropriate in cases where a problem situation is relatively vague. This is now popularly termed the 'soft systems' approach, advocated by Bolton (1987), for example, for use in the exploration of organizations currently faced with implementing the shift from institutional to community care. For Checkland, the situation will contain elements of 'structure' which are relatively static and elements of 'process' which are dynamic, the former existing as the framework in which the latter operates. Checkland suggests that the analysis should provide answers to the following questions:

1. What resources are deployed, in what operational processes, under what planning procedures, within what structure, in what environments and wider systems and by whom?

2. How is this resource deployment monitored and controlled?
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Thus, this approach offers what is generally lacking in the literature on the influence of statutory funding on the receiving voluntary agency, i.e. a way of systematically examining, within the individual organization, the effects of this dependence.

It is important to stress that statutory funding should not be seen as deterministic. As Leat, Smolka and Unell (1981) argue with reference to funding in general, it should be seen as one factor interacting with others which it may affect and be affected by. Figure 3.1 is a reminder of the complexity of the environment in which funding sources and the recipient voluntary agencies operate, and of the network of interrelationships involved. Also, Dawson (1986) emphasizes that, even if the environmental features do, within a short-term time-span, largely 'determine' what happens within an organization, the part played by individuals' perceptions and interests should not be overlooked, given their influence on choice of strategy in organizations.

For the purposes of this study 'structure' is considered in terms of the three interrelated dimensions described in Hendrick (1987):

1. **Complexity** refers to the degree to which organizational activities are differentiated (vertically, horizontally, geographically) and the extent to which integrating mechanisms are utilized to coordinate and facilitate the functioning of the differentiated components.

2. **Formalization** is the degree to which an organization relies on rules and procedures to direct the behaviour of people.

3. **Centralization** refers to the extent to which the locus of decision-making authority is either centralized or dispersed downward in the hierarchy.

With regard to 'process', Checkland considers this in terms of the basic activities of planning to do something, doing it, monitoring how well it is done and its external effects, and taking the necessary corrective action. For the purposes of this study these activities are defined as follows:

**Planning**, is seen as establishing goals and designing an enabling infrastructure. This requires consideration of the goals to be pursued, their clarity of definition,
compatibility, and acceptability to participants; how far the chosen goals are achievable given the available resources, including making explicit any philosophy which has resource implications; setting policies for implementation/service delivery (e.g. deciding who constitutes the clientele, prioritizing clients such that staff have clear criteria for deciding who gets what, how much, how often); setting policies for monitoring the service once delivered; and designing appropriate structures.

Implementation/Service Delivery is seen as the deployment of resources in operational processes directed at the achievement of goals. This requires an enabling infrastructure and underpinning financial resources such that at the point of delivery the necessary resources come together, i.e. human (staff with appropriate skills, motivation and time); physical (accommodation, equipment, facilities); it also requires service users and service providers to have appropriate access to each other.

Monitoring is seen as collecting information relevant to service delivery, according to policies and procedures previously established. This requires those initiating and undertaking monitoring to know:- what information to collect and the uses to which it will be put; how to obtain and store relevant information, retrieve it, disseminate it; how to ensure it is complete, accurate and up to date; how to use it to inform decisions on service delivery; how it may be used to change the goals; how it may be used to change the policies and procedures for monitoring.

Clearly these three processes are interrelated, influencing and being influenced by each other. Setting goals, for example, should not be a once and for all activity, undertaken only at the birth of an organization. The experience of implementation, as recorded through previously agreed monitoring procedures, should be used to review progress and, where necessary, to modify or eliminate existing goals and initiate new goals.

The succeeding chapters seek to answer the questions identified above regarding the influence of statutory funding on the dimensions of structure and on the process activities of planning, implementation and monitoring in voluntary service delivery organizations created on the strength of short-term statutory funding. Where possible, the different types of influence observed will be identified. Distinctions will be made, for example, between the consequences for structure and
process of the operation of formal accountability requirements, other formal restrictions, and chosen responses to the experiences of receipt of short-term statutory funding.

Reference will be made to the expectations, perceptions and evaluations of service users and of members of the key groups influential in the formulation and pursuit of official Project goals, i.e. the Society's Executive Committee; the paid staff; funding agencies; agencies providing services in the field of mental handicap with which the Project services were to be integrated.

The framework of analysis described above was not neatly formulated before the research commenced. The writer, once employed, was committed to an approach previously agreed between those proposing the research and the charity funding the post of Project Manager. This required an 'evaluation', focused on the role of the Project Manager in developing what the Society and research proposal termed 'a comprehensive, integrated service'. The writer, once involved in the research, found that her interest in the wider topic of short-term statutory funding could only be pursued systematically by employing a framework of analysis which would encompass the issues she was observing; this was developed as data-collection progressed.

PART (III) : METHODS OF DATA COLLECTION

Access to the Project and the Society
The problems of access commonly experienced by researchers seeking entry to organizations (Bryman, 1988a) did not arise. Those proposing the research, together with key members of the Society's Executive Committee, had formulated agreed proposals made to the charity for grants to pay the salary of a 'professional' manager (i.e. a manager with professional qualifications in the field of mental handicap) and to fund an 'evaluation' of the service, following the manager's appointment. The research director had accepted an invitation to join the Executive Committee of the Society.

Access to the Beech House Project was assured for a period of three years, from 1st February 1985 to 31st January 1988. The writer was recruited to the position of part-time contract research worker, funded by the charity to 'evaluate' service delivery in terms previously agreed by the Society and the charity. The research
worker was based in a university department and was independent of the Project and the founding Society. Her appointment coincided with that of the manager, funded by the same charity. The research programme was a condition of the Society's receipt of this grant-aid.

Within the organization, however, there were constraints on access to some of the separate services as far as opportunities for observation were concerned. These are identified below. During the research a number of other problems were encountered, some of which derived from the longitudinal nature of the study, others relating to the official label of 'evaluation' and to ethical and political issues. These will be outlined below, following an account of the methods of data collection employed with regard to both the history of the Project and its operation.

The History of the Project
For an understanding of the present-day service a clear picture was required of the way in which the Society had reached the point at which members wished to generate for themselves a family support service. The precise situation which the new Project Manager inherited (for example, organizational structure, formal goals, funding sources, staffing pattern, relationships with relevant groups/organizations) had to be established.

The compilation of this 'history' of the Project was an essential but laborious task, requiring the analysis of documentary material from a wide range of sources, including the minutes of most Society Executive Committee proceedings from 1966, correspondence with funding bodies and other outside agencies, and Society literature such as publicity material. Personal interviews were conducted with a small number of Society members and informed observers with memories of the early development of the Project. Structured interview schedules with open-ended questions were used.

The Operation of the Project February 1st 1985-January 31st 1988
The research worker needed both to document the operation of the Project and to obtain the views of participants (i.e. Society representatives, employees and users) together with their accounts of their experiences of the service. To these ends the research worker used documentary evidence; observation and recording of
meetings; formal interviews with participants and informed observers, and informal discussions.

Methods of data collection
Both qualitative and quantitative data were obtained, as appropriate to the problems being addressed. Given the need to become familiar with all aspects of an organization previously unknown to the researcher, the development of quantitative approaches to the study of service use were dependent on prior qualitative research. Only through observation, documentary research and informal discussion could the information be obtained which was essential to the design of interview schedules for use in formal interviews. Information was obtained through observation and informal discussion which was unlikely to have emerged from formal interview and vice-versa. As the research progressed, observation became increasingly structured, due partly to feedback from formal interviews and informal discussion.

(i) Documentary search: the writer had free access to all documents in the possession of the Society which related to the Society's development and the initiation and funding of the Beech House Project prior to its opening in mid-1983. Documents relating to succeeding funding bids were also provided. In the course of the research the managers provided copies of relevant documents, sometimes in response to requests from the writer, but often on their own initiative.

Prominent among the sources of documentary evidence studied were records of service use maintained within the Project. The writer was given free access to the central files on individual service users which began to be established in 1985. These provided some information on the characteristics of service users and families, the different Project services each individual/family had used and, where appropriate to the type of service, the amount of use and the length of time a service had been used. Additional material on service use was available from the figures compiled by the individual service supervisors. While there were no problems in obtaining access to Project records there were major difficulties with regard to the quality of the records available. These will be outlined in the discussion on integrating mechanisms in Chapter 6 - Organizational Structure. The problems for Project staff of establishing and maintaining service records became an issue for the research.
(ii) Formal interviews: It was decided to use formal interviews to investigate the services used by substantial numbers of customers unknown to the research worker, and provided by a constantly changing staff, some of whom were also little known to the research worker.

Formal interviews were conducted with 29 current or past members of staff, 41 parents and 12 informed observers, including statutory service practitioners and representatives of funding agencies. Several key respondents were interviewed more than once.

Structured interview schedules\(^1\) with open-ended questions seemed appropriate, given the varied nature of the work experiences of staff employed in different branches of the Project, the widely different patterns of service use shown by parents, and the impracticalities of undertaking the pilot studies which would have been required to generate an adequate range of forced-choice responses to questions.

No interviews were undertaken with those Project users with a mental handicap. The writer had regular contact with only a small minority of these users. Many, both adults and children, would have been anxious about responding to questions from a stranger. The writer also lacked the communication skills often essential to any dialogue. However, with regard to the research issues central to this thesis, the contribution of these users would have had limited relevance. Nevertheless the lack of this contribution presents a gap in the data on service use which, though unavoidable, needs to be acknowledged.

No informed observer refused a request for an interview. Some interviews with members of this group took place early in the research, as a means of obtaining information on the Project's history. Others were conducted at intervals during the research, for reasons of accessibility. Some were conducted at the end of the research at a time when those concerned had the necessary experience of Project affairs.

Although the new Project Manager was interviewed for the first time about three months after the research commenced, the writer waited almost a year before

\(^1\)Examples of interview schedules used in the research are presented in Appendix I
approaching the paid staff in general with requests for interviews. This time lapse ensured the writer had sufficient information to permit the construction of interview schedules. It also allowed the writer to settle into the Project and gain the confidence of the staff. Difficult decisions had then to be made regarding the timing of interviews and the selection of staff for interview. There was a constant turnover of staff, and to interview all staff working in the Project over the three year period was an impossibility. The writer was employed on a part-time basis and worked alone. Staff approached for interview were chosen on the grounds of the particular service in which they worked, since representatives of the full range of services were required. It was important to interview non-supervisory staff as well as supervisors and managers. Staff needed to have sufficient experience in the Project to be able to answer questions on working practices. Requests to interview Community Programme staff were made as those concerned were on the point of leaving, to minimize any pressure they may have felt about the interview. Only two members of staff failed to respond to requests for interviews.

Staff interviews, once commenced, were arranged over a period of about 18 months. Therefore, due to changes within the Project, staff interviewed at one time had experiences rather different from those interviewed at another. This was unavoidable, for reasons of practicality. Repeat interviews were arranged with key longer-serving staff members where changes within the Project had affected their branch of the service in a major way.

Interviews with parents on service use only began in the final year of the research. It was clear that these would be so time-consuming, due not least to the travelling involved, that the survey would have to take place at a point when other research tasks could be reduced. Also, the writer needed to become familiar with all aspects of service provision before designing the interview schedule. The selection of parents to approach for interview was also problematic since, for example, representatives of users of the full range of services were required. The writer had to extract information from several sources and compile her own user records before deciding which families to approach. Interviews were obtained with 36 families. The difficulties in obtaining a sample for survey between February and May 1987 are outlined in Appendix VII, where the composition of the final sample achieved is described, together with the detailed findings of the survey regarding access to services. While it was not possible to generalize from the sample, valuable illustrations were obtained of the way parents used the services and the views they
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held about the Project. This information had not been accessible in any other way. The insights the survey permitted into the problems of access to services are considered in Chapter 9 on implementation/service delivery. The information thus obtained did not stand alone, but was considered alongside the data obtained from the analysis of Project records on service use, observation of staff meetings, staff interviews etc.

Formal interviews were often lengthy, especially those with parents. Respondents were allowed to depart from the questions and order of the interview schedule to speak freely about matters that affected them deeply. Every effort was made, however, to elicit responses to all the items included on the interview schedule.

All those approached for interview were given an information leaflet about the research which stressed the independence of the study. Assurances of confidentiality and anonymity were given. Every effort was made to stress that there was no obligation to participate in personal interviews. This was particularly important where the paid staff were concerned; there was a danger that the Society's approval of the research had generated the feeling among its employees that a refusal to cooperate with the research worker might jeopardize future employment prospects.

(iii) Informal discussions: During visits to the Project, to attend meetings and work on the records, the writer was involved in informal discussions, mainly with staff, but also with parents and representatives of statutory services. As the writer became a familiar figure in the house several staff members would freely air their anxieties about their work, knowing their comments would be treated in confidence. Whenever such discussions generated information relevant to research issues the information was recorded in private at the earliest opportunity.

(iv) Observation and recording of meetings: The proceedings of over 300 meetings were observed and recorded. The writer was able to attend all the relevant meetings, i.e. Society Executive Committee meetings; those involving Society representatives and Project staff; liaison meetings with statutory service representatives; parents' evenings and organized events; internal staff meetings including those where the cases of individual families/users were discussed. She chose to withdraw from a few meetings where a person with a mental handicap might have been deterred by her presence.
Formal opportunities for observation and recording were largely confined to attendance at meetings. The researcher devoted the minimum time necessary to the observation of staff delivering care services within Beech House, with only occasional visits to the playgroup and Adult Daycare sessions. There was no intention to make professional judgements of the quality of care delivered to individual users. The writer lacked the professional medical and social work backgrounds which would have been required for this, given the wide range of services provided and the great range of special needs among users. The writer did not request permission to observe domiciliary staff working with families, or Respite Care staff caring for weekend guests. She felt this would be an invasion of the privacy of users. This was a form of constraint on access within the organization, but one which was self-inflicted.

PART (IV) : METHODOLOGICAL ISSUES

Buchanan, Boddy and McCalman (1988) note that researchers' views on what is desirable in research are constantly compromised by the practical realities, opportunities and constraints presented by organizational research. Some instances of such compromise have already been identified in the foregoing discussion, for example, the resource limitations of one part-time worker restricted the numbers of formal interviews which could be undertaken; the personal nature of much of the service delivered by the Project led the researcher to withdraw from certain opportunities for observation. Other methodological issues encountered during the research are identified below.

(i) Participant or non-participant observer: It is arguable whether the role of the writer within Beech House can be defined as that of 'participant observer'. She was in no way disguised so as to be accepted as a member of the group (Bailey, 1978; Goode and Hatt, 1952). Her identity as an independent researcher was always emphasized. If participation in the life of the group is an accepted criterion (Becker and Geer, 1969; McNeill, 1985) such participation only took place to a limited extent. Nor can the activities she undertook within Beech House be described as 'sustained immersion' with a view to generating a rounded, in-depth account of the group (Bryman, 1988b). Her experience of the daily routine of Beech House was limited in a number of respects. However, given the number of meetings to attend and the need to visit the house daily for several weeks when
working on Project records, the researcher became well-known to many of the staff. Although her role as an independent researcher was always made explicit, the staff seemed to find it most comfortable to treat her as a fellow worker. On occasion, she was introduced to newcomers as 'our resident historian'. Thus, although not fully participating in the life of Beech House, the writer was far more than a non-participating observer; this brought advantages in that her understanding of the range of perspectives and experiences within the staff was enhanced, and through staff preparedness to discuss their work in her presence she was able to obtain major insights into the operation of the services which would not have been obtained otherwise. It also brought dangers of over-identification with staff viewpoints of which the writer needed to be constantly aware. The intensive interviews with Society members and parents of users proved a necessary and, it is hoped, an effective counterbalance.

(ii) Getting in and getting on: the problems of access as identified by Buchanan et al. (1988) did not arise, for reasons outlined above. However, access was no guarantee of acceptance. The presence of a researcher as a condition of grant-aid from the charity had been presented to the staff as a fait accompli by their employers. They were understandably anxious. The writer had to stay in the organization for three years and retain the cooperation of the paid staff. This would have been impossible had the staff lacked confidence in the discretion of the researcher. The writer allowed almost a year for the development of the necessary relationship with the staff before seeking information from them through personal interviews. At the start of the research the staff were assured that, although the charity termed the research programme 'an evaluation', no professional judgements on the quality of care delivered would be made. New members of staff with whom the writer came into contact were given the same assurances.

(iii) Change in the organization: The long-term nature of the research involved the writer in documenting the perpetual state of change in which Beech House operated, for example, the constant turnover of staff, including a change of manager half-way through the research; the introduction of new sources of funding; the development of new services; the increasing demand for certain services. The accompanying problems of the timing of interviews and the selection of staff for interview were described above. Bresnen (1988) draws attention to the problems which arise when studying developments in an organization over time,
regarding changing patterns of key informants, changing perspectives and frames of reference. The difficulties in handling the sheer volume of data generated in such situations should not be overlooked. Nor should the temptation to keep accumulating data in the fear of missing something be underestimated.

(iv) Requests for feedback while the research is in progress: Shortly before his departure the Project Manager asked the writer to discuss the problems of the Project's records of service use with a member of staff who was to assume responsibility for the records. With the approval of the research director, the writer agreed to a meeting. However, she stressed to all concerned that she would only help identify issues, and would not formulate prescriptions for action. She made clear that the responsibility for deciding what was possible and appropriate, regarding the contents of records and regarding procedures, lay with management and not the research.

By mid-1986 it was apparent that the state of the Project records on service use was such that the researcher could not obtain the material on these matters which had been promised in the original research proposal to the charity funding the research. The research director felt this commitment should be fulfilled if at all possible and informed the Chairman of the Society of the situation. The researcher was then asked by the Acting Project Manager to inform the relevant staff of the problems she had found with the records and to assist with the establishment of a central records system. The writer was anxious that this involvement should not jeopardize her relationship with the staff. Although she did prepare a statement of the practical problems she had found, she stressed there was no intention to criticize, and that she understood the reasons for the delay in establishing a central records system. The major issues of what information should be recorded and by whom were matters, she felt, for the staff to decide and not for the researcher to prescribe or insist upon. She did participate in discussions with staff, restricting her role to helping them formulate the questions which would assist decision-making on these matters. She was not aware of any hostility or resentment on the part of staff as a result of this involvement. Nevertheless, it was a potentially damaging situation which could have jeopardized the remainder of the research programme.

(iv) Ethical and political issues: Bulmer (1988) argues that ethical issues arising in the negotiation of research access should be considered more fully. He stresses the
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responsibility to show members of the organization draft material in order to allow the correction of factual inaccuracies. Such an agreement had been made between the research director and the Society. However, the formula did not prevent occasional but significant difficulties arising when those given the right to comment asked for additional material to be included, or disagreed strongly between themselves about whether a particular statement was inaccurate.

Bulmer also advocates the use of anonymity in naming the organization. This would have been the writer's preference and anonymity has been preserved for this thesis. However, the research director and the Society had not chosen this approach. Indeed, the existence of the research worker in Beech House was publicized by the Society, for example, in documents relating to bids for funding from statutory social services. It was thought the research would enhance the reputation of the Project in the eyes of professional observers and potential funders.

This situation exposed the research worker to strong pressures from both statutory service representatives involved in decisions on the future funding of Beech House, and from key figures involved with the Project who wished to strengthen their case for future funding. While the research was proceeding she was asked on several occasions to provide the potential funders with information on the Project. This she refused to do, with the support of the research director. The position was taken that the Society would receive a copy of the final report to do with as they wished. Prior to that no information would be released by the researcher for use by potential funding bodies. To have done so would have been to break the assurances given to staff and parents regarding the independence of the research. It was especially important that this position be held, given that the research director was a member of the Society's Executive Committee and potentially vulnerable to criticisms from observers about the independence of the research. These experiences illustrate the need for both the researchers and those giving permission for access to an organization to establish a clear understanding about what the research will and will not provide for the host organization. Ideally, there should be no unrealistic expectations. Such issues need to be anticipated at the proposal stage and agreement reached within and between the researchers and the host organization.
CHAPTER 4 - OUTLINE OF THE BACKGROUND TO THE CREATION OF BEECH HOUSE AND ITS DEVELOPMENT 1982-87

SUMMARY

Chapter 4 outlines the way in which the Beech House Project came to be established in mid-1983 and the changes in formal statements of Project goals, in funding and service provision which took place during the period under consideration. Part I gives a brief general history. The change in the policy of the founding Society towards the provision of its own services and away from the subsidizing of local statutory services, is noted. Beech House relied on short-term funding from a number of sources; Urban Aid and Urban Policy grants provided the necessary accommodation, with the MSC and later joint finance providing the staff required for the delivery of a wide range of services. Not until early 1985 was funding obtained to cover the salary of a 'well-qualified' manager. A charity gave this support, initially for two years. This appointment was seen as ensuring the welding together of the separate services provided by Beech House into a 'comprehensive and integrated service'. It is argued that an understanding of the development of the Project will be enhanced by an appreciation of the complex network of relationships within which Beech House was operating, and of the interrelationships of the relevant components with Beech House and with each other. The state of continual change, internal and external, experienced by the Beech House Project is described. In Part II, particular attention is paid to the changes in the formally-stated goals set for the Project in the period between the time it was conceived in 1982 and the appointment of the second charity-funded manager in 1986. Acknowledgement not only of the commitment to the charity of creating a comprehensive and integrated service, but also of other formal statements of goals set for the Project, will help illuminate later discussions of the structure and process of this service delivery organization. Part III describes the separate services provided by Beech House during the research.

PART (I): THE BACKGROUND TO THE CREATION OF BEECH HOUSE

The Beech House Project was established as a service delivery organization in mid-1983, by a local parent-run society for children and adults with a mental handicap. The Project occupies a secluded site about two miles from the centre of a Midlands market town. The borough which it serves is approximately 108 square miles in
area, with a population of about 150,000. In addition to the market town the borough contains over 30 other parishes in a largely rural setting.

At the time Beech House was established, the Society estimated that in the borough there were 250 families with a mentally handicapped member living at home. In 1985, though, a recently appointed specialist social worker reported having identified a total of 260 people with a mental handicap living in the community in the south of the borough alone. One hundred and ten of these were children. There was no register of people with a mental handicap living in the county. Such a register was in preparation by the Health Authority during the research fieldwork, but when completed this would refer only to adults.

A discussion document presented within the Social Services Department at the end of 1984 predicted an increase in the county of the number of people with a mental handicap. This was anticipated due to changes in the birth rate, in life expectancy and the growth of private and voluntary residential care promoting moves of people with mental handicap into the county from areas with higher property prices. The Society's estimate, in 1983, of 250 families with a mentally handicapped relative living in the borough could well have been too low, therefore, both at the time it was made and during the research. It also excluded those individuals without families or living apart from their families in hospitals, hostels, private care etc. or in their own homes in the community, a number of whom would later become users of the Beech House services.

Prior to the opening of Beech House the Society had spent over 20 years raising funds for local statutory social services, e.g. the special school, the day centre. The Society had only slowly involved itself in pressure group activity and the provision of services to members by members (Shepherd, 1986). The services which were developed concerned the provision of information and of social/leisure activities, not the provision of care. However, by 1982, the dissatisfaction with statutory services felt by some Society members, and their hostility towards those services, had marked the point where, in addition to pressing for improvements in statutory services, they proposed to set up and run themselves a wide range of services. The Executive approved the proposal made by this group of parents. Services would be available to all those 'within reasonable travelling distance' and not confined to residents of the borough. People with a solely physical handicap might also use the
services. The Society ceased to contribute financially to local statutory services, channelling any available funds into the Beech House project.

Funding for Beech House was obtained from three main sources initially. The property, a large Victorian building leased from the County Council, was restored and furnished with an Urban Aid grant. From April 1983 further funds to cover most of the maintenance and running costs for three years were provided by the Urban Policy Sub-Committee of the County Council. The same source provided the salary of a part-time House Manager (house administrator-cum-caretaker) for three years. In June 1983 the staffing of other functions and of a range of services was provided by a 27-place Manpower Services Community Programme. The Executive Committee of the Society assumed the responsibilities of a management committee for the Project.

During 1983 the Society commenced negotiations with a charity, seeking funding for a 'well-qualified Service Coordinator'. The appointment of such a manager was seen by the Society as the prime mechanism for creating 'a comprehensive and integrated system of support services for families and their mentally handicapped members'. However, the appointment of a manager funded by this charity did not come into effect until February 1985. Until that point the overall management of the Project was undertaken, on a voluntary basis, by the Chairman of the Society. Although a total of three Community Programme managers had been in post during the first 20 months of the life of Beech House, the Chairman and Executive Committee felt that none of them had the qualifications and experience to justify full responsibility for the service. The first charity-funded manager resigned in June 1986, seven months before his two-year contract expired. He was replaced by the Assistant Manager. The charity agreed to contribute to this manager's salary until September 1988, the amount thus made available being supplemented by the Society from its own funds.

By the time the first charity-funded manager was appointed, a second major source of funding for services had been obtained. Following lengthy and sometimes difficult negotiations, joint finance was acquired for the domiciliary Home Care and Sitting-in service from January 1985 and for the pre-school playgroup from mid-1985, replacing Community Programme funding. Other services continued to be staffed by the Community Programme. As the research fieldwork drew to a close in mid-1987 negotiations were proceeding between the Project, the County
Social Services Department and the Health Authority regarding future funding of adult daycare and respite care at Beech House, together with the manager's salary. These negotiations had acquired a particular urgency. Changes were taking place in Government policy on the Community Programme, resulting in staff cutbacks at Beech House, while the charitable funding of the manager's salary would expire in 1988.

The environment in which Beech House operated
It is important to stress that Beech House, for the period of the research, experienced perpetual change. Internal changes in financial resources, staffing, organizational structure and service provision took place in a wider environment which was also characterized by change, notably in the structure, management and interrelationships of local statutory services and in Government policy on the Community Programme.

The County Social Services Department was substantially re-organized during the research. The three Social Services areas related to Beech House were combined into a single Division with one Divisional Manager replacing three Area Directors. In addition, several new posts in the field of mental handicap were established in 1986. Specialist social workers were appointed to two of the Social Services areas shortly before re-organization. An occupational therapist with responsibility for mentally handicapped people was also appointed to the Beech House area at the beginning of 1986.

The implementation of the Griffiths Report on health service management also produced fundamental changes in the Health Authority, of particular relevance to Beech House. A new Unit General Manager was appointed in 1986, a senior post with responsibility for all mental handicap services in the District. One priority was the transfer of mentally-handicapped patients into accommodation within the community.

Thus, during the research, the Beech House staff had to come to terms not only with new statutory service personnel at management and practitioner levels but also with the new structures within which they operated. Communication and liaison with statutory service staff were required not only in connection with day-to-day issues of service delivery and the development of future policy but also
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with regard to the bids made by Beech House for further joint finance and main programme funding. Here, senior managers of Social Services, Health and Education had key roles to play. Those responsible for the Beech House services needed to develop new patterns of relationship with statutory services at both personal and organizational levels, while those statutory services were simultaneously experiencing the same situation with regard to each other.

The complexity of the environment in which Beech House operated is illustrated, albeit in limited form, in Figure 4:1. Here, Beech House is shown at the centre of a web of interrelationships, the separate components all influencing and influenced by each other. The relationships considered are intra-organizational and inter-organizational, the latter identified at both local and national levels:

(a) Intra-organizational: the inner circles represent the relationship between the Project and the Society (i.e. paid staff and employer) and the Executive Committee, and indicate the role of volunteers. The situation is, in reality, far from clear-cut, for many users of Beech House services are not Society members; not all Society members are service users; some but not all volunteers are Society members; some staff may also belong to the Society, while some volunteers are also paid employees. Issues arising from these roles and relationships will be considered where relevant in the discussion on organizational structure (Chapters 6 and 7) and process (Chapters 8 - 10).

(b) Inter-organizational: the outer ring of circles contains examples of key bodies/groups relevant to Beech House: these are mostly drawn from the local level, but the charity operated at national level, the MSC from a regional base. Some of these are particularly significant with regard to the future of Beech House, i.e. those bodies with the power to give or withhold substantial financial support, notably the MSC, the Health Authority and the County's Education and Social Services Departments. The relationships between these bodies and the views they hold of each other can be highly influential for the future of organizations such as Beech House.

'The community', though a diffuse association of groups and individuals rather than a single group or body, cannot be overlooked. For the Society it was an important reference point, a source of funds and volunteers, for example, and of political support for Beech House at times of financial crisis.
Figure 4.1: The Beech House Project and its Environment
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The complex network of interrelationships presented in Fig. 4:1 is operating in a climate set nationally by Government policies on unemployment, on the National Health Service, joint finance, urban renewal, local authority finance, care in the community, and expanding the roles of voluntary social services and private care agencies vis-a-vis state provision.

It is apparent that the development of Beech House has not taken place in a vacuum, and that the interrelationships between Beech House and relevant components of its environment should be included in any study of the organization's development. The groups and bodies with the power to influence the operation of Beech House and/or its continuation, together with their representatives, will have their own, possibly conflicting, goals to pursue. These may or may not be explicit and may or may not be compatible with the goals formally espoused by the Beech House Project and the Society which created it. Nor can agreement on formal Project goals be assumed to exist within and between the Project and the Society. These considerations are borne in mind while presenting the following discussion of the formal or 'official' goals of the Beech House Project.

PART (II): THE EVOLVING GOALS OF BEECH HOUSE

The following discussion refers to the official goals of Beech House, those given formal expression by the Society and the two charity-funded managers during the course of the research.

One official goal of the Project, identified in documents published by the Society, achieved particular significance because of its use in the funding bid to the charity in March 1983. Here the goal of the proposed Project was described as providing "a comprehensive and integrated system of support services for families and their mentally handicapped members".

The Society was seeking funds from the charity for the position of a Service Coordinator, anticipating that the person appointed would create a coherent whole from the separate service components already planned by the Society. This funding application was linked with a bid from a University research group for funding for a part-time research worker at Beech House to 'evaluate' the service
following the appointment of the charity-funded manager. The charity, in granting the research funds, requested that the 'evaluation' should be made in terms of the aims put forward in the funding application, though changes in these aims occurring during the course of the research should be identified. The writer, appointed to undertake the research, argued that such an approach was unsatisfactory. It was important to consider not only the particular 'official' goal identified in the funding proposal and any changes therein, but also to consider the influence of certain other goals. These, though not mentioned in the application for funding made to the charity, were articulated within the Society in the period preceding the application and in the interim period between the submission of the application and the appointment of the charity-funded manager 20 months later. Their existence contributed to the complexity of the situation inherited by the new charity-funded manager. The relevant goals are identified below. Discussion of their clarity of definition, their compatibility, acceptability to participants and the adequacy of the resources available for the pursuit of the goals identified for the Project is deferred until Chapter 8.

(a) Formal Project goals expressed prior to the appointment of the Service Coordinator

A study of the available documentary evidence on the history of the Society shows that initially, during a series of meetings termed 'Survival Meetings' held in 1982, at which parents voiced their dissatisfaction, it was not general goals which were formulated. Rather, parents generated lists of specific needs which they felt were not being met by statutory social services and decided to somehow meet many of these needs themselves by providing a wide range of services. Such expectations, articulated prior to the formulation of the 'official' goal, as presented in the funding application to the charity, might well influence parents and Society members in their future judgments of the Project's performance.

The Society's application for Urban Aid, in October 1982, gave a lengthy list of planned services. Beech House would provide a social activity centre; a parents' meeting place; office space for the Society; creche facilities; school holiday playschemes; day care for children and adults; short-term respite care; accommodation for visiting NHS consultants and for a community mental handicap team; training facilities for nursery nurses, taxi escorts, social workers; parents' workshops; an information and advocacy service; a volunteer centre.
The Society described this as 'constructive self-help'. The goal of the Project was now given, very generally, as "To develop work with mentally and other handicapped people in the area". The Society would consider extending services to cover those with any form of severe physical or mental impairment. The proposed services were intended to 'supplement and support' existing statutory services in the area. A guiding principle was 'the precise focussing of voluntary and statutory help on the most pressing needs of mentally handicapped people and their families'.

As the Society became further involved in bids for funding from various sources, certain services were emphasized rather than others and distinctions were made between 'immediate uses' and 'planned uses'. The term 'family support service' also came into use, in connection with a funding application (unsuccessful) to the Leonard Cheshire Foundation. In discussions on the proposal for a Community Programme it was stated that the services envisaged were those not currently supplied to a significant degree by statutory agencies and they were intended to 'complement' existing statutory provision. This particular funding application, in February 1983, included a reference to a service not previously mentioned, that of permanent residential accommodation for mentally handicapped people.

Also under discussion at the time was the funding application to the charity. Here, only weeks before Beech House opened, was the introduction of rather academic terminology associated with a general statement of aims, grafted onto proposals for a range of pre-planned services. Reference to the 'comprehensive' and 'integrated' service to be supplied following the appointment of a 'Service Coordinator' had only emerged in the process of discussions between the Society and the University research unit, while the research proposal to the charity was in preparation.

In July 1983, a document was drawn up, describing in more detail the thinking behind the proposal for a Service Coordinator's post. The newly-introduced Community Programme at Beech House was described as 'temporary', and a desire expressed that the efforts to create a truly comprehensive service should be expanded. The emphasis in this document was on the need for permanent funding and an acceptance that in the long-term the bulk of this funding must come from statutory sources. This would be forthcoming, it was believed, when the main Beech House services had become "an important and integral part of the general pattern of services. This will be especially true if our project comes to serve as a
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model on a national basis for the voluntary sector, in partnership with statutory services, to organize and deliver care in the community for the mentally handicapped."

According to this document, there had been little constructive response to parents' criticisms of serious deficiencies in the statutory services and "...many of the needs we had identified were unlikely ever to be met satisfactorily by statutory agencies.". The services Beech House would provide were "intended to be complementary to existing services supplied by other statutory and voluntary bodies.". If there had ever been a vision of the Beech House Project as something necessary only for a limited period, initiated purely to motivate the statutory sector to improve services, this was not the official view expressed by the Society once the Project was underway. The emphasis here was on permanence of provision, funded by statutory sources.

The shift from the use of the terms 'supplement' and 'support' with reference to statutory services which had been employed in the Urban Aid application in October 1982, to the use of the term 'complementary' in official statements in 1983, may not be significant. The terms 'supplementary' and 'complementary' can be distinguished analytically for academic purposes, but may have been used interchangeably here. The shift in terminology does demonstrate, however, the difficulties in trying to establish exactly what was meant by the Society's statements of Project goals, an issue which will be raised again in Chapter 8.

The formal joint finance application submitted by the Society in January 1984 sought support for all the Project provisions with the exception of Respite Care and the Information Service. It proposed, in addition, a counselling and advocacy service. The proposal, using by now familiar language, stressed the advantages to families of a 'comprehensive' service and emphasized the ways in which the Project was of benefit to the statutory social services, noting the ability of the Project to 'complement' statutory provision.

The goals of the Beech House Project, as expressed by the Society before February 1985, have been discussed at some length in order to 'set the scene' of the situation encountered by the charity-funded Service Coordinator. The concise single general goal identified in the funding bid to the charity concealed the complexity of the pre-existing situation inherited by the Service Coordinator. It is now necessary to
consider the issues arising and changes occurring in the goals set for the Project following the appointment of the new charity-funded manager in February 1985.

(b) Formal Project goals expressed during the appointment of the first charity-funded Service Coordinator (Project Manager) February 1985-June 1986

On appointment, the Service Coordinator was immediately re-titled 'Project Manager'. The person employed was a qualified social worker with previous experience in the Social Services Department of the local authority in which Beech House is situated. He shared the Society's commitment to obtaining long-term statutory funding. He also brought to the Project commitments which seemed very much in tune with the official statement of the goal of Beech House presented to the charity in the funding application, i.e. a desire to offer users a 'balanced' service, not merely access to a number of separate services, each with its own role, objectives and accountability, which had been his experience in the statutory sector. He envisaged the delivery of care through a flexible, locally-based service, responsive to the needs of users. Great stress was placed on serving the needs of the individual.

In addition, the Project Manager brought with him a particular approach to the care of people with a mental handicap, i.e. a commitment to the principles of 'normalization'. A Campaign for Mental Handicap publication has defined this approach in the following way:-

"Normalization implies that the means and the ends are equally important, so the environment, activities, materials, goals and methods should enable people with mental handicaps to have opportunities to share experiences with their peers who are not handicapped, NOT create barriers to positive experiences and relationships." (Carle, 1984).

To the best knowledge of the writer, this term had never appeared in the available literature on Beech House issued by the Society, in which the emphasis was on the needs of parents as identified by parents. It remained to be seen how far an emphasis on the needs of the mentally handicapped person and a commitment to 'normalization' would fit into an environment initially created by parents to meet what they saw as the needs of families with a mentally handicapped member living at home.

In the months following the Project Manager's appointment it became apparent that he was anticipating and operating with a far wider definition of the goal of a
comprehensive service than that employed by the Society in the funding application submitted to the charity before Beech House opened. There, the implicit assumption was that a 'comprehensive' service would emerge from the integration of the separate services provided by Beech House. The Project Manager saw the role of Beech House as one of activating and contributing towards the establishment of a 'partnership' between statutory and voluntary services in the locality, involving the planning, development and delivery of services to mentally handicapped people and their families. He sought to offer a total package of co-ordinated services tailored to individual needs. People would not be fitted into existing services, services would be designed to meet the needs of individuals. The service would integrate not only the separate services provided within Beech House, but would integrate those 'internal' services with services provided by external agencies in the area, both statutory and voluntary. To this end, various structural changes were introduced during the appointment of the Project Manager, to promote communication and coordination within Beech House and between Beech House and external services. These will be described in detail elsewhere (see Chapter 6).

Thus, the first charity-funded Project Manager, while accepting the pre-existing goals of securing long-term statutory funding and providing a comprehensive, integrated family support service, also introduced to the Project an extended definition of the latter goal, involving integration of services externally as well as internally, together with the frequently reiterated commitments to 'normalization' and 'serving individual needs'.

(c) Formal Project goals expressed during the appointment of the second charity-funded manager (re-titled Project Coordinator) September 1986-July 1987 when fieldwork ceased

In June 1986, the Project Manager resigned after completing seventeen months of his two-year contract. During July and August 1986 the Assistant Manager became 'Acting Project Manager'. For this busy summer holiday period the Acting Project Manager seemed committed chiefly to keeping the Project afloat and the existing services, especially the summer playscheme, available to users.

From September 1986 the Assistant Project Manager was appointed Project Coordinator, a post she still occupies. She had a professional background very different from that of her predecessor. Her experience came not from social work
but from nursing. She had worked at Beech House in a number of different capacities since her first appointment, initially short-term, to equip and organize the respite care provisions during the first year of the Community Programme 1983-84.

As far as the Society was concerned the official goal of providing a comprehensive integrated service, as included in the original bid for charitable funding, would remain. This was decided in June 1986 during discussions of the Executive Committee on whether the goal was a realistic one for the future, given the departure of the Project Manager.

Following her appointment in September 1986, the Project Coordinator, like her predecessor, accepted this official general goal and sought to integrate services both internally and externally. She also demonstrated her commitment to the goal of securing long-term funding from statutory services during intense negotiations with the Social Services Department and the Health Authority. These developments were precipitated by the rejection of a bid for joint finance for Respite Care and Adult Daycare in the late autumn of 1986. Later, in the spring of 1987, came the decision of the MSC to introduce cuts in the Community Programme staffing at Beech House. The Project Coordinator made plans to withdraw the two services which would be affected by staff cuts, i.e. Respite Care and Adult Daycare. The need to convince the statutory services of the indispensability of Beech House in the total network of services for mentally handicapped people in the borough had become more urgent than ever before.

The Project Coordinator also voiced a commitment to other goals in terms similar to those used by her predecessor. In a new Staff Handbook, circulated in mid-1987, she expressed her enthusiasm for a flexible, non-institutional service, providing for individual needs, while involving parents as far as possible and helping families and individuals use the ordinary services and resources of the local community. However, the Handbook contained no explicit reference to the implementation of a policy of 'normalization'. There was, though, a strong emphasis on opportunity and choice, on responsiveness to user needs, together with a statement of the rights of users to live in a manner and circumstances which correspond as far as possible with what is normal for non-handicapped people.
It was apparent that the new Project Coordinator had a different style and different priorities from those of her predecessor. Even where there is general agreement on ends, this is no guarantee of agreement on means. Following the appointment of the Project Coordinator the research worker observed the extent to which she demonstrated a commitment to the goals expressed by the Society and by her predecessor, and the extent to which there may have been changes in goals and in the methods used to achieve goals. Rather than the introduction of new goals, there appeared to be changes in emphasis and interpretation of existing goals and in the means used in implementation. These matters will be discussed, where relevant, in succeeding chapters, particularly Chapter 9.

PART III: THE SERVICES PROVIDED BY BEECH HOUSE

The services first provided by the paid staff were a summer holiday playscheme, an information/welfare rights service, domiciliary home care, sitting-in and a shoppers' creche (though the latter soon ceased due to lack of demand). These services joined the volunteer-run Youth Club and Saturday Afternoon Club, provided by the Society long before the opening of Beech House, but now based in their own accommodation. By the time the research ended Beech House was providing, in addition to the services first offered, adult daycare, short-term respite care, a pre-school playgroup and a small-scale employment project, together with a volunteer-run Saturday night disco.

In the intervening period certain services were provided which later ceased or were suspended. These comprised a befriending scheme, a 'living away from home' scheme, three different children's clubs, parents' evenings, and 'care mornings' (formerly the shoppers' creche) resurrected in late 1986. The reasons for the disappearance/suspension of these services included one or more of the following factors: lack of use; staff departures; insufficient resources; changes in priorities in resource allocation; problems with service development.

The description of the separate services which follows inevitably underplays the role of ancillary staff - the drivers, cooks and cleaners, the receptionist/typist - in the experiences of the users of Beech House and in the life of Beech House in general. Their contribution should not be underestimated. Nor can this approach communicate a complete picture of the extent to which staff, in addition to providing specific services, were involved in a variety of associated activities such
as sharing the tasks of cleaning the house, fund-raising, and organizing events for users eg. an Open Day, parents' evenings. Services to outside bodies were also provided, in the form of entertaining parties of visitors to Beech House, giving talks to local community organizations and supervising trainee social workers and college students on placement at Beech House. This latter group of activities, although not providing a direct service to mentally handicapped people and their families, may nevertheless be seen as attempting to further the aims of Beech House and the welfare of users by publicizing the approach to service delivery employed at Beech House, and presenting a professional image to statutory service observers.

(a) The volunteer-run leisure services

The Saturday Club, Youth Club and Disco were all well-established. The Saturday Club and Youth Club had existed before the Project, in borrowed premises, but the number of Youth Club members had expanded over the period of the research, reaching 53 in April 1987. The Disco was a newer service introduced in early 1984, after the Project had been initiated, and the numbers attending had grown rapidly with 60 - 70 members attending regularly by early 1987.

The Saturday Club was seen by many of the users as a family activity. In mid-1987 there were 30 members. It was apparently more attractive to the parents of older children and adults than to parents of young families. The Disco and Youth Club were not seen as activities involving parents; both provisions catered for teenagers and upward.

Eligibility rules for membership of the Youth Club, relating to wheelchair users and the need for supervision, were beginning to be relaxed by a new leader as fieldwork ended. Apart from the Youth Club eligibility rules, access appeared to be open. However, the increases in numbers using the Disco and Youth Club had raised the possibility of the need for some controls on numbers in the future.

Rather than becoming an integral part of the Project, the services provided by volunteers seemed to have each retained an independent role, somewhat separate from each other and distinct from the services provided by paid staff. The Project staff knew little about the attendance at these activities and no records on their use were available centrally. Paid staff played no formal role in the running of
these services, though they may occasionally have helped as volunteers or participated in the activities.

(b) The services provided by paid staff

The holiday playschemes

Prior to the opening of Beech House the only holiday playscheme available was one of two weeks duration organized by parents and based at the local special school. A playscheme lasting most of the summer holiday was the first service provided by Beech House. From mid-1983 Beech House provided the holiday playschemes for school-age children which were highly regarded by parents and which were seen as a key service by the founders of Beech House. However, the assumption of some responsibility for playscheme provision by statutory service staff meant the Beech House service from 1987 catered only for the 5 - 16 age-group, rather than 5 - 19 as in the past.

The Easter playscheme was only a few days in length and tended to cater for fewer children overall than the long summer playscheme of approximately six-weeks duration. The summer playschemes recruited to the daily permitted maximum of 25, serving between 40 and 50 different children. Allocation of places was by invitation to those eligible according to age and catchment area, though occasional exceptions were made, numbers permitting. Rationing, by reducing the number of days available, was sometimes instituted when demand was too great. The catchment area rule was introduced in 1985 when the authorities responsible for allocating 'one-off' joint finance grants to holiday playschemes decided such provisions should be locally-based. The new rules barred a number of families who had used the Beech House playscheme in the past.

Throughout the research it was apparent that the scale of the summer playscheme made great demands on the staff and accommodation, due not least to the large numbers of young, inexperienced volunteers recruited to assist the paid staff.

The pre-school playgroup

The playgroup commenced in late 1983, staffed by Community Programme employees. The implementation of joint finance in mid-1985 saw the creation of a separate staff group responsible for year-round playgroup provision. Prior to this, the playgroup was suspended during the long summer holiday, while the staff were occupied with the playscheme.
A number of the children using the playgroup had special medical needs which placed particular demands on the playgroup staff and also upon the staff of other Project services used by the families concerned. A small number of playgroup places were sometimes unfilled, due to parents' reluctance to accept that their young children needed special services. Playgroup staff needed not only skills in caring for children but skills in handling relationships with parents. The playgroup was open for two days each week. The numbers attending the playgroup were small. Under the local authority's registration rules the maximum attendance was 10 i.e. one member of staff to two children. Children offered places were expected to attend regularly for the relevant period. The admission policy with regard to age was changed following the introduction of joint finance. The sponsoring Education Department ruled that children over three should attend the local special school and not Beech House, which had previously accepted children until the age of five. Only in very special circumstances and following an educational psychologist's report would a child under three attend the special school. This ruling was designed to prevent duplication of services. The admission policy of accepting children with a solely physical handicap when there were spare places was also changed eventually, on the initiative of the Project Co-ordinator, because of the implications of an admission to playgroup for demand for other Project services. A playgroup place made families eligible for other services such as Home Care and Sitting-in, for which considerable demand had developed from individuals with a mental handicap and families with a mentally handicapped member. In 1986, after discussion between the Project Co-ordinator and members of the Executive, it was agreed that children with a solely physical handicap and their families could use Project services only while there were doubts about a child's mental development.

During the research the playgroup seemed to be consolidating its standing with professional workers. Not only were the great majority of referrals coming from outside professionals but a number of these professionals were familiar visitors to the playgroup. Notable here was the peripatetic teacher who used the playgroup as a venue for regular sessions with her pupils. However, there was relatively little contact between playgroup staff and the staff of the special school to which most of the children transferred at the age of three.
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Adult Daycare

This service began in October 1983, with eight residents of the local mental handicap hospital attending Beech House daily for activities and outings - a total of 24 different residents attending each week. This was an interesting development, for it did not fall under the heading of a 'Family Support Service' but provided care for mostly elderly hospital residents who did not live in the community. The holiday playschemes and the playgroup, already described, were very much the services that the founding parents wanted for themselves. According to staff employed at that time, the incentives for providing daycare for hospital residents were the existence of somewhat embarrassing spare capacity at Beech House, for the use of services by parents expanded only slowly in the first year of operation, together with the desire of the Society to demonstrate the usefulness of the Project to statutory services. By the time the charity-funded manager arrived, this service had developed from a provision for mainly elderly hospital residents to include individuals living in the community, some with no family support. The service was by then provided no longer daily but on three week-days, by employees who were also responsible for the play-group. On the provision of joint finance for the playgroup in mid-1985 Adult Daycare continued with a separate, mostly new, group of staff, funded by the Community Programme. However, this could not be a staff-group with any permanence as MSC rules ensured that staff in Daycare Assistant posts could stay no more than 12 months. The Project Manager encouraged a change in the nature of the service provided, with activities taking place in the community given priority over the development of domestic and personal hygiene skills emphasized in the past. Following his departure in mid-1986, his successor sought to ensure a more structured programme of activities for each user and to re-emphasize domestic and personal hygiene skills.

During the research, the service catered for a wide age-range, from 19 - 90, with approximately 20 people attending on each of the three days. Between 1985 and 1987 the total number of different users increased from 38 to 45, and the proportion of users living in the community, alone or with family, increased from 42% to 53%. However, the service was a low intensity provision, with the great majority of users attending for only one day a week, a group which included all the hospital residents. The normal routine of the service was disrupted for an extended period each summer, until 1987, due to the demands of the holiday playscheme.
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For the majority of those attending there was no substitute service available in the community, although a number of users had chosen Adult Daycare at Beech House in preference to attendance at a day centre. During the research, staff became aware that certain users were demonstrating needs which Beech House did not have the resources to meet. Some pressure from parents for places was evident in cases where a handicapped dependant was unhappy at the day centre. The staff concerned did not always feel that Beech House was the most appropriate place for such referrals or that it offered an acceptable long-term solution to problems relating to day-centre provision. It was noteworthy that while a small number of people chose to cease to use Adult Daycare, the majority of users attended on a long-term basis. Few users moved on to employment or educational/training provision. The involvement of outside professionals with Adult Daycare seemed slow to develop, although many referrals were made to this service by these professionals. However, during 1987, contracts with new practitioners in speech therapy and occupational therapy were increasing.

By early 1987, the continuation of the Adult Daycare service was in doubt, due to cuts in the Community Programme. At Easter, the service was withdrawn from the hospital residents and other users were warned that the service might cease completely at the end of June. A temporary resolution of the funding crisis was achieved when emergency interim joint finance was granted to support Adult Daycare (and Respite Care) for six months from July. Hospital residents were allowed to use Beech House again. In March 1988 the Project learned that main programme support for the service would be provided from June by the Health Authority and the County Social Services Department, although staffing would be reduced.

Living Away from Home

At the time the research began, parents were expressing great enthusiasm for the development of a Living Away from Home service, to provide long-term residential accommodation of an acceptable quality in the local community. This was an interesting development, given the emphasis in the initial funding and research bids to the charity on the parents' preference for 'home-based living for dependents with mental handicap'. The appointment of a part-time (19 hours per week) MSC-funded Living Away from Home worker, to be responsible for development work with interested families, was seen as a first step. However, a
year after the appointment of the first Living Away from Home worker the whole issue had been set aside. The first post-holder had moved into Home Care as an assistant, taking her clients with her. The second occupant of the Living Away from Home post had become part of Adult Daycare. No 'Living Away from Home' development work, as originally envisaged, was being undertaken. The Project Manager had drawn up a far-reaching 'policy document' on the establishment by Beech House of residential accommodation in the community in partnership with the relevant statutory services; this had been approved by the Executive Committee and presented to the statutory authorities. The lack of response indicated that there was no prospect of the large-scale finance the scheme would require being provided by the statutory authorities.

This was a service which had failed to live up to expectations. The vision put forward by the Project Manager in his 'policy document' had far exceeded the modest scheme envisaged by the interested parents and the Executive Committee. Following the submission to the statutory authorities, the topic of Living Away from Home ceased to be a prominent item on the agendas of the Executive Committee. A small number of adults living alone in the community - nine or ten - were by that time being supported by the Home Care Service, together with Adult Daycare in some cases. However, these people were not members of the families who had originally expressed an interest in involvement in the Living Away from Home project. They were mostly individuals and couples referred by statutory service workers, because they needed support to live alone in the community. Staff commitment to these users seemed very long-term, if not permanent. On the departure of the Living Away from Home worker in the spring of 1987, the Project Co-ordinator decided not to advertise the post, feeling its continuation would not serve the original aims of Living Away from Home.

During 1987 the Executive Committee again began to discuss the introduction of residential accommodation provision and established contact with a Mencap Homes Foundation group. The Project Co-ordinator appeared to feel unable to become actively involved in regenerating the Living Away from Home project. The future of Living Away from Home as part of the Beech House service remained unresolved as fieldwork ended.
The Home Care and Sitting-in Service

The two sections of this service were distinguished by the staffing used and the type of care provided. 'Sitting-in' was mainly provided by a body of casual, 'on-call' sitters, though Home Care Assistants and other regular Project staff would sometimes act as sitters, in addition to their normal work, receiving the standard fee and travelling expenses. Parents paid for the service (90p an hour). Home Care, in contrast, was free, was provided by its own group of regular paid staff, and was a wide-ranging service intended to provide practical help in the home, with no restrictions envisaged on the type of assistance available. Readers of the Society Newsletter for Easter 1986 read of the Home Care service that:

"The well-trained staff know that families have sorted out their own ways of coping and will follow the established lead".

It was apparent that, in reality, the Home Care service was providing emotional as well as practical support, and that staff were undertaking tasks not only in the home but in the community eg. providing transport, accompanying people to hospital. Also, care was being provided not only to families but to individuals and couples with a mental handicap living alone in the community. Demands on the Home Care service grew rapidly (see Appendix II(a)).

After January 1985, when joint finance replaced the MSC funding of the service, staff numbers doubled. Even so, the demand for Home Care was such that requests for help could not always be met, and ways of rationing the service began to develop. In the autumn of 1986 the Project was informed that further joint finance for the Home Care and Sitting-in service and for the playgroup had been approved on a tapering basis for a period of four years, commencing December 1987, and thereafter to be taken into main programme funding. Thus, for the Home Care and Sitting-in service itself the future seemed assured, although the funding of the Project as a whole remained in question.

Respite Care

During the research Respite Care expanded, due to the appointment in early 1985 of a Community Programme organizer responsible for the service. The service became popular with parents and a high demand was established (see Appendix II(b)), shown by the existence early in 1987 of a six-month waiting list for the one weekend a month respite care. Staffing problems arose because of the reliance on the Community Programme and the need to recruit qualified and/or experienced
casual staff in considerable numbers. For most of the year weekend stays only were available, because of the use of the Beech House accommodation for other purposes and the fact that most casual staff had other jobs and were not available on week days. Holiday fortnights for adults were arranged in June each year until 1987, when one week of the fortnight was reserved for children. Regulations restricted to three the number of guests which could be accommodated at any one time.

In the Community Programme for 1986-7, a part-time Respite Care assistant was recruited but this additional staffing resource did little to reduce the reliance on a bank of casual staff. Occasionally it was impossible to recruit sufficient weekend staff and bookings had to be cancelled. By the end of the research the Project Coordinator was exploring the possibilities of employing private agency nurses to staff respite care. Efforts to consolidate the service through the achievement of joint finance were initially disappointed in 1986. However, the funding crisis precipitated by cuts in the Community Programme eventually led to the granting of interim joint finance and the possibility of secure funding from 1988.

*The Horticulture and House Maintenance Employment Scheme*
This was established by the Project Manager in mid-1985 with the agreement of the MSC, with the aim of providing employment opportunities for a small number of people with a mental handicap. There were problems in recruiting to the maximum of three employees with a handicap, due to the MSC eligibility rules applicable to these Community Programme posts. By 1987, the Project Co-ordinator was expressing the view that more attention should be paid to developing the self-presentation and interview skills of those working on the employment project.

*The Befriending Scheme*
The proposal for a Befriending Scheme, made by the Activities Coordinator in early 1986, was greeted with great enthusiasm by the Executive and encouraged the hope within the Project that its development would ease the pressures on Home Care. It was envisaged that volunteers would undertake long-term commitment on a one-to-one basis, involving people with a mental handicap in the life of the wider community. In the event, little was achieved, due to the staffing problems relating to the post of Activities Co-ordinator, and the unfilled needs for both an extended period of service development and the creation of a strong network of support for the volunteer befrienders. Five families were matched with
beprienders. A request for funding from the DHSS Opportunities for Volunteering Scheme was unsuccessful. As fieldwork ended, the post of Activities Co-ordinator was to remain part of the next Community Programme, with the inevitable problems of lack of continuity. The service was described as being 'on ice' and there was no indication the Befriending Scheme would be extended beyond the original five families.

Leisure Activities for Children
During the research three different forms of leisure activity for children were provided by Beech House, all of which had ceased by the time field-work ended, due to decisions taken on the effective allocation of resources. The 7-11 Club, initiated by an MSC-funded Activities Co-ordinator in 1985, in consultation with the local special school, had catered for seven or eight children in this age group. The children were specifically invited and there was little turnover of membership given the four-year age-range. Staffing was initially by volunteers, overseen by the MSC-funded Activities Co-ordinator, later by Community Programme staff overseen by the Respite Care supervisor.

The Thursday Evening Club which replaced it in early 1987 was the joint responsibility of Community Programme daycare and respite care staff, and catered for 10 - 16 year olds. Recruitment was on a first-come, first-served basis, with the new club advertised in the Society Newsletter. This club was seen by staff as having a wider appeal than the 7-11 Club, and was partly a response to pressure at the 1986 November AGM of the Society when two parents asked for the creation of a youth club for those too old for the 7-11 Club and too young for the Youth Club. Attendance was poor, i.e. a maximum of five children, and the club soon ceased.

Weekly activity sessions for children resident in the local mental handicap hospital had begun in 1983, provided by daycare staff. When the children's ward closed in the summer of 1986 a similar service was provided for the children living in a Health Authority residential home. This service, together with the 7 - 11 Club, was discontinued in favour of the Thursday Evening Club, itself short-lived, the Project Co-ordinator feeling this was a more effective use of resources.
**Saturday Care Mornings**

This service, initiated in 1983 and then withdrawn due to lack of interest, was resurrected in the winter of 1986 to provide care on Saturdays from 10 am - 1 pm for people of all ages with a mental handicap. By April 1987 it was decided the response from parents was insufficient to justify its continuation and the service ceased.

**Information/Welfare Rights Service (later incorporated into the Common Resources Group/Administration Support)**

The role of the Information and Welfare Rights service staff group was transformed during the appointment of the first charity-funded manager. This service, one of the first provided by Beech House, undertook not only public relations activities, but ran an enquiry service, produced a monthly Society Newsletter and information leaflets and organized parents' evenings with invited speakers. The enquiry service, by early 1985, had expanded to assist parents with claims and appeals relating to benefits, in a few cases involving staff in home-visits and accompanying parents to medical examinations. At this point, the work of the Information Service was seen by the staff very much as a service to families and people with a mental handicap. The charity-funded manager transformed this staff group into primarily an administrative support body, known as the Common Resources Group. The balance of functions shifted further away from a direct service to users when staff training became an additional responsibility and with setbacks in the publication of the Newsletter. By the autumn of 1985, after several months' discussion on the future of the Newsletter and a short-lived increase in its size, the Project Manager was arguing that a monthly publication was a luxury the Project could not afford. The Executive Committee, anxious not to lose what they saw as the only point of contact for many parents, agreed to a compromise, i.e. a quarterly publication, reduced in size. A later attempt by the Common Resources staff to re-establish a monthly Newsletter, following the offer of free printing by a company, was rejected by the Project Manager on the grounds that staff time was better spent providing administrative support to the Project. The saga of the Newsletter offered a particular example of the differences of opinion within the Project and between the Project Manager and the Executive over what activities were appropriate and feasible for the Project.

One of the early information services in abeyance for some time was revived in 1986 when a programme of parents evenings was organized by the staff. With one
or two exceptions the sessions were poorly attended. No further programmes were arranged before fieldwork ceased.

Twelve months after its creation, the Common Resources Group was disbanded by the Project Manager, shortly before his departure. He had decided that an administrative staff group was unnecessary, the supervisor's post could be abolished and, although a quarterly newsletter could continue, the provision of a formal enquiry/welfare rights service should no longer be undertaken within the Project. The intimation was that the statutory services could and should fulfil this task. Requests for advice would be transferred to statutory agencies.

Following the appointment of the Assistant Manager as Project Coordinator in September 1986, the Newsletter (received by 350-400 people) reverted to a monthly publication, although less elaborate in style than in the past. The provision of a formal enquiry/welfare rights service by the Project was restored. Members of staff involved began to work once more in a group, known as 'Administration Support' and reporting to the Project Co-ordinator. Following recruitment problems, the staff complement was changed from that previously negotiated with the MSC, two part-time posts being traded for one full-time key-worker post. In the proposal for Community Programme renewal, this post was regraded to that of supervisor. By mid-1987, therefore, the Common Resources Group had to some extent been reconstituted, in body if not in name, with responsibility for an enquiry and welfare rights service restored and the Newsletter a regular monthly provision. Throughout the period under study the staff undertaking the tasks of Information/Welfare Rights/Common Resources, which later transferred to Administration Support, had been provided by the Community Programme. This seemed likely to remain the case in the foreseeable future. The experiences of this staff group had no parallel elsewhere in the Project.

This account of the separate services has indicated the wide range of services provided. Services differed in character, e.g. the domiciliary nature of Home Care and Sitting-in, compared with the building-based provision of the other care services; the type of clientele served varied, with some services designed to meet children's needs, others designed for adults. They also varied in their availability to users. The issue of availability of services and the influence here of the sources of statutory funding received by the Project are considered in Chapter 9, when service delivery is discussed.
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CONCLUSIONS

Chapter 4 has shown how the history and development of the Beech House Project have made the service a valuable case study for research, an example of a voluntary self-help group moving into service provision in a major way, through the employment of paid staff. The considerable variety of services described was reliant on a range of short-term funding sources made available through Government policies. Twenty months after the opening of the Project the Society obtained additional funding from a charity to pay the salary of what the Society termed "a well-qualified individual as Service Coordinator" for a period of two years.

The need to obtain large-scale, albeit short-term, funding from such sources meant the Society was required to produce formal statements of Project goals for use in funding applications and publicity documents. The ways in which these formal statements changed between the Project's inception in mid-1983 and the appointment of the second charity-funded manager in 1986 were described. Both charity-funded managers brought to the Project their own interpretations of the Project's formally stated goals, while the first charity-funded manager introduced new goals in addition to those previously espoused for the Project by the Society.

The discussion of the evolution of the formally-stated Project goals has indicated that it would be too restrictive to limit consideration to the single goal identified in the funding bid to the charity, i.e. that of creating a comprehensive and integrated support service. Such an approach would ignore the role in the Project's development of other formally-stated goals, e.g. the way in which the pursuit of goals identified in statements made to potential funding bodies might influence the achievement of other formally-stated goals and vice versa; the way in which the existence of other formally stated goals might encourage certain expectations in participants and hence their assessments of the services delivered.

Changes in formal statements of goals set for the Project presented only one aspect of the perpetual state of change experienced by Beech House. Continual change, for example in staffing patterns and service provision, took place in the setting of a wider environment itself characterized by change. Especially relevant for Beech House were the new structures and personnel introduced to the County Social
Services Department and the Health Authority, and the changes in Government policy towards the Community Programme.

It has been argued that an appreciation of the complex network of interrelationships in which Beech House operated is essential to an understanding of the development of Beech House. Since the focus of this thesis is the implications for structure and process of reliance on sources of short-term statutory funding, certain components of this network and their interrelationships with the Project and each other will receive particular attention in the succeeding chapters. They comprise the current and potential sources of funding for the Project, and those groups/bodies etc. with the capacity to influence the views of the Project held by these funding sources. Chapter 5 will examine in detail the pattern of funding of the Project, and the formal accountability of the Project to its various funding sources. Discussion of the influence of statutory funding on the structure and process of the organization is presented in Chapters 6-10. The account of the services given in Chapter 4 has been confined to a brief, descriptive outline. In Chapter 9, service delivery is considered in some detail, when the influence of statutory funding on the physical and human resources of the Project, and on the access of users to services, is examined.
CHAPTER 5 - THE FINANCIAL RESOURCES OF THE BEECH HOUSE PROJECT AND FORMAL ACCOUNTABILITY TO FUNDING SOURCES.

SUMMARY

Chapter 5 looks in some detail at the financial resources of the Beech House Project; a grasp of the complex pattern of multiple sources of short-term funding on which Beech House survived is essential to an understanding of the development of this organization, created virtually overnight by the acquisition of a paid staff funded by the MSC Community Programme, based in accommodation provided on the strength of Urban Aid and Urban Policy funding. Serious financial and management problems experienced in the first year of operation led the MSC to insist that the Society should cease to be a managing agent, this responsibility being transferred to the Borough Council. Attempts to obtain more secure funding than the Community Programme could provide were partially successful; joint finance was obtained for three years for the Home Care/Sitting-in Service and the playgroup. A charity agreed to fund for two years a Service Co-ordinator to replace the manager hitherto provided by the Community Programme. 'One-off' grants from joint finance and County Council sources were obtained for specific items e.g. transport, holiday playschemes. The Society itself could dispense money from its general funds to subsidize Project activity, and the Project also received voluntary donations direct from community sources. A detailed summary of the full range of sources of finance is available in Appendix III.

It is noteworthy that though the Society had as a formal goal the creation of a comprehensive integrated service, the Project was never funded as a whole during the course of the research, since each funding source provided only for a limited aspect of Project operations.

The expansion of the range of sources of finance had implications for financial management. The main funding bodies each operated with different procedures and different forms of accountability, though with the emphasis on financial criteria. The MSC was also concerned with employment and training conditions. There was little evidence of a formal systematic approach to monitoring the services provided to users. The Society and charity-funded managers lacked professional skills in financial management and for most of the research had no access to a source of professional advice within the Society or the Project. The funding authorities themselves on occasion demonstrated confusion and differences of opinion on what arrangements for support of the Project had been agreed.
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The charity-funded managers and Executive Committee members also confronted problems relating to the renewal of existing grants. The goal of securing long-term funding from statutory service sources remained a further funding issue demanding attention, especially when cuts in Community Programme funding were implemented in 1987. Society funds were not adequate to support the employment of care staff, especially given the increasing tendency of donors to insist their contributions be used for the purchase of capital goods, reducing the amount of 'free' funds available to the Project. The continuation of service delivery on the present scale required a major input of funding from other sources.

INTRODUCTION

An understanding of the complex pattern of funding of the Beech House Project is essential to an understanding of the Project as a whole. It is not only the amount of money available to support and provide the various services which is crucial, but the multiplicity of sources of that money and the conditions under which it was made available to the Project. Changes in the funding pattern during the period contributed in a major way to changes in service provision (see Chapter 4) and in organizational structure (see Chapter 6). However, the ambition of the Society and the charity-funded managers of the Beech House Project to obtain long-term funding from the health service and local authority, as described in Chapter 4, was apparent throughout period under study. The implications of this will be considered in Chapter 7 onwards.

Throughout the period of the research, Beech House operated on a system of 'multiple funding'. This is examined in some detail because of the implications of this situation for other resources and for the operation of the Beech House service. Although the creation of a comprehensive, integrated service remained a goal during the period of the research, Beech House was never financed as a comprehensive, integrated service by the funding bodies concerned. An appreciation of this is fundamental to an understanding of the complexities of the Beech House Project as it developed during the period of the research. Chapter 5 offers in Part (I) a descriptive account of the financial resources of the Project. Part (II) discusses the accountability of the Project to its funding sources. Part (III) considers problems of financial management, including issues of future funding.
PART (I) : FINANCIAL RESOURCES

(a) Grant-aid: April 1983 - January 1988
Beech House was leased from the County Council. Repairs, furnishings, etc. were financed by an Urban Aid grant of £46,000. Funds to cover the major part of the maintenance and running costs were provided by the Urban Policy Sub-Committee of the County Council, this grant to run for three years from April, 1983. This also allowed for the salary of a part-time House Manager (house administrator-cum-caretaker) for the same period. Twenty-seven other staff were all provided by a Manpower Services Commission Community Programme which commenced in June 1983. The majority of these staff were part-time. Although the MSC did fund a Project Manager to oversee the Community Programme, overall management of the Beech House service on a day-to-day basis remained in the hands of the the Society Chairman, acting in a voluntary capacity. It was felt that the Project Manager recruited to the Community Programme lacked the experience and qualifications needed for the assumption of full executive responsibility. The Society was seeking funding elsewhere for the post of Service Co-ordinator, as described below.

During the first year of the Community Programme the Society acted as the managing agent. A series of severe managerial and financial problems arose, for example, the use of funds allocated for salaries to purchase capital items. These led to the insistence by the MSC that the Borough Council should take over as managing agent if the Programme was to be renewed. This arrangement was accepted for succeeding years of the Community Programme at Beech House.

Anxious that the Project should achieve more financial security than the annually renewable Community Programme could provide, the Society began, during the first year of the MSC scheme, to make moves to obtain joint finance. Long and sometimes difficult negotiations were not concluded until the end of 1984 and left a legacy of uneasy relationships between the Society and some parts of the statutory sector. For the latter half of 1984, while joint finance negotiations continued, a complex package of emergency interim joint finance supported eight Project posts relating to the provision of Home Care/Sitting-in and the playgroup. Joint finance for the Respite Care and Information services was never formally applied for. Informal discussions with statutory service representatives had
indicated that bids for funding for these services were unlikely to be successful. During the negotiations it was made plain by the joint finance authorities that no support for the appointment of a Service Co-ordinator would be forthcoming. The authorities believed that their resources should be concentrated on direct services. The funding of this service management post, together with clerical/administrative support for the Project as a whole, was felt to be the Society's responsibility. A proposal for funding for a counselling and advocacy service was rejected during the negotiations on the grounds that it was a luxury for a relatively small catchment area. It was dropped from the final bid. Eventually, joint finance for three years was obtained only for the Home Care and Sitting-in service and for the pre-school playgroup. Adult Daycare was refused joint finance on the grounds that this client group could be supported by statutory services. Together with any Respite Care provision and general clerical and administrative support, it would remain dependent on Community Programme staff.

Funding for the Service Co-ordinator's post was eventually obtained from a charity; by the time this appointment was made, twenty months after the Project opened, there had been three MSC-funded managers. The first Community Programme Project Manager had resigned after several months and had been succeeded by a member of the Executive Committee of the Society, on a temporary basis only. The Secretary of the Society had then stepped in to 'hold the fort' for six months until the arrival of the charity-funded manager. When this manager resigned 17 months after his arrival, continued support was obtained from the charity to help fund a new appointment for two years. However, this support was only partial and a contribution was required from the Society's funds.

In February 1985, when the charity-funded manager took up his post, Beech House was receiving funds from a number of sources. The MSC scheme had been renewed for a second year and a third year would have to be negotiated in the spring of 1985. The manager's salary was to be paid for two years by the charity, after which further funding would need to be obtained. The Urban Policy grant would expire in March 1986, again necessitating a search for alternative funding.

Joint finance had been implemented in January for the Home Care/Sitting-in service, providing twelve part-time posts. This grant would expire at the end of December 1987, though an undertaking had been given that the Social Services Committee of the County Council would consider assuming responsibility for the
continuation of the service after the initial period, subject to a review of the effectiveness of the scheme. Joint finance of the playgroup had been agreed, but not implemented, and these staff remained in the Community Programme for the time being. It was eventually arranged that joint finance of the playgroup would commence at the conclusion of the second year of the Community Programme in mid-1985, and would run until June 1988. No commitment to consider funding of the playgroup beyond that date had been given by the sponsoring Education and Welfare Sub-committee of the County Council.

In addition to these formal grants, paid on a regular basis, the Project was able to obtain some 'one-off' grants from the County Council and joint finance for specific events and items such as holiday playschemes and transport costs.

(b) Community donations
The Project received direct donations in cash and kind from a range of sources in the local community, for example, individuals, social clubs, other voluntary organizations. The Society itself obtained donations and was able to be a source of funding for the Project. During the research the support given to the Project by the Society included subsidizing Respite Care and the Sitting-in service; underwriting any 'deficit' generated by the Project; replacement of capital goods, and paying for a cleaner and for extra hours of book-keeping time, for certain periods.

From time to time during the period, concern was expressed by the Executive Committee and by the charity-funded managers about the amount of money which the Society could make available to the Project. Since the Society was a source of funding for the Project and also underwrote any budget 'deficit' generated by the Project, there was a paramount need for 'uncommitted funds' in the Society accounts. In April 1986, the Society Treasurer drew the attention of the Executive Committee to the drop in cash donations for the year ending March 1986 (i.e. £3,175 compared with £7,018 for the previous year), and stressed his worries about the lack of free funds. Direct fund-raising had produced similar figures for the two years, but at a much lower level than donations (£1,355 in 1985-86, compared with £1,326 for 1984-85). Earlier, in February 1986, the Treasurer had emphasized that donors were increasingly insisting that the money given be used to buy specific items and the Project Manager had confirmed that 75% of donations received were already earmarked for specific purchases. The Treasurer expressed
the fear that the Project might end up with a house full of fancy goods and nothing with which to run the house. In March 1987, a similar discussion took place at the Executive Committee regarding the consequences for the future if donors, and especially local organizations, continued insisting on the purchase of capital goods, rather than giving the Society and the Project freedom to allocate such donations according to their own priorities.

The multiple sources of funding and the different periods for which they were available are represented diagrammatically in Figure 5.1, which covers the whole life of the Project from 1982 to mid-1988. The high levels of complexity and uncertainty associated with the Project's financial management are evident in this figure. For the period covered by the research (February 1985 - January 1988) more detailed descriptions of the financial complexities are presented in Appendix III, which shows, together with the amounts and periods of operation of the major grants, substantial changes in the numbers and types of staff supported by each grant. The great majority of contracted staff were supported by either joint finance or by the Community Programme. In February, 1985, there were twelve joint financed posts and 15 Community Programme posts. Six months later the numbers had increased to 18 and 19 respectively. In June, 1987, the staff, apart from the Project Co-ordinator and the House Care Assistant, remained almost equally divided between these two sources of finance, with 19 joint financed posts and 20 Community Programme posts. Only a small number of contracted employees were supported by other forms of finance ie. the House Manager (Urban Policy), the Project Manager/Project Co-ordinator (charity), the House Care Assistant and extra hours for the Book-keeper (the Society). Casual staff were employed to do 'sitting- in' (paid out of joint finance and subsidized by the Society) and for respite care (paid through grants from the County Council Social Services Department when available and by subsidies from the Society when not). Financial resources were not sufficient to provide all contract staff for these services.

The annual re-negotiations of the Community Programme were not without problems. Changes in staffing patterns, often related to what was happening to funding elsewhere in the Project, were negotiated with the MSC before the formal renewal application was made. The procedures were such that Project staff might not know until the last minute whether another Programme would go ahead. In mid-1986, negotiations for a fourth year of the Community Programme had not
Figure 5.1 - Main sources of funding from Project's inception - 1988
been finalized when the renewal date arrived, and an interim funding arrangement was agreed, from 18th June - 5th September, 1986. After that date the re-vamped Community programme operated for another year.

PART (II) : FORMAL ACCOUNTABILITY TO FUNDING SOURCES

(a) Statutory funding sources

Financial accountability to statutory funding sources:

The formal accountability of the Project to the statutory funding sources was mainly confined to financial accountability in terms of, for example, audited annual financial statements of expenditure and conformity with agreed procedures.

*The Urban Policy grant:* appears to have required only an audited annual financial statement, for a financial year commencing in April.

*The MSC Community Programme:* operated with a financial year for Beech House which for 1984-85 and 1985-86 ran from mid-June, and for 1986-87, following a brief interim arrangement, ran from September. The MSC applied certain rules of financial management which had to be followed. The managing agent monitored the financial side of the MSC's relationship with Beech House Project, not the effectiveness of the care provisions.

*The joint finance grants:* sponsored by the County's Departments of Social Services and Education, were administered by the Health Authority which requires annual audited accounts to be submitted for each financial year, the official financial year commencing in April.

Service monitoring by statutory funding sources:

Monitoring of the actual services in any formal systematic way played little part in the accountability procedures. No representatives of the three sources of statutory funding were members of the Executive Committee i.e. the management body of the Project, nor did they attend in an advisory capacity.

*The Urban Policy grant:* required only fiscal accountability.

*The MSC:* required all Community Programme projects to apply their regulations on the employment and training of staff. The MSC arranged occasional visits by a
Link Officer, who interviewed employees to establish that the staff were doing the jobs that were described, that they had opportunities to apply for jobs, and that they were receiving training. While the MSC expected a Community Programme project to generally be of benefit to the community, there seemed to be no monitoring procedure to assess the beneficial effects upon members of the community using services provided by a project.

The joint finance authorities: had no formal system for regularly monitoring the services provided by joint financed staff at Beech House. Some informal but apparently infrequent visits were made by representatives of the joint finance authorities. In 1988 the Project Co-ordinator, for example, recalled only one such visit to the playgroup since that service achieved joint finance in mid-1985. A brief formal 'review' of the Home Care/Sitting-in Service and the playgroup, was carried out in August 1986 by the two sponsoring statutory services, to make recommendations on whether to grant these services further joint finance from December 1987.

Both the MSC and the joint finance authorities placed formal restrictions on the staffing and operation of services as distinct from formal accountability requirements. These are referred to in Chapter 6 on organizational structure and Chapter 9 on service delivery.

(b) The charity funding the manager's salary
The charity required an annual financial statement about the expenditure on the managers salary, for a year commencing 1st February. In addition, it can be argued that the existence of the university-based research was an example of formal accountability in terms of programme monitoring, since two interim reports and one final report were required, including material on monitoring the development of the Project and service delivery in particular.

(c) Community donations direct to the Project
While such cash donations were of a 'one-off' nature, it was common, as described above, to find strings attached. These took the form of requirements of formal assurances that the money would be spent on capital items of which the donors approved. This may be viewed as a type of financial accountability.
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(d) The Society
The Society itself was an important source of financial support to the Project, channelling donations from the community into Project funds, with donors able to insist on compliance with their requirements on expenditure. The Project Manager/Project Co-ordinator was accountable to the Chairman and Executive Committee for Project expenditure. The Society has a financial year which ends in November and expected the relevant accounts to be presented accordingly, while monthly budget statements of estimated and actual expenditure were prepared for examination by the Committee. The manager was also accountable for the quality of the service. Formal programme monitoring was observed by the presentation of reports to Committee meetings on the outputs of the various services as indicated by the numbers using each service, references to any changes in provision etc.

PART (III) : PROBLEMS OF FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

(a) The relationship with funding bodies
Difficulties arose in the control of a budget drawn from so many different sources, with each main funding body applying its own regulations and procedures. However, there were those within the Society and the Project who saw advantages in this situation of multiple funding, given that each source of funding was only entitled to a partial picture of the Project's finances. Difficulties also arose, where a funding body's financial procedures had not been fully understood by the Project or where the necessity of strict observance of rules on expenditure had perhaps not been fully appreciated.

Unfamiliarity with the administrative procedures of official bodies helped, on occasion, to produce decisions on funding which were not expected by Project staff. In November 1986, for example, the Project Co-ordinator was surprised to find the August review of joint financed services had resulted in a decision by the Joint Consultative Committee to provide future funding for Home Care/ Sitting-in and the playgroup when the existing joint finance expired i.e. by tapering the joint finance grant over four years from January 1988, until the full costs of these services were met from main programme funding. The Co-ordinator and staff were unaware that any such developments were taking place and had not understood the role of the review. This exercise was felt to have been both cursory and unsatisfactory, as it had not looked at the Project services as a whole
and had not offered the Co-ordinator an opportunity to express her views on future funding needs.

Also in November 1986, the Project Co-ordinator was presented with another unanticipated financial issue. The joint finance authorities exercised a 'claw-back' of £5,000 of joint finance grant, on the grounds that the Project had underspent on the Home Care and Sitting-in service for the year 1985-86. This had come as a surprise to the Project Co-ordinator, who had difficulties identifying the reasons for this amount of underspending in a period prior to her appointment. Then in April 1987, the Project was informed that a further £5,000 of joint finance for 1986-87 was to be 'held back' to compensate for money from the grant which had, in the past, been used for items other than those originally agreed e.g. for extra mileage for Home Care beyond the amount stipulated. Again, this issue came as a surprise to the Co-ordinator.

That official bodies themselves could also have problems in administering joint finance became clear in the autumn of 1986. The County's Education Department and the Health Authority had a major disagreement over the extent of the Education Department's financial commitment to Beech House, something which, it appeared, had never been clearly defined. This situation was resolved in November 1986 by the Joint Consultative Committee agreeing to increase joint finance for the Education Department's contribution to Beech House from the figure of £8,000 p.a. which it had approved, to that of £22,000 p.a. which the Education Department had actually been paying to Beech House.

A lack of communication on financial matters between the Society and the Project Co-ordinator was also apparent, when the Co-ordinator issued a written statement on Project income to statutory service representatives in 1987 during negotiations for long-term funding. This included the information that extra hours currently being worked by the book-keeper were a direct charge on the charity's grant such that the funding for the Project Co-ordinator's salary would run out in March 1988. The Society Chairman later corrected these statements, attributing the misunderstanding to the fact that the decision to draw on the Co-ordinator's salary account for bookkeeping expenses had been taken before her appointment, with the intention that the sum involved would eventually be re-imbursed by the Society.
During 1987, it became apparent that even a comparatively minor, though crucial, item could cause confusion, with a debate at the Executive Committee on the legal ownership of the mini-bus. No-one knew whether the bus, donated by a local Bingo Club over two years before, actually belonged to the Project such that it could be sold and the proceeds retained, or whether the Project merely had the use of the bus for the agreed period.

(b) The need for skills in financial management.
In this system of multiple funding, with the Project required to operate to four different financial years and with an annual turnover which was probably close to £200,000 p.a., it was inevitable that managers of the Project had major demands made upon them in the area of financial management. However, neither of the charity-funded managers had qualifications or experience in this field. The Society Treasurer and the Project book-keeper did not have relevant professional qualifications. For most of the period of the research professional assistance with problems arising from budget procedures or the design of appropriate financial systems was limited to that which the auditors might on occasion provide. How often such advice was offered during the research is not known. The Chairman and ex-Project Manager recall instances of such advice being offered. The Project Co-ordinator cannot recall receiving advice from auditors during her appointment.

By April 1987, the Project Co-ordinator had become deeply concerned about the financial management of the Project. Determined to obtain sound, professional advice, she finally found a qualified and experienced accountant prepared to help the Project in this way, and in May the Society agreed to arrange an honorarium.

(c) Future funding
During the period under study, developments were also taking place which would influence the pattern of funding after the research finished. For example, the Chairman had to negotiate an extension of funding with the charity, in mid-1986, when the departure of the Project Manager seven months before the end of his contract meant a replacement was required. Also, as previously mentioned, in mid-1986 County Council officials were reviewing the future of the Urban Policy Grant, the joint financed pre-school playgroup and the Home Care/Sitting-in service. They recommended that main programme funding should be provided by the Social Services and Education Departments when these short-term resources expired.
During the latter part of 1986, an application for joint finance for Adult Daycare and Respite Care was made and rejected. Shortly afterwards the MSC announced plans to cut staff on local Community Programme schemes, including Beech House. This put the services of Adult Daycare and Respite Care in jeopardy and precipitated the granting of an interim joint finance award. The future of these services, together with the issue of funding for both a Deputy Manager and a Project Co-ordinator, were reviewed by representatives of the County Council Social Services Department and the Health Authority, prior to a joint finance bid being submitted for consideration in November 1987. If successful, all the direct care services of the Project would then become joint financed. The reduced Community Programme negotiated for September 1987 contained only eleven places - four Horticulture Project/House maintenance staff, one Activities Co-ordinator, two House Care Assistants and four administration/clerical staff, one of which would be designated 'Senior Supervisor'. This contrasted markedly with the first year of the Community Programme, when all the care services were provided by MSC-funded staff.

As previously mentioned, there was concern on the part of the Executive Committee and the charity-funded managers about the amount of 'free funds' provided by voluntary donations. By the end of September 1987 the Society had been able to build up a reserve of almost £24,000, although £8,568 was committed to certain forms of expenditure eg. staff salaries, furniture and fittings (see Appendix IV). This reserve had been achieved in addition to the Society providing financial support to various aspects of the Project since its inception. However, this reserve, together with the Society's income for 1986-87 of £15,598 (a fall from a little over £19,000 in September 1986, as shown in Appendix IV) needs to be seen in the context of an annual turnover for the Project of some £200,000. Despite its success in attracting donations, therefore, the Society's experience suggested that voluntary giving would be unable to sustain the employment of Project staff to provide the present care services, should the Society fail to obtain large-scale future funding from other sources.

CONCLUSIONS

In Chapter 5, detailed consideration has been paid to the Project's financial resources, an understanding of which is essential to the aim of exploring the
influence of statutory funding on a voluntary service agency surviving on a range of sources of short-term funding. Changes in sources of finance have been described (see also Appendix III), showing how the range of sources expanded from the time of the appointment of the first charity-funded manager, with particular implications for staffing and for financial management. The great majority of contracted staff were supported by either joint finance or the Community Programme, with Urban Policy, the charity and the Society itself providing a small number of posts. The Society also supported the employment of casual staff.

The major external funding sources (i.e. MSC, joint finance, Urban Policy) provided not only for staff salaries but incorporated contributions to the running costs of the house and services. The forms of accountability employed were found to involve mainly financial criteria, although the MSC was also concerned with aspects of employment and training conditions. There was little evidence of the use by these funding authorities of formal systematic approaches to the monitoring of services provided to mentally handicapped people and families with a mentally handicapped member.

Voluntary donations were made available to the Project by various sources in the community. These donations frequently had strings attached. Donors often required a form of accountability from the Society and the Project, demanding that their donations be used to purchase specific capital items. This was not the source of free funds which might be expected.

This situation of multiple-funding placed considerable demands on the charity-funded managers in the area of financial management. Each of the major sources of finance had its own procedures and rules regarding expenditure, and the local authority, the MSC, the Society and the charity grant all operated according to different financial years. The state of the budget was of foremost concern to the managers and to the Executive Committee, especially in view of the financial crisis in the first year of the Community Programme. The renewal of existing grants and the securing of long-term statutory funding for Project services were also issues demanding the time and energy of managers and Committee members.

With the cuts in MSC funding announced in early 1987, the need to secure alternative funding from the statutory authorities became more urgent. The reduced MSC Community Programme agreed from September 1987 contained no
care staff for Adult Daycare or Respite Care. Although interim joint finance had been arranged for these services until December 1987, it seemed inevitable that they would cease if further joint finance was not achieved. The Society was able to subsidize the Project to some considerable extent, but its funds were in no way adequate to support the continued employment of staff providing care services.

Throughout the period under study, the issues of financial management, the securing of long-term statutory funding and the survival of services had to be confronted and dealt with by the charity-funded managers, in addition to their responsibilities for the overall management of care services on a day-to-day basis. No professional expertise in accountancy was available to the managers from within the Society or within the Project for most of the period of the research. Limited advice on such matters was offered by the auditors on occasion during the appointment of the first charity-funded manager. In the spring of 1987 the Project Co-ordinator, anxious to secure ready access to a source of professional expertise, found a qualified accountant willing to be called on for advice.

Some implications of multiple-funding and MSC regulations for the staffing of Beech House have been indicated in this paper. These will be considered in more detail in Chapters 6 and 7, when organizational structure is discussed. The influence of the statutory funding on planning, service delivery and monitoring will be considered in Chapters 8 - 10.
CHAPTER 6 - ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

SUMMARY

Chapter 6 describes the organizational structure of Beech House and the changes which took place in this structure during the research. Part I describes the basic structure of the organization, i.e. the way work is divided and assigned and coordination achieved. This entails discussion of hierarchy and division of labour illustrated by organization charts. The range of formal groups/committees intended to enhance coordination of staff activities is also considered. Part II examines the operating mechanisms introduced to enhance the direction and motivation of the paid staff, i.e. staff training, records and operating procedures.

INTRODUCTION

It is helpful, in considering the influence of statutory funding on organizational structure, to distinguish between basic structure and operating mechanisms (Buchanan and Huczynski, 1985). Basic structure concerns the way the work of the organization is divided and assigned to individuals, groups and departments, and the ways coordination is achieved. This aspect of structure is exemplified in the existence of organization charts, job descriptions, boards, committees and working parties. Operating mechanisms are used to specify expected behaviour in some detail, motivate members and to attempt to ensure they strive towards organizational goals. Part I will deal with hierarchy, span of control, specialization and definition of jobs, staff and line relationships and the departmentalization of jobs, illustrated by the relevant Beech House organization charts. The role of the management groups will be discussed here, i.e. the Executive Committee and Management Panel/Management Sub-committee, representing the formal reporting relationship between the paid staff and their employer, the Society. The range of formal group meetings/committees intended to promote coordination of staff activities will also be considered, i.e. the Supervisors' Group which regularly brought together the supervisors and organizers of the various sections of the Project; Communications Meetings, also attended by supervisors and organizers; the House Meeting, which was a relatively infrequent gathering of all the paid staff; Programme Planning Meetings/Reviews which were set up to coordinate service delivery at the level of the individual user; and the
Policy Group and Practitioners Group, both intended to coordinate at a general level Beech House services with externally-provided services.

Part II examines the operating mechanisms established by the charity-funded managers, i.e. staff training, a central records system, and formal statements of operating procedures.

PART (I): BASIC STRUCTURE

(A) Hierarchy and the division of labour

(i) Governance structure

Figure 6:1 shows the organization chart\(^1\) for Beech House in February 1985, at the point where the new charity-funded manager had taken up his post. The structure he inherited had been built up as Community Programme funding was obtained and services were introduced during the first year of the Project. Thus, the organizational structure in February 1985 was that determined by the founders of the Project, a small group of active parents with the Society Chairman in a dominant role. The Executive Committee had been responsible for Society affairs and the provision of limited services long before the acquisition of statutory funding permitted the employment of paid staff to provide a wide range of care services, operating within a newly-created organization, i.e. 'the Project'.

The creation of Beech House simply extended the Executive's responsibilities. There was no evidence in Society records of discussions on structural alternatives such as a cooperative. The possibility of a separate small management committee, composed of a few Executive Committee members, was raised but not pursued. The Executive as a whole became the management committee of Beech House, presiding over an organization designed as a traditional hierarchy of authority. While this structure may well have been in tune with the preferences of the MSC, as argued by some critical commentators (see Chapter 2), the prior existence of a long-established formal Committee, with the usual officers, can be seen as predisposing the Society to this structure.

\(^1\) The organization charts circulated to staff by the managers of Beech House did not include the Executive Committee or the Society Chairman. They are included in these organization charts to clarify the issue of levels of hierarchy.
Figure 6.1: Organization Chart - Beech House. February, 1985
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The Executive Committee and Management Panel/Management Sub-committee

The Executive Committee was composed largely of parents. In addition to the four officers of the Society (Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Secretary and Treasurer) there were 19 Committee places in February 1985. Four or five Committee places were held by people with an interest in mental handicap (including the director of the charity-funded research project) who were not parents of mentally handicapped children or adults. By June 1986, four Committee members had resigned, but no replacement members had been nominated. A year later, in June 1987, three new members (proposed at the AGM in November 1986) had become regular attenders and the new leader of the Youth Club had joined the Committee. The Committee continued to be mainly composed of parents, the majority of whom had been involved in setting up Beech House in 1983. It was the practice at the AGM to confirm as members of the Executive all those willing to serve again for the coming year. There was no annual process of re-election which involved nominations and voting by the general membership. By the time the research ceased the same Chairman had been in office for over five years.

During the research:- No statutory service professionals attended either as members or as regular observers; in the past the heads of a special school and a day centre had regularly attended meetings but this practice had ceased by early 1983. As the Society had become more vocal in its criticisms of statutory provisions the relationships with such statutory agencies were put under strain. The Chairman recalled that the Society decided the attendance of statutory service professionals at Executive Committee meetings would not make a useful contribution to the development of the Beech House Project.

No funding body representatives attended either as members or as observers; none of the funding bodies had expressed a desire for such arrangements.

No mentally handicapped user had a place on the Committee or attended as an observer; the Society had no arrangements for such participation.

There was no formal staff representation on the Committee; members of staff other than the manager were invited to attend when it was thought that their presence would be helpful to the proceedings; the manager attended in order to report to the Committee, receive comments and queries and participate in
discussions on various issues relating to the Project. Since no staff attended the Executive Committee as participants or observers on a regular basis, the manager was the sole formal channel of communication between the staff group and the Executive Committee.

The Committee also provided the one formal structure within which the manager could meet with a group of parents who used Beech House and hear their views on the aims and achievements of the Project. However, attendance at the Executive Committee was often limited. Apart from the officers, only about eight members attended the Executive on a fairly regular basis. Many parents using Beech House were not Society members and had no part in the Executive Committee. There were no plans for the establishment of a users' committee for parents.

On occasion the manager would propose change in various features of the Project - a new service, a change of image by introducing a new logo, a cut-back in service, the need for expenditure by the Society on a particular item. The Committee would debate the matter and accept or reject the proposal. Some changes within the Project were implemented without consultation with the Committee. For example, two major reorganizations of the Information Service/Common Resources Group by the Project Manager were agreed by the Chairman to be matters of management policy which the Committee need not discuss.

It was possible for a major issue not to come before the Committee. In April 1986, the Project Manager submitted a confidential report to the Chairman of the Executive Committee, in which he proposed a radical change in the services provided by Beech House, notably a drastic reduction in the number of Community Programme places and the closing of Adult Daycare. Such changes would require re-structuring. However, these matters were never openly discussed with the Executive as a whole and the proposals were not implemented. In May, the Project Manager resigned, following his acceptance of an appointment elsewhere.

The Management Panel/Management Sub-committee: Prior to the appointment of the charity-funded manager the Chairman met formally with the Community Programme Project Manager, the House Manager and supervisors, at the fortnightly 'Management Panel'. This meeting, which he chaired, was then the operational
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group of the Project, the agendas dominated by day-to-day matters of running the house and service delivery.

After the arrival of the first charity-funded manager the Society Chairman withdrew considerably from his formal involvement in overseeing the day-to-day management of Beech House. However, there appeared to be frequent contact between the Chairman and the manager, with some decisions on Project matters being taken outside the setting of formal committee meetings. Matters concerning day-to-day service provision were discussed by the Project Manager and supervisors at the newly introduced fortnightly supervisors' meetings (see below).

There remained a group with the title of Management Panel, but this no longer constituted the regular operational meeting of the Project. Instead, it gave the Chairman and one or two interested members of the Executive Committee a formal opportunity to meet the Project Manager and supervisors. The supervisors presented reports, answered questions, received instructions and could raise issues with these representatives of the Executive. At first, meetings were monthly. Then in June 1985 the Chairman decided the Management Panel need meet only quarterly. In March 1986 the Chairman proposed meeting once every two months. However, by December 1986 the Management Panel had not met for six months.

By then the new Project Co-ordinator felt the inclusion of Project business as only one item on the agenda of the monthly Executive Committee left insufficient time for discussion of Project matters. There was also a lack of contact between the Project Coordinator and members of the Executive Committee apart from the Chairman.

The Project Coordinator suggested the resurrection of the Management Panel, with some modifications. A small group of Executive Committee members would meet regularly with the Project Coordinator, to discuss only Project business. Coincidentally, there was some pressure for change from within the Executive Committee on the grounds that too much time at meetings was being taken up by Project affairs. It was felt that there was insufficient time to discuss issues of general interest to parents, that the Executive had become little more than a management committee for Beech House.
New arrangements were put into practice from February, 1987. A Management Sub-Committee was to meet at six-weekly intervals, alternating with the Executive Committee which would also meet every six weeks. The Sub-Committee would report back to the Executive Committee. The Chairman and Project Coordinator would attend the Sub-Committee, together with any members of the Executive interested in participating; contrary to the intention of the Project Coordinator, the Chairman, anxious that the group should not be seen as a 'closed shop', issued an open invitation. Unlike the Management Panel, it would be an evening meeting. At the meetings held between February and May 1987, four or five Executive members attended in addition to the Chairman. Members of staff were asked to attend only when matters relating to their particular activity were expected to arise, whereas all supervisors had routinely attended the Management Panel. By June 1987, the Project Coordinator had become concerned about the consequent lack of involvement of staff and about the problems of predicting which staff-members needed to be present. A request to the Chairman that all supervisors should attend the Management Sub-Committee as routine was approved.

The Project Coordinator continued to attend the Executive Committee but no longer presented a formal report on the Project on a regular basis. The Chairman gave an account of the previous Management Sub-Committee meeting. More time was devoted to matters of general interest such as fund raising and developments in services elsewhere in the country. The Sub-Committee was given authority to spend up to £3,000 of Society funds without prior reference to the Executive. The Sub-Committee gave an opportunity for more discussion on issues of special concern to the Project Coordinator, e.g. financial management problems, the establishment of a policy for dealing with referrals to Beech House.

(ii) Operational structure

The organization chart for Beech House in February 1985 shows a traditional hierarchy had been designed (see Figure 6:1), fairly flat in shape, with four levels of hierarchy between the Executive Committee and the non-supervisory employees of the Adult Daycare services, and three levels in the other service sections ('Staff' relationships, e.g. the book-keeper and administrator, as distinct from the line relationships, do not constitute an additional level in the hierarchy.).

At this time there were 15 Community Programme posts and 12 joint financed posts. Although there was a designation 'Senior Supervisor', in accordance with
MSC Community Programme rules, the occupant of this position in reality had no line management responsibilities on a day to day basis for sections other than Daycare. She took responsibility for the management of the full range of Beech House activities only in the absence of the Project Manager.

The number of levels in the hierarchy had not changed on paper, with the introduction of funding by the charity for the manager’s salary. However, in reality, the new manager was given more authority and responsibility than his Community Programme predecessor. For the first 20 months of the Project’s life the Society Chairman had played a prominent role in operational management. It was felt that all three of the Community Programme managers employed during that time lacked the necessary experience for full executive responsibility. Following the arrival of the charity-funded manager the Chairman withdrew considerably from his formal involvement with Beech House, in effect interposing a new level of hierarchy between himself and the supervisors. However, there appeared to be frequent contact between the Chairman and the new manager, with some decisions on Project matters being taken outside the setting of formal committee meetings.

The new manager was also given responsibility for coordinating the volunteer-run leisure services with the services organized by the paid staff. However, the manager had no authority over these independent services. They were, nevertheless, supposed to be an integral part of the total package of services available to users.

Figure 6:1 shows some specialization of jobs, with a small number of support staff, including a joint financed post of part-time book-keeper for 5 hours a week. Three groups of workers are providing services direct to users. The Chairman of the Society described choosing a service-based structure on the grounds of the desirability of separate strong service groups, each with a supervisor, capable of continued operation in the absence of the Project Manager. However, it is noteworthy that the Daycare staff-group offered at this time a range of provisions, i.e. daycare to adults, a pre-school playgroup, occasional respite care, and holiday playschemes for 5-19 year olds. At this time the span of control of the manager was eight employees, including both part-time Home Care supervisors. Job titles had been identified, and there were somewhat limited job descriptions circulating, in advertisements for staff and proposals for funding.
Figure 6.2 applies to the period June 1985-March 1986 and shows the changes taking place following the arrival of the new charity-funded manager. The number of employee places had increased from 29 to 39. Eighteen posts were now funded by joint finance, 20 by the Community Programme.

With the introduction of considerable numbers of joint financed staff to the Project services one particular operating rule of the MSC assumed at least formal significance, i.e. the stipulation that MSC-funded supervisors should not be responsible for the work of staff funded from other sources.

These changes should be noted:-

(a) The Information Service had been replaced by the Common Resources Group. This staff-group, while continuing to provide an information service, now had responsibility for health and safety matters, administrative and clerical support, personnel matters, the ordering of supplies and equipment. The duties of the House Manager post were absorbed by the group. Common Resources, said the Project Manager, would become "the engine-room of the Project", facilitating administration and communication within the Project, and with external agencies.

(b) A new role of 'Deputy Manager' had been designated. Daycare services had become divided into the playgroup and Adult Daycare, the former now being supported by joint finance and the latter remaining with the Community Programme. The new post of supervisor for Adult Daycare was designated 'Senior Supervisor', and the incumbent of the playgroup supervisor post, was entitled 'Deputy Manager'. While the Deputy Manager was herself directly involved in providing the playgroup and playscheme services, she now also had line-management responsibilities for some ancillary staff and the Activities Coordinator. There is also an indication, via the arrows linking the Deputy Manager to Daycare and Respite Care, of some responsibility for overseeing these services. No such relationship is indicated for the Deputy Manager vis-a-vis the Home Support Services and the Common Resources Group. These services would report directly to Project Manager, with the Deputy Manager still only assuming responsibility for the Project as a whole in the absence of the Project Manager.
Figure 6.2 - Organization Chart. June 1985 - March 1986
The title 'Deputy Manager' seems, in these circumstances, to have been inappropriate, implying a responsibility and authority which did not exist in reality. Confusion over the position of the Project Manager's immediate subordinate remained, therefore.

(c) Specialization and departmentalization within Beech House had increased, with a division of labour between the playgroup, Adult Daycare and Respite Care, and the introduction of new posts, i.e. the cleaner, the Horticulture Project, and Living Away from Home.

The MSC had allowed posts freed by the transfer of the playgroup and Home Care to joint finance to be retained and used for new services.

By the end of June 1985, therefore, Beech House possessed a bigger staff and offered a wider range of services than had been the case in February 1985, when the charity-funded Project Manager arrived. Joint finance arrangements had at last been fully implemented, leading to the formation of new staff groups and freeing Community Programme posts for allocation elsewhere in the Project. The organizational structure of the Project had been considerably changed, linked as it was with funding sources and the pattern of service provision.

The Project Manager had commenced the task of introducing written job descriptions for all Project posts. The span of control of the Project Manager remained the same as in February 1985. However, his responsibilities for coordinating service provision had increased. There was no funding for an official Deputy Manager post. Extra responsibilities for certain services were allocated to the supervisor of the playgroup without the knowledge of the joint finance authorities funding the playgroup. Given the ambiguous position of the Deputy Manager the situation regarding the number of levels in the hierarchy is confused. However, since the incumbent had no overall deputizing role on a day to day basis, there had been no change in the levels in the hierarchy for the Project as a whole.

Between March and June 1986, the organizational structure of Beech House was in a state of flux. The Deputy Manager's dissatisfaction with her role, together with the Project Manager's desire to ease tensions between them, led to the latter's attempt to achieve a generally acceptable re-allocation of responsibilities. The end-
Chapter 6 - Organizational Structure

... product of an extended period of discussion was the decision that the Respite Care and Adult Daycare supervisors would report directly to the Deputy Manager, making the situation less ambiguous than before. However, Common Resources, Home Care and the Book-keeper and Administrative Assistant would continue to be managed directly by the Project Manager. Only in the Project Manager's absence would the Deputy Manager have line management responsibilities for these staff groups/individuals. She still had no formal deputizing role on a day to day basis for the Project as a whole.

The Deputy Manager was re-titled Assistant Manager. Her responsibilities were increased in a way not indicated by the organization chart. She was given a formal service coordinating role. In future she would act as chairperson of the Programme Planning meetings (see below), a position formerly occupied by the Project Manager.

Also in March, the MSC-funded occupant of the Living Away from Home post successfully applied for a joint financed vacancy as a Home Care Assistant. The Project Manager allocated the new Living Away from Home worker to Adult Daycare. The people helped by the former Living Away from Home worker became a Home Care responsibility.

Before these structural changes could be assessed the Project Manager resigned. Shortly before his departure in June he dismantled the Common Resources Group, described a year earlier as "the engine room of the Project". The staff were to work as individuals and not as a staff group, and would be given new job descriptions. The MSC had already agreed to the manager's proposal that the post of Common Resources Group supervisor would disappear in the renewed Community Programme, starting in September. The post would be re-allocated to Respite Care, where the organizer had so far been classed and paid as a member of the non-supervisory staff.

Many of the details of this re-organization remained hazy, and staff were unsure who would be doing what. The situation was further complicated by continuing negotiations with the MSC over the renewal of the Community Programme. Administrative delays meant a temporary renewal was arranged for three months to September 1986, when the annual renewal would be implemented. On the departure of the Project Manager, the Assistant Manager stepped in on an 'acting'
basis. In September she was appointed to the post, re-titled Project Co-ordinator, on a two-year contract.

Figure 6.3 shows the organization chart in circulation at Beech House by the beginning of 1987, following changes implemented by the new Project Coordinator during her four months in post. The Project then consisted of 41 staff posts with 20 of them Community Programme-funded. The following points should be noted:

(a) Figure 6.3 shows that the organizational structure of Beech House was presented diagramatically by the Project Coordinator in the form of a circle as opposed to a hierarchy. The Coordinator described this new version as indicating more effectively the importance of every job in the organization. However, the hierarchy remained operational with the pattern of line-management unchanged. The Coordinator's span of control has increased to 11, compared with the Project Manager's span of control of eight in Fig 6.2. This is due to the abolition of the post of Common Resources Group supervisor, and a new job-sharing arrangement for the playgroup supervisors.

(b) The formal position of Assistant Manager has gone. The new Project Coordinator felt the combination of the two positions of playgroup supervisor and Assistant Manager was inappropriate for a number of reasons:

(i) it was practically difficult and too demanding to fulfil the responsibilities of both positions adequately; the playgroup had not developed as she believed it should;

(ii) other supervisors had reservations about this position of authority being occupied by someone simultaneously responsible for the direct delivery of a service in the same way as all supervisors;

(iii) the position of a full-time playgroup supervisor with specified duties was funded by joint finance; no permission had been sought from the relevant authorities for this supervisor to undertake the additional duties of a deputy manager; the new Coordinator was anxious that situation, should it come to the authorities' attention, could put future funding bids at risk;
Figure 6.3: Beech House - Organization Chart.  
September 1986 - September 1987
(iv) the two full-time members of staff who could be considered for a deputy manager position (i.e. the Adult Daycare supervisor and Respite Care supervisor) were both MSC-funded and were officially ineligible to supervise anyone who was not a member of the Community Programme Scheme. Thus the Project Coordinator's ability to deploy staff to provide additional management support was greatly restricted.

c) Abolishing the post of Assistant Manager had structural implications requiring the re-allocation to other supervisors of a number of posts, i.e. the drivers, domestic staff and the Activities Coordinator.

d) Figure 6:3 shows one of the two MSC-funded part-time posts of cook has been withdrawn; when vacant it proved impossible to fill. From September 1986 this was 'traded' for a new post i.e. the MSC-funded part time Kitchen Assistant.

e) Figure 6:3, compared with Figure 6:2, shows the single full-time post of playgroup supervisor is divided into two part-time posts to allow for a job-sharing arrangement.

(f) The new Project Coordinator had chosen to modify the proposals of her predecessor with regard to the administrative staff. The joint financed administrative staff and the staff of the former Common Resources Group are now grouped together and entitled 'Administration Support', though without a supervisor, thus removing a level of the hierarchy for this staff group.

In December 1986, the new Project Coordinator negotiated with the MSC for a waiver for the incumbent of a part-time administrative post who was at the end of her contract. Her part-time post and another unfilled part-time post were 'traded' for the new full-time post of 'Administration and Training Officer'.

(g) The House Care Assistant is no longer funded by the MSC (compare Figure 6:2) but by the Society. A satisfactory candidate had never been found for this post; the few suitable candidates did not conform to MSC eligibility rules. In October 1986 the Society agreed to employ a cleaner for Beech House for one year. A suitable candidate, formerly ineligible, was recruited at once. This is an example of the difficulties created by MSC eligibility rules. The freed MSC place was re-allocated elsewhere in Beech House.
(h) The staffing of the Horticulture/House Project has been reduced. One part-time post has gone, traded elsewhere in Beech House, because of the problems of finding mentally handicapped people who conform to MSC eligibility rules.

From the appointment of the former Assistant Manager as Project Co-ordinator in September 1986 to the renewal of the Community Programme for 1987-88, in September 1987, the levels of the hierarchy remained unchanged. However, specialization had further increased, with the introduction of the new posts of Kitchen Assistant, Respite Care Assistant and Day Care Aide, together with Administration and Training Officer. The Co-ordinator was continuing the task begun by her predecessor, that of producing a written job description for every post, to be kept on file. Like her predecessor she chose to change job-content where she felt this was necessary to meet service goals, e.g. she experimented with extending the responsibilities of existing staff by introducing new, if short-lived services i.e. the Thursday Club for children; the Saturday shoppers' creche.

Post-script

The funding basis of the organizational structure of Beech House, as represented in Figure 6:3 only applied until June 1987. A funding crisis, precipitated by cuts in Community Programme staffing announced in March/April, led to plans to cease provision of Adult Daycare and Respite Care. However, interim joint finance was hurriedly arranged for a six-month period commencing July 1987. The future funding of Respite Care and Adult Daycare and of the Project Coordinator's post was to be considered by the statutory service authorities in November 1987.

Thus, Adult Daycare and Respite Care would no longer be MSC-funded. The Community Programme scheme proposed for the year commencing September 1987 was much reduced, the MSC providing only two House Care Assistants, staff for a slightly expanded Horticulture and House Maintenance group, and an Activities (Volunteer) Coordinator, together with some administrative support for the Project. The post of Administration and Training Officer was to be designated a supervisory post, the occupant to act as Senior Supervisor to the Community Programme staff and as unofficial deputy to the Project Coordinator.

Under the interim funding, only a part-time Respite Care supervisor post would be permitted, and this position was to be taken by one of the part-time playgroup
organizers in addition to her existing responsibilities. The interim joint-finance would also provide extra hours for the Book-keeper and the Administrative Assistant, both posts originally joint financed but, in the Project Coordinator's view, inadequately.

Since field-work virtually halted in June 1987, it is not possible to provide any greater detail on these issues. This postscript has been included to demonstrate that Figure 6:3 in no way represents a continuing, stable situation in the organizational structure of Beech House.

(B) Formal coordinating groups/committees

(i) House Staff Meeting
This was initiated by the first charity-funded manager. There was no union organization for the staff, nor a staff committee of a non-union nature. Nor were staff represented on the Executive Committee. The House Meeting provided the one formal opportunity for non-supervisory staff to communicate their views on general issues to the manager. It also gave staff from different sections of the Project the opportunity to meet each other. The gathering took place quarterly and all staff were expected to attend. The Project Manager took the chair. News items of general interest were announced, as were staff departures. New members of staff were introduced. Staff were then invited to raise any matters about which they were concerned or on which they required information. The House Meeting continued during the appointment of the Project Coordinator, but she tried to widen the range of topics open for discussion and to encourage staff to participate by asking those who had been on visits/to conferences etc. to tell the meeting about these activities.

(ii) Supervisors' Group
This was introduced by the first charity-funded manager on his arrival; it replaced the Management Panel as the regular operational meeting of the Project. The group generally met fortnightly, attended by the service supervisors and organizers. Matters discussed included a wide range of topics, e.g. arrangements for staff training, safety procedures, MSC staff changes, funding developments and news from the last Executive Committee. Staff members present would also report on activities and plans concerning their own particular service.
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The meetings permitted a coordination of activities on a general level as distinct from the coordination of services provided to specific individuals. The meeting also afforded the supervisors the opportunity to voice their opinions on what form of service should be provided by Beech House and the extent to which they felt an appropriate standard of service was being achieved.

(iii) Programme Planning Meetings/Reviews

Programme Planning Meetings: Formal arrangements for the discussion of individual cases had not existed before the first charity-funded manager, a qualified social worker, came to Beech House. He introduced 'Programme Planning' in March 1985. Programme Planning was seen as a means of identifying individual and family needs and selecting appropriate services. It was intended also to provide a venue for supervisors to meet to discuss individual cases, to coordinate their own activities within Beech House and with those provided by outside agencies. Families would be asked how they felt about the services being provided, and needs which could not be met at Beech House would be referred elsewhere. Programme Plans would be reviewed at regular intervals, and services given would be gauged against service principles. No formal assessment of individuals' skills and abilities was employed in connection with Programme Plans.

At the first Programme Planning meeting, agreement was reached on the design of a referral form and on the type of information needed for Project records. It was acknowledged that files needed opening for all existing users as well as new referrals. As no systematic record-keeping had previously been undertaken at Beech House, the supervisors were thus presented with a major administrative task (see discussion of records in Part II, below).

The research worker attended the great majority of Programme Planning meetings held at Beech House between March 1985 and June 1986 (21 meetings attended). As these meetings became part of the Beech House routine, outside professionals became increasingly involved in the proceedings either by invitation or as the person referring a new case to Beech House. At the 10 meetings attended by the research worker during 1985 an outside professional was present for only 17 of the 32 cases discussed. By contrast an outside professional was present in all but three of the 17 cases discussed in 11 meetings attended during the first half of 1986. Usually, the professional was a social worker or a social work assistant.
Occasionally, several professionals were present, to discuss a major change in an individual's circumstances such as moving into accommodation in the community.

Although generally invited, parents and relatives attended less often than professionals. A parent or relative was present for only eight of the 32 cases discussed in 1985 and five of the 17 cases in the first half of 1986. Least likely to attend were the mentally handicapped people themselves. For most of the period of appointment of the Project Manager it was not the practice to invite them to the meetings at which their needs were discussed. During 1985, one mentally handicapped person attended meetings where her future was discussed. During 1986, a limited number of meetings were arranged to include the mentally handicapped people concerned. The researcher attended three such meetings, and there were at least three, possibly four, more which the research worker felt it was inappropriate to attend.

The chair was taken by the Project Manager until, after re-structuring in February 1986, this role was assumed by the Assistant Manager; the Project Manager ceased to attend on a regular basis. Attendance of other Beech House staff at the meetings depended on the case being discussed; staff were requested to attend who were most familiar with the cases concerned. Supervisors of the relevant services were usually present.

After 17 months the research worker was only able to identify 31 different individuals as having been the subjects of the Programme Planning meetings (compared with 178 user files on record in April 1986). The majority were the subject of only one meeting, but a limited number of families/individuals were the subject of two or more meetings.

With the virtual suspension of formal Programme Planning meetings during the long summer playscheme, and with the departure of the Project Manager whose innovation they had been, the future character of Programme Planning became an unknown quantity. It was apparent that supervisors were dissatisfied with the opportunities afforded for communication and coordination of services in individual cases, for in late May 1986 they decided to initiate an additional regular meeting, tentatively entitled 'Communications Meeting', to take place either before or after the Programme Planning meetings. The development of this new formal arrangement is outlined below, in (iv). Programme Planning meetings re-
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commenced in September 1986, but by December meetings had been held for only eight different individuals/families.

Reviews: In January 1987, with files open on 246 individuals/families, the Project Coordinator decided to replace Programme Planning meetings with 'Reviews'. It was hoped Reviews would cover far more users than Programme Planning meetings had done. The new title reflected the feelings of the Project Coordinator that Beech House was not in a position to achieve either the approach to identifying needs normally associated with Programme Planning or the integration of internal services with the full range of externally-provided services also used by customers (see the discussion of goals set for the Project in Chapter 8). The aim of Reviews was thus more modest, in one sense, than the aim of a total, tailor-made package which had underlain Programme Planning. However, it was an ambitious programme given the greatly increased numbers it was intended to serve.

Although, as before, some relevant professionals would be invited to participate, the emphasis would be on involving the Borough's three specialist social workers, and Reviews were soon timetabled with the intention of maximizing the attendance of these practitioners. Supervisors were asked to suggest names of users they felt would benefit from a 'Review'. Sixteen Reviews were completed during February and March, 1987.

A crisis of funding for Respite Care and Adult Daycare was by then developing, with the strong possibility that these services would have to cease in July. The need to review the situations of those using these services became urgent. The Project Coordinator felt it was crucial to look at the current needs of those concerned and to explore the availability of suitable alternative services. Where necessary, whole days were set aside for Reviews with invitations extended to relevant professionals, to carers, and to the mentally handicapped people involved (unless a carer did not wish the mentally handicapped person to be present). From mid-March onwards the Project Coordinator chaired almost all Review sessions. During April, May and June, 42 Reviews were completed.

The granting of interim joint finance for Adult Daycare and Respite Care was succeeded by the introduction of a Management Review of Beech House by the

---

2 The research worker did not attend 'Reviews', other aspects of the research by then demanding priority.
County Council Social Services Department and the Health Authority. This was in
preparation for the consideration by these bodies of the Beech House bid for long-
term joint finance, to go before the Joint Consultative Committee in November
1987. Thus, by mid-1987, it was the aim of the Project Coordinator to review all
users of those Beech House services provided by paid staff, and to complete this
process by Christmas. It was the intention of the Project Coordinator to ensure
every user routinely had a Review every six months.

Since Reviews involved all users, not only new referrals or crisis cases, they were
organized systematically in a way not evident when Programme Planning was in
operation. It was clear that major motivations to the rapid extension of Reviews to
all users were the funding crisis arising in the spring of 1987 with the withdrawal
of some MSC Community Programme places, and the introduction of the
Management Review of Beech House by the statutory authorities following the
granting of emergency interim joint finance.

(iv) Communications Meetings
These were introduced by the Project Manager, initially on a trial basis, in May
1986, following discussions by supervisors of the fact that most users of Beech
House were never the subjects of Programme Planning. At first 'Communications'
followed Programme Planning meetings. Supervisors would bring to the new
meeting all relevant information on new arrivals and 'up-dating' of existing cases
to share with other supervisors of Beech House services. Outside professionals
were not invited. However, it was hoped that more effective communication and
coordination within Beech House would benefit the working relationship between
Beech House staff and other professionals.

The staff now had a formal opportunity to discuss not only new referrals which
may or may not be appropriate for Programme Planning, but changes in the
circumstances and needs of existing service users whose cases had never been
discussed at Programme Planning meetings. After two meetings it was agreed that
the innovation was very useful. The meetings would recommence in September,
after the summer playscheme. The meetings were retained when Reviews replaced
Programme Planning in January 1987, but were moved to follow the fortnightly
Supervisors' Group. In April 1987 'Communications' became a separate weekly
meeting.
Two other meetings were specifically intended to further communication and coordination between Beech House and local statutory and voluntary services, but at a general level and not (in contrast to Programme Planning/Reviews) in relation to individual cases. These were commonly referred to as the 'Policy Group' and the 'Practitioners Group' and are described in (v) below.

(v) Policy Group and Practitioners' Group

These groups had been initiated before the arrival of the first charity-funded Project Manager, having their origins in a meeting organized by the Society in August 1984. This brought together the Chairman, Community Programme Project Manager, Beech House service supervisors and representatives of the local statutory services. The creation of such a group had been included in the joint finance proposal to be submitted by the Society to the Health Care Planning Team on 5th September 1984...

"Close contact with the statutory services will be assured by an Advisory Panel of professionals operating in the locality. They will advise on local need, quality of service delivery, avoidance of duplication and integration with existing statutory provision". The proposal went on to detail ways in which links with the statutory provision would be established, for example with peripatetic teachers, health visitors and local colleges.

It was decided a single professional advisory group would be insufficient and that two different groups were required to meet different objectives, i.e. a policy group at service manager level and an operational group for practitioners. Both groups had one meeting, in the autumn of 1984. There followed a gap of almost a year, the Policy Group only being resurrected at the request of one of the community physicians, in September 1985. As a consequence, the group of service practitioners also re-emerged.

The Policy Group acted mainly as a venue for general discussion between senior statutory service managers and between these managers and the Society Chairman and the first charity-funded Project Manager. A representative of a local voluntary society also attended. Until about March 1986 the Policy Group had a very limited role as an 'advisory panel' to Beech House, with attempts to avoid duplication of services apparent in, for example, the eligibility rules based on age applied to the playgroup. During local reorganization in the statutory services in 1986 the Policy Group did not meet for several months.
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The Practitioners' Group brought together a wide range of statutory service practitioners (many of whom seemed confused about the roles of services other than their own) together with the charity-funded Project Manager and Beech House supervisors. In early 1987, due to the efforts of a group of statutory service practitioners, the Practitioners and Policy Groups merged into the Mental Handicap Policy Group. This group was to be part of the new local planning framework for the Division and would report to the 'Local Planning Group'.

This latest form of the Policy group was in marked contrast to the original Policy group. A small meeting of senior managers, a representative of a local voluntary organization, the Chairman and the Project Manager, meeting quarterly and initiated as an 'advisory panel' for Beech House, had evolved into a component of a local planning framework, meeting monthly and drawing on a far wider field of membership. The Chairman no longer attended, but two parents nominated by the Society were invited. Beech House was no longer the official focus of the meeting, the Project Coordinator being one practitioner among many now invited. County Councillors, Day Centre Managers and representatives of further education joined those who had previously been invited to the Practitioners' Group, and those representatives sent by senior managers. The senior managers removed themselves to participate at a higher level in a new consultative structure devised following re-organization in the Health Authority and Social Services Department.

For Beech House though, direct contact with senior managers had not ceased. It continued through frequent, informal meetings between the Project Coordinator, the Divisional Social Services Manager and the Unit General Manager for Mental Handicap of the Health Authority. The development of this informal communication offered opportunities for discussion of the future of the Beech House service, especially the funding of the Project, which the original Policy Group had not, in practice, provided. This informal pattern of direct consultation had begun prior to the joint finance application in November 1986 and had intensified following its rejection. By mid-1987, after the granting of emergency, interim joint finance, this informal process of consultation culminated in the formal 'Management Review' of Beech House, linked to the preparation of a further joint finance bid for submission to the Joint Consultative Committee in November 1987.
PART (II): OPERATING MECHANISMS

Three types of operating mechanism introduced by the charity-funded managers are examined, i.e. staff training, records and information systems, and operating procedures.

(i) Staff training
Training of paid staff had taken place prior to the arrival of the charity-funded Project Manager, but on an ad hoc basis, with on-the-job instruction, staff visits to local agencies such as hospitals and special schools, and attendance at short courses and lectures. The new manager made plans to introduce a standardized training programme which would be relevant to all staff involved in service provision. Making such arrangements was fraught with problems relating to the availability of staff, many of whom were part-time.

A programme was finally instituted in February 1986, organized by the Common Resources Group. All staff were encouraged to attend. The subjects were essentially practical, designed to improve skills in the day-to-day care of mentally handicapped children and adults, many of whom also had physical handicaps. The course finished in April. It was intended that the training course should be the 'roll-on, roll-off' variety, so that new staff could join as they arrived. However, the course did not recommence and with the disbanding of the Common Resources Group in June 1986, it was not clear who would be responsible for future training.

The Project Manager also saw a need for training in 'normalization'. To this end, representatives of MIND visited Beech House on two occasions in January 1986, to run participatory workshops. Fewer than half the full complement of Beech House staff participated.

Further work on 'normalization' was deferred until the arrival in April of a social work student on placement. The Project Manager gave the student responsibility for this aspect of staff training. The principles communicated to staff would be used, with the student participating, in devising an Individual Programme Plan for a particular user. To the student the active participation of the mentally-handicapped person in devising his/her Individual Programme Plan, and the presence of that person at the subsequent meetings and reviews of the plan, were essential ingredients of the whole scheme. The Programme Planning approach
practiced at Beech House had not thus far generally involved the mentally handicapped people themselves.

On the departure of the Project Manager in June 1986, the student had to leave to seek a new placement, as no-one else at Beech House was qualified to supervise her. She was therefore unable to participate in any follow-up work on Programme Planning. The Common Resources Group, formerly responsible for arranging staff training, had been disbanded. It was decided the responsibility for organizing and running future training workshops on devising Individual Programme Plans would lie with the Home Care supervisors. No definite arrangements for future training sessions were made. Some months later one of the supervisors arranged a training session on 'normalization' but on her resignation in mid-1987 it was not clear what future provision there would be for such training.

In the latter half of 1986 the induction and training of paid staff reverted temporarily to its previous ad hoc basis. By December 1986, the Project Coordinator was able, following negotiations with the MSC, to allocate responsibility for staff training to a new full-time administrative post. The 'Administration and Training Officer' would be responsible, in consultation with service supervisors, for devising a standardized training programme within the Project, and for ensuring that the staff requiring training were appropriately informed of the arrangements made. The Training Officer would also be responsible for coordinating the training previously carried out within the separate services, ensuring that visits to local organizations were not duplicated and that all staff who would benefit from participating were able to do so.

The Project Coordinator took advantage of a budget provision of the MSC to obtain funds to support staff training. This source of funds, not previously used by the Project, provided £800 towards the costs of staff training in the period January to September 1987; this enabled some staff to attend training courses run by external agencies.

In August 1987, the Project Coordinator drew up and issued a 'Handbook for Staff' which would in future be distributed to all new staff as part of an induction procedure. This included information on a wide range of topics, including the philosophy of caring, arrangements for sick pay and annual leave, the disciplinary and grievance procedure and a statement of the safety policy. Some of this type of
information had been available to staff in the past, either as information sheets or lists pinned on noticeboards, but this was a first attempt at a comprehensive staff handbook designed to aid the induction of new staff.

Finally, the whole area of management and supervision was excluded from the staff training plans. No outside sources of training were exploited by the Project Manager for himself and the supervisors, though none had professional experience of managing an organization. His successor, conscious of her own lack of management experience, did attend a short MSC course for Community Programme Managers in 1987. This, she found, did not cater for the special problems of Community Programme schemes providing personal social services. By mid-1987 she was emphasizing the need for some form of management training and development, while aware of the difficulties involved in taking the necessary time away from the Project..."I am too busy doing the job to be trained!".

In conclusion, it should be borne in mind that the provision of staff training was expected by the MSC. Questions in the proposal form for the renewal of the MSC Community Programme required details about 'on' and 'off-the job' training and the ways in which the Project would enhance employees' employment prospects. Also, the 'Management Review' of Beech House by statutory service representatives which commenced in July 1987, was to look among other things at the area of staff development and evaluation. Joint finance for the Project had, however, included no allowance for the funding of staff hours for participation in training programmes.

For Beech House, therefore, the provision of a formal training programme can be seen as contributing not only to the development in staff of skills and attitudes considered desirable in those caring for mentally handicapped people, but also to the very continuation of the funding of the service.

(ii) Records and information systems
Prior to the arrival of the first charity-funded manager, records on the use of Beech House services had never been kept in any standardized, systematic way. There had been no centrally available records and individual supervisors had kept on record only the information they felt was necessary for their own purposes. Some figures on individual services had been produced by supervisors for circulation at the Society's Annual General Meeting, for publication in the annual
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Year Book of the Society, and for routine reports which supervisors gave to the Project Manager of the Community Programme for use at the Executive Committee meetings. None of the external funding sources, i.e. MSC, joint finance, Urban Policy, required the systematic provision of data on service use and service users.

The figures available were presented in a way which treated services as separate entities. There was no way of identifying the number of families using more than one Beech House service. Little information was communicated on users. Where figures on use over a period were given it was often impossible to tell whether an individual or family had been counted several times. Thus, a service could have been used many times by a few, or infrequently by many.

The new Project Manager related the introduction of Programme Planning to the need to establish and maintain central records on both existing users and new referrals. The staff were told that the charity funding the manager's salary had asked for figures on service use and the characteristics of service users. However, it was agreed that records should only be kept of material relevant to the needs of the Project, i.e. that required for delivery of a comprehensive, integrated service designed to meet individual needs.

Under the final agreed format for referral and recording, the following information would be required for all cases:

- Name
- Address and telephone number
- Date of birth
- Agency/Person making the referral
- Ages and numbers of siblings
- Person's employment/occupation/educational status
- The Beech House services the person/family was interested in using
- Society membership
- Whether the case was to be referred to a Programme Planning meeting
- The action taken
- Date and reason for ceasing to use a Beech House service
Information on disability, behaviour, medical history and family circumstances would only be included at the discretion of the staff member making out the referral form.

The Project Manager decided information on the use of volunteer-run leisure activities would not be recorded in the central files; where necessary, enquiries would be made of the volunteer organizers who kept private records.

With regard to the need to keep records of service use, the form included only a blank page with the heading 'Programme Plan' and brief reminders about recording details of 'Dates of subsequent contact', the services requested and provided, and any follow-up action decided at Programme Planning meetings. It was not clear, therefore, how information on service use over extended periods was to be recorded on this blank page in a regular, systematic and easily accessible way.

The Project Manager felt that the new central records would be fully operational by July 1985. The writer examined the files in the late summer of 1985. It was apparent that progress had been slow; many files were missing. Of the files that were available, basic information was not always included on the referral forms. The only systematic records of use came from Home Care and the Common Resources Group. The latter had designed their own forms to record details of enquiries and action taken on benefit claims. The Home Care supervisors had also recently introduced their own forms for recording frequency of use by an individual/family and the number of hours and type of help given by the Home Care Assistant. The Project Manager felt that such information might be useful for circulation to statutory authorities involved in allocating joint finance and to potential sources of future funding, to demonstrate the exact nature of the help available from the Home Care service. Equivalent records were not available in the central files on the use of other Beech House services.

The summer months of 1985 were marked by serious staffing problems. The Deputy Manager was away due to a serious illness, there was no supervisor for Adult Daycare and the Project Manager was heavily involved, as were other staff, in keeping the long summer playscheme going. In the autumn, examination of the files available showed there was a back-log of work on records of existing users. Many gaps in information remained in the files that had been compiled.
It was clear that the aim of creating a 'comprehensive, integrated service' was not reflected in practice in the records needed to support such a service. Seven months after the decision to introduce a central filing system to underpin the Programme Planning scheme and the associated coordination of services, there was still no way of obtaining from one source a total picture of the services used by one family or individual. There was no precise information on the numbers of people using services, as there were individuals and families on whom no files were yet available. Even where files had been opened, the most basic information on the referral form was frequently missing, and there was often little information on individual or family characteristics and needs.

In April 1986, by which time there were files open on 178 families/individuals, it was clear that the problems identified earlier remained, a year after the introduction of the central files. Home Care and the Common Resources Group were still the only services inserting information on service use. The Home Care information was available only up to December 1985, because the Home Care supervisors had found themselves unable to fit this administrative work into their routine.

A number of practical issues appeared e.g. the lack of cross-referencing for families where users had a different surname to that of the parent(s), inaccurate alphabetical ordering of the files, the accumulation of 'closed' files kept together with current files.

The supervisors themselves commenced discussions on the records, in April 1986. Initially, the concern was to improve the referral form by designing a clearer layout. Discussion soon extended to both the practical problems of the files and the issue of file contents. One supervisor commented that records of service use were not being kept within the central files on a regular basis. The Project Manager's response was that it was not appropriate and that 'We only want what is suitable for our own requirements'. Another supervisor pointed out that the different services did have their private records of attendance and activity. The Project Manager agreed that this was important to the separate staff groups, but that it was not important to a general file. He felt any records kept 'should be within the capacity and skills of people here'.
Discussion continued in May, with concern expressed about a lack of coordination between services within Beech House and the need for more effective communication.

The Common Resources Group supervisor suggested that the recently-acquired computer could be employed to create a data base relating to which services an individual/family was using. He stressed this would only work if supervisors were up to date on the use of services...'We want a profile of service delivery to each family.' The Project Manager disagreed '...The charity is paying for research to do that, so we don't want to get involved in that'.

The writer explained that the necessary information was not available to her to permit the development of profiles of service use, but discussion on the topic was terminated.

The Home Care supervisors stressed how time-consuming it was to record the use of their service in the central files. The Project Manager insisted such recording should continue and that the Home Care Assistants should be trained to do it for themselves. The supervisors felt this was impractical, also there was a five-month backlog to deal with. The supervisors had no clerical or administrative support and had found this aspect of their work difficult to cope with. They were also confused as to why they should need to transfer this information into the central files from their 'private' files when the other service supervisors had been told such a practice was unnecessary. The Project Manager emphasized the 'accountability' of Home Care and the need to show which families used the service, for what, and for what length of time.

Shortly before his departure in June 1986, the Project Manager decided to allocate to an administrative assistant prime responsibility for the files, their accuracy and updating; she would organize attendance at Programme Planning meetings and keep records of the proceedings. He described the records as so far having been 'everyone's responsibility' and the filing system as 'weak and vulnerable'. The staff member in charge of the records would have 'carte blanche' to use her initiative. Nothing specific was said about file contents and exactly what information should be recorded in the files. Thus, the manager had acknowledged the weakness of the central records, but to allocate 'prime responsibility' for these...
and 'carte blanche' to a junior staff member, with no specific guidance, was unlikely in itself to achieve much improvement.

In mid-1986, at the request of the Project Manager and later the Acting Project Manager, the writer became involved in discussions with administrative staff and supervisors, where she described the problems she had found with the records but made no recommendations (see Chapter 3). These discussions covered a wide range of issues requiring clarification and resolution before a standardized, systematic approach to the central records could be implemented. These issues had remained largely unidentified within the Project for many months.

The Acting Project Manager committed herself to creating records which would provide, within a central file, a total picture of the use made of the Beech House services by each family or individual. At a special Supervisors' Group at the end of June, she emphasized "What Home Care, Daycare, even the Disco, do should all be a picture together, not in little bits". She was anxious to obtain such information on service use to provide some basis for discussion on service allocation, especially where demand for a service exceeded supply. However, she was very much aware of the problems caused by the absence of a Project Manager, the staff changeovers required by the Community Programme, and the playscheme which would commence in mid-July. She was anxious that the administrative assistant allocated responsibility for the files should not be overburdened. It was also apparent that other members of staff would have to give considerable time to the matter.

It was decided that up-dating and maintaining the files should not be the sole responsibility of one person, but should be shared by the administrative staff. Various practical improvements, such as the removal of 'closed files', were to be implemented as soon as possible. It was accepted that there was a need to identify those users for whom no files yet existed, and that a priority would be the completion of a new basic referral form on every user, finding 'missing' information where necessary. This in itself would be an enormous administrative task, and one which would have to be somehow incorporated into the normal work routine required to support day-to-day service delivery.

In addition to considering the state of the central files, the Acting Project Manager announced an innovation, in the form of an 'Unmet Needs Book'. Supervisors were...
asked to record all instances where Beech House was unable to meet a need, and the reason for this. She did not say whether this information would also be inserted in the central files. It was, however, the first formal attempt to establish where the demand for a Beech House service was exceeding the resources of that service.

In December 1986, the research worker returned to the files for a final, detailed scrutiny. Some changes were evident. Many new files had been opened, with the total standing at 246. A colour-coding system was operating. A new form had been introduced for records of Sitting-in, replacing the earlier system of separate slips for each 'sit' which had produced bulky bundles in the files. However, many of the old problems remained and, at the request of the Project Coordinator, the research worker identified these in a long memo, a copy of which was also sent to the Chairman of the Society. It was emphasized that the points raised were in no way intended as criticisms or as prescriptions for action and that any decisions on the files were the prerogative of the Project Coordinator and staff, to be taken in the light of what was felt to be appropriate for the service and the resources available.

The memo identified both the persistent practical problems and the issue of file contents. There still seemed to be confusion within the Project as to the purposes the files existed to serve, and decisions were required on the type of information which should be kept in the central files, the form it should take, the occasions when it would be used and by whom. The memories of staff could not provide an adequate basis for the delivery of services tailored to individual needs, given the constant turnover of staff, the increasing numbers of users and the acknowledged problems of communication between the different services.

During the spring and summer of 1987, the Project Coordinator initiated action to deal with the whole area of files, records and information storage and retrieval. The need to confront these issues became pressing, with the introduction of a major programme of 'Reviews' (see above) for which accurate and up to date information was required on users on a scale never undertaken in the days of Programme Planning. The later announcement of a 'Management Review' of Beech House, the results of which would influence the acquisition of future funding, brought with it the clear message to staff that detailed information on all users and on patterns of service use would have to be generated in a very short time.
Over a six month period, records of users were put on file in the computer, such that accurate, up-to-date lists of current users of all services could be quickly produced. Aware that the task of creating complete and accurate central files for users' records was by now one of massive proportions which could not be attacked in normal working hours, the Project Coordinator arranged for relevant staff to put in overtime, working together in the evening. For a week in July, services were kept 'ticking over' while supervisors devoted the great majority of their time to discussing and tackling administrative problems.

By August, although the research worker was unable to study the new user records in any detail, it was apparent that the central files had been streamlined, many closed files removed, and gaps in information identified. The process of bringing files up to date was, although not complete, well underway. A new design for the referral form was being employed. This included details of practitioners involved with the person/family, medical information (e.g. on allergies, epilepsy, asthma, diabetes, medication), dietary requirements, and an immunization record. There was also a list of services, including the volunteer-run leisure services, with columns where ticks could indicate when use of a service had commenced and finished. For an overall picture of current users of Beech House services, a large board on a wall in the main office identified by name all those using each service in a given week. Newly appointed 'key workers' were responsible for ensuring that any relevant information on 'their' group of users was transferred to the notice board and to the central files.

Thus, during 1987, there was a major onslaught on the service records, requiring great effort on the part of the Coordinator and staff. However, the introduction of new forms and procedures took place after fieldwork had ceased and the research worker cannot comment on the way in which the files and other sources of information on users and service use were being maintained and employed by staff. The role of 'key-workers', an innovation at Beech House, would be vital here. It remained to be seen whether the new system could provide information on service users and service use which would be accurate, accessible and up-to-date, and in a form appropriate to the needs of the Project.

It should be noted that, during 1987, the Project Coordinator dealt not only with users' records, but also included in the deliberations and activities, staff records.
and all the records on 'domestic affairs' such as insurance, fire, health and safety, guarantees of equipment etc. There was a complete overhaul of the administrative infrastructure of the Project.

(iii) Operating Procedures

The two charity-funded managers introduced or re-designed a number of operating procedures. In March 1986, for example, the Project Manager announced that he had drawn up a list of 'Rules for Acceptable Practice', which would specify the philosophy he felt to be appropriate for Beech House, together with practical rules for situations such as toileting, feeding, etc. The rules would be circulated to all staff and to new staff and volunteers. It was important that Beech House staff have a common philosophy, a shared sense of values, and that new staff and volunteers should sense this and put it into practice. The Project Manager undertook this task on his own initiative. A year earlier he had asked for a discussion on the principles of care practice to take place at the Executive Committee but the issue had never appeared on the agenda.

Other notable examples of operating procedures are: the introduction of a disciplinary and grievance procedure for Beech House staff; the introduction of an 'Equal Opportunities Policy' in staff recruitment; the development of certain financial procedures relating to an annual budget forecast, monthly budget updates and the writing of cheques and the handling of petty cash; the design and implementation of a set of firm, compulsory operating procedures for staff responsible for the administration of drugs to service users. Other operating procedures were in existence to ensure conformity with legal requirements or with the MSC conditions of employment specified in the Community Programme contract, and covered such matters as Fire, Health and Safety. Provisions in these areas had existed prior to the employment of the charity-funded manager. However, both charity-funded managers took steps to improve record-keeping and staff awareness. Both charity-funded managers were concerned to promote an image of competence and professionalism to funding bodies and statutory service observers, and to provide conditions of service for employees which were as comparable as possible to those of their counterparts working in the local authority.
CONCLUSION

The Society's Executive Committee acted as the management committee of the Project throughout the research. The Executive was composed mainly of parents, the majority of whom had been involved in establishing Beech House in 1983. There was no representation of users, paid staff or funding sources. On the arrival of the first charity-funded manager, responsibility for overseeing the day-to-day running of the Project shifted from the Society Chairman via the Management Panel, to this new professional via a Supervisor's Group. However, the Chairman remained actively involved in Project matters outside the formal setting. The Management Panel, which met far less frequently than in the past, became a formal meeting of the manager and supervisors with the Chairman and perhaps one or two interested members of the Executive, discussing issues of more general interest than details of day-to-day running of the Project. The Management Panel was re-titled as the Management Sub-Committee early in 1987; more Executive members were encouraged to attend and the time spent discussing Project matters at the Executive Committee was much reduced. Some members of the Executive argued for the change because it would allow more time for the Executive to discuss matters of general interest. The Project Coordinator proposed the change with the aim of enhancing policy-making, decision-making and communication as between the Project and the Executive.

The arrival of the charity-funded manager meant that an additional level in the hierarchy was interposed between the Executive Committee and the paid staff. The increase in specialization and departmentalization during the research was noteworthy. Job descriptions were developed. The provision of management support in a deputizing role remained problematic. Many changes in operational structure were apparent over the period, particularly in relation to the role of administrative staff; both managers chose to change job-content of posts where this was felt to enhance service delivery.

A number of formal co-ordinating meetings/committees were operating at Beech House. Overall, with the exception of the Policy and Practitioners' Groups, the formal group meetings described were all introduced by the first charity-funded manager. The Supervisors' Group assumed the role of the Management Panel, the former operational group of the Project in the period when the Society Chairman was overseeing the day to day management of the Project. The House Staff
Meeting was seen as furthering communication within the house between the
different staff groups and between non-supervisory staff and the supervisors and
manager. Programme Planning Meetings were intended to promote the
coordination of services, internal and external, at the level of the individual, in a
way which had not formerly been attempted. The Project Coordinator later
replaced these with 'Reviews', a less intensive approach but one which came to be
applied to all users, not the restricted numbers which it had been possible to
involve in Programme Planning. The Communications Meeting was the response of
the Project Manager to the worries expressed by staff about problems of
communication and coordination between the different services provided by Beech
House.

Further changes in organizational structure were observed during the research,
given the introduction and development by the charity-funded managers of three
types of operating mechanism i.e. staff training, records and information systems
and operating procedures. Chapter 7 draws on the foregoing descriptive account of
the organizational structure of the Project to explore the influence of statutory
funding on three dimensions of organizational structure i.e. complexity,
formalization and centralization. The material presented in Chapter 6 will also be
relevant to the discussions of planning, implementation and monitoring in Chapters
8 - 10.
CHAPTER 7 - THE INFLUENCE OF STATUTORY FUNDING ON THREE DIMENSIONS OF STRUCTURE: COMPLEXITY, FORMALIZATION AND CENTRALIZATION.

SUMMARY

Chapter 7 examines the influence on organizational structure of the relationship with the sources of statutory funding identified in Chapter 5. Drawing on the description of organizational structure in Chapter 6 it discusses the extent to which three interrelated dimensions of structure, i.e. complexity, formalization and centralization, have been influenced by seeking and obtaining statutory funding. A complicated picture emerges, showing that pressures for change in one dimension of structure are not necessarily matched by pressures for change in another. Contradictory influences can be observed at work, even with respect to one source of statutory funding in relation to one dimension of structure. Some of the most significant influences on structure have been due not to direct formal constraints applied by statutory funding sources but to the freedom permitted to the Project, for example in the MSC's flexibility with regard to changes in job content and staffing patterns, and in the lack of interest of all the statutory funding sources in the generation of data on service use and service users. The discussion shows the dangers of generalizing about the impact of statutory funding on structure; there is a need to distinguish between different sources of statutory funding and to examine the dimensions of structure separately in relation to each funding source.

INTRODUCTION

Chapter 7 assesses how far the organizational structure described in Chapter 6 shows the influence on three dimensions of structure, (i.e. complexity, formalization and centralization; Hendrick, 1987) of the relationship with statutory funding sources. The extent to which structure is affected directly by formal accountability and by formal restrictions exercised by the statutory funding sources is examined, together with any referred effects of such formal constraints and of choices in the design of structure made with the retention/acquisition of funding in mind. The way in which the freedom permitted to the Project by its statutory funding sources has allowed the exercise of choice in relation to organizational structure is also considered.
Chapter 7 - Complexity, Formalization and Centralization

COMPLEXITY

This refers to the degree of differentiation and integration that exists within an organization. The number of levels in the hierarchy, i.e. vertical differentiation, in effect increased with the arrival of the professionally qualified Project Manager 20 months after Beech House opened. The Chairman of the Society responded to his arrival by retreating from direct involvement with supervisors at regular operational meetings, thereby interposing another level in the hierarchy. However, the funding which made this possible came not from statutory sources but from a charity. The Community Programme had not provided a manager of a calibre accepted by the Executive Committee as capable of full responsibility for the operation of the Project. Joint finance had rejected a bid from the Society for the funding of such a post. At the same time, Society documents suggest that the appointment of a well-qualified manager was made because the Project wished to project an image of competence and professionalism to potential sources of long-term statutory funding, and to employ someone with the skills to successfully negotiate that funding.

Though the number of levels in the hierarchy varied slightly between the different services over the research period, there was no evidence of increased vertical differentiation, overall, following the Project Manager's appointment. There was a short-lived attempt to designate a supervisor as Deputy Manager. However, there was no statutory funding for such a post; the occupant found herself in an ambiguous position, never given authority over the full range of Project services on a day-to-day basis which such a title would suggest. Later, as Project Coordinator, she abolished the formal position of Deputy Manager, partly due to fear that current negotiations on formal funding could be jeopardized if the joint finance authorities discovered that the playgroup supervisor's post they funded had been given additional responsibilities without their approval. This was a matter of choice on the manager's part. The direct constraint applied by the MSC is also relevant here, i.e. the refusal of the MSC to approve the supervision of non-Community Programme staff by the Community Programme Senior Supervisor. Such restrictions limited the Project Coordinator's room for manoeuvre with regard to finding a supervisor to fill any formal deputizing role.

Horizontal differentiation, unlike vertical differentiation, increased markedly, with new services and new posts created on the strength of statutory funding.
Joint finance contributed directly here, by funding the playgroup as a separate service with its own distinct staff-group, together with the part-time support posts of book-keeper and administrative assistant. However, there was little evidence here of major specialization of administrative tasks as a consequence of applying for and accounting for statutory funds. It was the MSC in particular which encouraged greater overall horizontal differentiation. In Chapter 6, examination of the organization charts showed the outcome of the MSC's flexible policy towards staffing patterns. Community Programme places 'freed' by the acquisition of joint finance were retained and, with the MSC's permission, used elsewhere in the Project. This allowed expansion of existing services (e.g. Respite Care) and extension of the range of services (Living Away from Home; Horticulture employment scheme). The managers were allowed to eliminate posts they felt no longer appropriate to service needs (e.g. the Common Resources Group Supervisor; Living Away from Home Worker) and use the places elsewhere in the Project. Similarly, posts eliminated on the MSC's recommendation because they were difficult to fill and could therefore be said to have failed to meet the needs of the local community (e.g. part-time cook, Horticulture Project Assistant) could also be retained and re-allocated. It was by such means that new posts of House Care Assistant, Respite Care Assistant, Day Care Aides, Kitchen Assistant, were created. Also, the MSC allowed the managers to alter markedly the job content of posts whose occupants were in mid-contract, seen particularly in relation to the administrative staff of the Common Resources Group, formerly the Information Service.

In these ways, it can be argued, the MSC operated with considerable flexibility, encouraging the introduction of new services and posts and expanded provision of existing services. The managers were offered substantial opportunities for choice in staffing patterns and the chance to experiment with service provision. Here at least there is not the restriction on service delivery which one might have expected on the basis of much of the available literature on the Community Programme.

What is marked here, is the effect on organizational structure of the lack of formal constraints exercised by one statutory funding source, i.e. the MSC. The horizontal differentiation which took place was not confined to routine repetitive tasks but involved the delivery of services to a vulnerable clientele. In this sense it can be argued that professionalization increased. However, the occupants of such posts were not professionally qualified in the field, as described in Chapter 9.
The more elaborate organizational structure which emerged from these developments brought the need for greater reliance on group meetings, to improve coordination and communication. The Supervisors' Group, the House Meeting and Programme Planning Meetings proved insufficient means to coordination and communication. Anxieties about the failure of Programme Planning to promote coordination and communication were increasingly aired by service supervisors. Thus, as described in Part I of Chapter 6, Communications Meetings were introduced towards mid-1986.

The first charity-funded manager brought with him a strong commitment to a particular approach to service delivery which was exemplified by his proposals for Programme Planning. However, as described in Chapter 6, relatively few users came within the sphere of Programme Planning Meetings. The emphasis in Programme Planning was on new referrals and crisis cases; the approach did not become the routine for all users which had been anticipated. Only when the Project Co-ordinator replaced Programme Planning by the less intensive Reviews did some consideration of individual needs in relation to service use begin to take place for users in general. A major incentive to concentrate on rapidly extending the number of users having Reviews came with the cut-backs in Community Programme funding in the spring of 1987. This put in jeopardy the futures of Respite Care and Adult Daycare. It brought the need to negotiate with statutory service personnel over the provision of alternative services for users who might be affected by the cuts in services at Beech House. Further encouragement to review the needs of as many users as possible came with the implementation of the 'Management Review' of Beech House by statutory service representatives in mid-1987. This required the provision of information on service use and service users on a scale not previously required of Beech House by its funding sources. However, such scrutiny of the service was not a condition attached to the existing funding, but was part of an assessment process relating to the provision of future long-term statutory funding for Adult Daycare, Respite Care and the Project Manager's post.

The Project Coordinator had been expressing worries and dissatisfaction regarding Programme Planning for some months before the funding crisis developed. However, it was clear that this aspect of the relationship with statutory funding
sources and the desire to favourably impress a future funding source were major motivations in the developments observed in the means used for service integration.

A similar pattern of activity with regard to records of service use and service users was also apparent. Given the range of available services, the establishment of central records can be seen as a means of achieving integration. On the departure of the first charity-funded manager in mid-1986 there was still no access to central records giving a total picture of the use made of Beech House by a given family or individual. However, the need for change had by then surfaced as a key issue in staff discussions and an awareness of service delivery problems arising from the lack of records was a pressure for change within the Project, as described in Part II of Chapter 6. The new Project Co-ordinator was convinced of the need for central records. However, the demands of the Management Review undoubtedly helped the staff in general to share this conviction. Thus, it was not only a belated appreciation by staff of the need for records as an integrating mechanism which speeded their development, but the demands of a major potential funding source for the information they could provide. Staff were left in no doubt of the urgency of the task or of the essential contribution such records would make to the future of the Project.

This was the first occasion on which the Project had been required to provide the sort of data which was only obtainable through the systematic compilation of central records. The requirement of the charity for the inclusion of such data in research reports had proved insufficient motivation to the Project Manager and staff to establish and maintain central records. The Policy Group, created to promote co-ordination with statutory services and including representatives of the services sponsoring joint finance of the Project, did not require such records. The major external funding sources of the MSC and joint finance had made no demands for the regular provision of data on service use, service allocation, etc., nor had the Society's Executive Committee. This situation helps to explain why it was four years after the Project began before a real attempt was made to create and maintain an effective system of central records, a source of information on service use and service users which was complete, accurate, up to date and accessible in a form appropriate to Project requirements.
FORMALIZATION

Hendrick (1987) suggests that there is a relationship between formalization and complexity which tends to be a function of (a) the direction of differentiation and (b) the degree of professionalization. High horizontal differentiation, if achieved by increasing the numbers and kinds of routine repetitive tasks, brings the need for a high degree of formalization. If it is achieved by increasing the number and kinds of highly-skilled, complex positions (professionalization) low formalization should be optimal, along with decentralized decision-making.

Formalization is defined as the degree to which an organization relies on rules and procedures to direct the behaviour of people. In highly formalized designs, jobs allow little employee discretion over work matters. There are explicit job descriptions, extensive rules and clearly defined procedures covering work processes. Where formalization is low, jobs are designed to allow considerable exercise of discretion. Low formalization usually necessitates greater training or experience for staff employed.

In the terms set out above, there was a relative lack of development of formalization at the point where the new charity-funded manager arrived, 20 months after Beech House opened. This is indicated by the extent to which this manager and his successor began to introduce job descriptions, rules and procedures where none, or only rudimentary ones, had previously existed. However, low formalization at Beech House had not been correlated with professionalization of staff in terms of qualifications. The Community Programme employees, including the first three managers, generally lacked relevant professional qualifications and experience, though there were a few who had experience as informal carers within their own families. From February 1985, there was the development of personnel records; job descriptions; procedures for the administration of domestic affairs (i.e. health and safety, insurance cover, maintenance agreements for equipment); disciplinary and grievance procedures; budget procedures; drugs administration procedures; procedures for the maintenance of records on service use and service users; the issue of formal rules for care practice; a formal, standardized programme for staff training.

How far can such formalization be attributed to the influence of statutory funding? The mere acquisition of statutory funding is insufficient explanation,
for the Project had been using Community Programme funding for 20 months before the appointment of the charity-funded manager. During this time, the Project had been staffed by Community Programme employees, eligible for placement as unemployed by the MSC’s criteria. Management had been overseen by the Society Chairman. It was the arrival of a manager with a professional background in the social services, albeit funded by a non-statutory source, which was the occasion for a formal articulation of Project goals. These included the desire to establish working relationships with statutory services in order to both ensure the delivery of a comprehensive integrated service to users and to enhance the chances of obtaining long-term secure statutory funding by becoming indispensable to the statutory services.

It was the new manager’s wish that the Project be seen as competent and professional by the statutory services, given the hostility to the Project’s existence expressed in some quarters of the statutory services and the legacy of ill-feeling left by the recent joint finance negotiations between the statutory service representatives and the Society. A desire to impress the MSC as capable and competent was also apparent, a response to the severe financial and managerial problems arising in the first year of the Community Programme (referred to in Chapter 5). While the Executive Committee and both charity-funded managers hoped to see an end to reliance on MSC funding, its continuation was essential until it could be replaced by long-term support from statutory service sources.

Thus, there was considerable motivation for the introduction of formalized procedures, deriving not only from existing funding sources, i.e. the MSC and joint finance, but from potential statutory service sources of long-term funding. However, the influence described above did not derive from direct formal constraints imposed by the funding sources, but from the manager’s interpretation of the actions likely to impress funding sources, actual and potential. In contrast, the provision of training for Community Programme employees was a direct condition of the grant, and a perceived failure to comply could well jeopardize the renewal of the Community Programme. However, the introduction of a formal, standardized training programme for all staff, to replace the prior ad hoc arrangements, was hindered by the large numbers of part-time staff imposed on the Project by MSC regulations. Joint finance for the Project had included no allowance or time for staff training. However, the 'Management Review' arranged
by the statutory services in 1987 was to look, among other things, at staff
development.

Statutory funding sources were not the sole source of motivation for the
introduction of a formal training programme. The unqualified, inexperienced
staff recruited to the Community Programme required training in order to deliver
the services provided. And the ambitions of the Project Manager to educate his
staff in the principles of 'normalization' meant training needed to be directed at
attitudes as well as practical skills.

The development of staff training was sporadic, as described earlier. There were
problems of bringing staff together in sufficient numbers, when staff were needed
to provide services, and difficulties relating to the allocation of responsibilities for
organizing training. Formalization generally was not a matter of smooth
progression on all fronts. Development was often patchy, progress slow. Staff
disciplinary and grievance procedures ante-dated rules of care practice and drugs
administration procedures by over a year. Drugs procedures were developed after
pressure from staff concerned about this issue, and there were simultaneous
arguments for staff protection in the form of insurance. A range of procedures
which had been initiated by the first charity-funded manager but not followed
through were re-vamped or brought to completion by his successor. Personnel
records and job descriptions, budget procedures and procedures for administering
'domestic' matters were given a major overhaul in 1987. Similarly, although lip­
service had been paid to the need for central records on service use and service
users from February 1985, the introduction of routines for recording data on
service use and service users had progressed only slowly, as outlined above, with
many problems. Not until 1987 was there the great input of staff time required to
establish such data recording procedures.

It was only at the end of research fieldwork that there were prospects of staff
having to comply with policies and follow procedures relating to the allocation of
services, a situation for which no policies and procedures had previously existed.
The Project Co-ordinator sought formal policy statements from the Executive
Committee on such matters as an 'intake policy'.

When formalization was low the staff, albeit untrained and unqualified, had
considerable discretion over decisions on care practice, allocation of services, the
Hendrick’s concerns regarding formalization relate to procedures for personnel and service delivery matters. However, procedures for participation in governance require some comment. These remained unchanged following the acquisition of statutory funding and of a paid staff to serve many users of Beech House. Procedures for the selection of Society officers and members of the Executive Committee, and for participation in decision-making at this level, pre-dated the acquisition of statutory funding and continued unaltered afterwards. There was no formal definition of the nature of the responsibilities of the Committee or the Society Chairman vis-a-vis the Project.

It is apparent from the foregoing that there is no clear, direct relationship between statutory funding and increased formalization at Beech House. Different aspects of formalization had different patterns of development and the mere acquisition of statutory funds offered an inadequate explanation. While the arrival of the charity-funded manager had considerable impact, progress thereafter was sporadic. Key factors were the motivation, skills and time of staff to devote to such issues. These will be discussed in Chapter 9 on implementation/service delivery, when the influence of statutory funding on the human resources available to the Project is examined. There was evidence of the direct influence of statutory funding, actual and potential, on this dimension of structure, seen in the MSC’s insistence on training provision and the role of the Management Review. The research also showed that while one effect of statutory funding could be to promote formalization, i.e. through the MSC’s direct requirement for the provision of staff training, the same funding source, by providing mainly part-time workers, could hinder that development. Thus a single source of statutory funds generated opposing forces with regard to formalization, while a second source (i.e. joint finance) provided no funding for staff training, and again provided mainly part-time posts inherited from the Community Programme. Elsewhere, notably with regard to the establishment of procedures for recording data on service use and service users, there was little or no direct impetus for development from statutory funding sources, until the Management Review of 1987.
In addition to the direct influence for increased formalization described above, the managers were motivated by the desire to promote a professional, competent image to actual and potential funders. This is not to overlook the pressures for increased formalization from sources other than statutory funding i.e. the commitment of staff to the quality of the service they provided.

CENTRALIZATION

Centralization refers to the extent to which the locus of decision-making authority is either centralized or dispersed downward within the hierarchy. Hendrick (1987) sees the degree of control over the decision-making process as the true measure of centralization. In considering centralization at Beech House it is useful to employ his distinctions between decisions directly affecting the work of employees, decisions on personnel issues, and strategic decision-making.

The hierarchical governance structure had its origins in the governance structure of the funding Society. Statutory funding greatly extended the responsibilities of the Society’s Executive Committee. Authority for strategic decision-making was highly centralized, in the sense that there was no staff-representation on the Executive Committee, nor any user-representation. The charity-funded managers attended to provide information and join in the discussions. They could make proposals which would be rejected/accepted by the Committee. Active participation was restricted to a relatively small number of Committee members.

The Executive Committee found its membership unaffected by the acquisition of external funding, since the statutory funding sources did not seek representation on the Committee and the Society did not invite it. Nor was there any requirement for representation of users or paid staff. Statutory funding allowed the perpetuation of a pattern of decision-making which existed before the Project was created.

At the operational level the lack of detailed, written, formal procedures regarding personnel issues and service delivery left a largely unqualified and inexperienced staff with considerable discretion over decision-making on these matters. For example, it can be argued that the lack of detailed information on service delivery passed upwards to the Executive Committee and the lack of requests from the
Committee for such information in reality enhanced decentralization of decision-making on work-related matters.

The appointment of the first charity-funded Project Manager saw a degree of decentralization, with the manager being delegated the responsibility for many operational and personnel decisions previously taken by the Chairman of the Society, while the latter was overseeing the Project in a voluntary capacity. However, the Chairman, with no apparent objection from the Committee, on occasion exercised decision-making authority on a range of issues outside the setting of formal meetings. New policies were formulated by the Project Manager and formalized procedures drawn up, as described in the preceding discussion on formalization. Operating mechanisms, i.e. staff training, central records of service use and service users, and operating procedures, including personnel procedures and directives on delivery of care, began to be introduced. These were taken further by the Project Coordinator, to the extent that, by the end of the research, staff decision-making discretion on a range of personnel and work-related issues had been considerably curtailed compared with the early years of the Project. However, only towards the end of the research was there an increased flow upwards of information on service use and service users, necessary for effective decision-making and providing the basis for discussion on the need for policy change.

Overall, pressures from statutory funding sources regarding centralization seemed muted, even contradictory. There appeared to be no motivation for the Committee to share decision-making authority with employees other than the managers, or with users. There was no requirement to share this authority with representatives of statutory funding bodies. There were limited formal requirements exercised by statutory funding sources with regard to operating mechanisms, e.g. staff training, which can be seen to have restricted staff decision-making discretion. However, a major motivation for the establishment of policies and procedures which limited employees' decision-making discretion on work matters was the desire of managers, in pursuing the accepted goal of seeking long-term statutory funding, to impress potential statutory funding sources with the professionalism and indispensability of Beech House services. To this extent, the existence of statutory funding provided pressure for increased centralization, sporadic though the establishment of such policies and procedures may have been. However, for several years there was a lack of information upwards on service use and service users. This was
permitted by the lack of concern for such data demonstrated by the Executive Committee, echoing the lack of concern about the generation of such data on the part of the statutory sources of Beech House funding. This was an influence for decentralized decision-making with respect to work matters which persisted until the Management Review of Beech House undertaken by potential statutory funding sources in 1987. The growing awareness on the part of staff that certain formalized procedures, for example, the maintenance of systematic records, were essential for effective service delivery on a large scale, should not be overlooked.

CONCLUSION

Consideration of the three dimensions of organizational structure, i.e. complexity, formalization and centralization, in relation to statutory funding, has illustrated the dangers of generalizing about the impact of statutory funding on structure, and the need to define what exactly is being observed. Examining the three interrelated dimensions separately has revealed a complicated, even confused, picture. Pressures for change in one dimension are not necessarily matched by pressures for change in the others. The discussion has highlighted the way in which the relationship with a statutory funding body can provide contradictory influences, even with respect to just one dimension of structure.

With regard to complexity, the receipt of statutory funding had generated little direct encouragement for increased vertical differentiation; indeed, there was no statutory funding provided for a manager of the calibre required by the Society, or for the post of deputy manager responsible for overseeing the staff provided by a range of funding sources. Here, the restriction imposed by the MSC on supervisors funded by the Community Programme were felt by the Project Coordinator to limit her room for manoeuvre where vertical differentiation was concerned. At the same time, a lack of accountability to the funding joint finance authorities permitted the Project Manager to allocate deputy manager responsibilities to the playgroup supervisor without the knowledge of those authorities. The influence of potential long-term sources of statutory funding on the appointment of a well-qualified Project Manager can be seen in the desire of the Society to convince statutory service observers of the Project's competence in service delivery and to acquire a manager able to negotiate as an equal with statutory service officials.
Increased horizontal differentiation could be related to statutory funding, directly via joint finance for a separate playgroup staff and for support posts, indirectly by the freedom of choice offered by the MSC regarding changes in job content and in the allocation of staff. This lack of formal constraint permitted the expansion of existing services and the introduction of new ones. The resulting referred effect of statutory funding, i.e. a need for effective integrating mechanisms, eventually brought pressures for an extension of Programme Planning and for a complete overhaul and update of the central user records. However, the inadequacies of the integrating mechanisms displayed were only belatedly appreciated. The major motivation for changes here came not from existing statutory funding sources, but from potential sources of long-term statutory funding, in the form of a Management Review of Beech House in 1987, part of a process of negotiating long-term funding from statutory services.

Similarly, the influence of statutory funding on formalization can be seen as uneven. The acquisition of statutory funds in the form of the Community Programme did not promote a generally high degree of formalization in the Project. It was the arrival of the charity-funded Project Manager which brought the introduction of formalization with regard to personnel and service delivery matters. The motives here were his desire to present a competent, professional image to the funding authorities, partly to enhance the chances of obtaining future funding, and his espousal of particular service delivery goals. There were some direct pressures for formalization due to statutory funding, i.e. MSC requirements for staff training, and the examination of 'staff development' by the Management Review of 1987. However, there were contrary pressures, since the MSC provision of largely part-time posts hindered the introduction of a systematic training programme and the joint finance authorities provided no funding for time for training. Development of formalization was sporadic, and was notably slow in the area of establishing procedures for recording data on service use and service users, and in the establishment of procedures for the allocation of those services where demand had long exceeded supply. The pressures for formalization here came, for most of the research, from within the Project, where certain staff-members saw such developments as essential to improved service delivery. Only towards the end of the research, in 1987, came pressure for such formalization from statutory funding sources. This was due not to the requirements of existing statutory funding sources, but to the funding crisis and an evaluation by a potential
statutory funding source which made demands for information on service delivery not previously experienced by the Project.

The relative lack of formalization in the early days of the Project implies an influence for decentralized decision-making, given the discretion staff were allowed to exercise with regard to personnel and work issues, in spite of a general inexperience and lack of professional qualifications. The advent of the charity-funded Project Manager brought the beginnings of increased centralization, via the implementation of formal procedures relating to personnel issues and service delivery, thus reducing staff discretion.

Although the manager's post did not have statutory funding, the pressures for centralization via the introduction of procedures which constrained staff decision-making discretion emanated at least partly from statutory funding, as described above. However, the lack of pressure from statutory funding sources and from the Executive Committee, for the provision of data on service use and service users, drawn from systematic records, was another influence for decentralization of decision-making discretion which was only reversed in 1987. This reversal was partly due, as described above, to the evaluation of the Project by a potential statutory funding source. Decision-making authority with regard to overall strategy remained the province of a small number of active parents, with users, staff and statutory funding sources excluded from formal representation. There appeared to be no pressures from the Project's statutory funding sources for wider representation on the Society's Executive Committee, though by the end of the research there were suggestions that the future acquisition of long-term statutory service funding could bring with it requirements for representation.

Overall, the consideration of the influence of statutory funding on organizational structure has shown that two major sources of statutory funding can differ substantially in their effects on structure. The MSC, for example, contributed to a far greater extent than joint finance to the increase in horizontal differentiation, as shown in the discussion on complexity. There was little evidence of formal constraints applied by funding bodies influencing changes in complexity and centralization; there was more evidence of such influence with regard to formalization, with the Project accountable to the MSC for the provision of training. Even so, the major influence of statutory funding upon organizational structure was seen not in the exercise of formal constraints but in the choices
taken by the managers with a view to enhancing the chances of obtaining long-
term statutory funding, and in the course of exploiting the considerable freedom
granted to the Society and the Project by the statutory funders with regard to
matters of organizational structure.
CHAPTER 8 - PROCESS: PLANNING

SUMMARY

Chapter 8 considers the influence of statutory funding sources on aspects of the planning process at Beech House i.e. setting goals; their clarity of definition, compatibility and acceptability; the adequacy of resources for the goals pursued; the setting of policies for implementation and monitoring; designing appropriate structures.

To the goals articulated and reiterated by the founders i.e. providing the specific services identified by parents as desirable, obtaining long-term funding from statutory services and creating a comprehensive integrated service, were added the first charity-funded manager's commitments to normalization and serving individual needs. The inclusion of the pursuit of a potential source of statutory funding as a Project goal indicates the need to examine the influence on the development of the Project of not only the receipt of current funding from statutory sources, but also the possibility of obtaining long-term secure future funding.

There was no evidence that the seeking and acquisition of Urban Aid and Urban Policy funding, or Community Programme funding, had brought a shift in the goals initially set for the Project by its founders. However, the process of negotiation for joint finance resulted in the Society's withdrawing a number of proposals for funding, i.e. for Respite Care, the Information Service, salary for a well-qualified manager, a minibus, and a counselling and advocacy service. Proposals for the latter were never resurrected. Other provisions rejected for joint finance either continued in the Community Programme or were found alternative sources of funding. This suggests some impact of direct constraint by statutory funding sources on the range of services provided.

The problems arising from the co-existence of several official goals are discussed, with reference to issues of definition, compatibility, acceptability, and adequacy of resources. These, together with issues of policies for service delivery and monitoring, and of the design of organizational structure, did not appear to have been effectively confronted at the prior planning stage. The paid staff were presented with difficulties arising from these planning-related issues as the Project developed. The needs, for example, to establish basic procedures of personnel management, create user record systems and ration services, after the Project had been operating for a considerable
time, confronted both charity-funded managers, as described in the discussion on organizational structure in Chapter 6. The resulting pressures on the Project's human resources are described in Chapter 9.

The Society and the Project were given substantial freedom by statutory funding sources, with regard to planning. The detachment from planning issues of the statutory funding bodies for most of the period of the research offered no counterbalance to the inexperience of the Executive Committee in these matters. Chapter 8 concludes that the influence upon the organization of this type of freedom from constraint is as deserving of attention as the influence of formal acceptance/rejection of Project goals by funding bodies.

THE SETTING OF OFFICIAL I.E. FORMALLY-STATED GOALS

In Chapter 4, five goals were identified as deserving particular attention in the course of the research. These comprised the desires of parents involved in setting up Beech House to ensure the provision of specific, identified services; the creation of a comprehensive integrated service; the pursuit of long-term secure funding from statutory services; serving 'individual needs', and promoting a policy of 'normalization'.

The first charity-funded manager was committed by the charity to the goal of creating a comprehensive, integrated service. He inherited an organization which had been shaped by the pursuit of the goals of obtaining long-term statutory funding and the provision of specific services identified by parents as the ones they wanted. The parents sought services of a type and/or quality which they had not found provided by statutory sources. The goals of fulfilling the demands of parents for the services they wanted, pursuing the acquisition of long-term statutory service funding and creating a comprehensive integrated service, were freely expressed before and after the Society obtained Urban Aid, Urban Policy and Community Programme funding for the Project. They did not appear to have been modified as a means of acquiring these sources of statutory funding. During negotiations for joint finance, in 1984, the Society did scale down its requests for funding for specific services, as indicated in Chapter 5. Advice given informally by officials resulted in the Society dropping plans to seek joint finance for Respite Care and the Information Service. Lack of enthusiasm on the part of the joint finance authorities for funding a well-qualified manager for the Project also
encouraged the Society to continue efforts begun in 1983 to obtain funding from a non-government source for a post seen as the lynch-pin in the creation of a comprehensive, integrated service. Requests for funding for a mini-bus and a counselling and advocacy service were also dropped from the final version of the bid for joint finance, following opposition from the authorities during the negotiations. Alternative funding was found for the minibus. Plans for a counselling and advocacy service were never resurrected. Adult Daycare, though refused funding by joint finance, continued with MSC support. Later, attempts by the Project Manager to obtain large-scale, long-term statutory service funding for a Living Away from Home service came to nothing. Plans for such provision were effectively shelved for two years until parents on the Executive Committee began to explore the possibilities of obtaining assistance from within the voluntary sector for a small-scale accommodation project.

At the time of the Project Manager’s appointment, the Project had just acquired joint finance for Home Care/Sitting-in and the playgroup. This followed an extended period of difficult negotiations with the statutory authorities which had left an atmosphere of mistrust and antagonism in some quarters. The long-term future of the Project as a whole was not assured. The charity-funded evaluation was seen as a means of enhancing the reputation of the Project in the eyes of statutory service professionals. The history of the development of the Project prior to the arrival of the first charity-funded Project Manager suggested the dominance of the felt need of the Society to establish the services quickly, expand the numbers of people served and justify the existence of the Beech House service, especially in the eyes of sceptical or hostile statutory service professionals. These individuals would be influential in future decisions on long-term statutory financial support for Beech House.

The early decision to pursue the long-term survival of the Project, rather than merely use short-term funding to ‘show the way’ to the statutory sector, made the goal of acquiring secure statutory funding a crucial influence on the development of the Project prior to the arrival of the first charity-funded manager. It was to remain a major influence on future development. The Executive and the Project Manager agreed on the need to convince the statutory sector of the indispensability of Beech House to the statutory services. Although there remained the commitment to provide the services parents wanted, there was a real sense in which the ‘customers’ Beech House was serving were not the parents, but those statutory
service representatives with influence on long-term funding sources. In the last analysis, the long-term survival of Beech House depended on these statutory service professionals and not on the users of the Beech House service. Certainly the services had to be acceptable to users on a scale sufficient to make the Project appear credible to statutory sector observers, but however much service users valued Beech House they could not guarantee its long-term survival.

Thus, the need to operationalize the 'official' goal of creating a comprehensive service, on the arrival of the charity-funded Project Manager, became activated in an organization influenced by the pursuit of pre-existing goals. The new charity-funded manager brought to the Project the goals of serving individual needs and introducing a policy of 'normalization'. It was evident that the manager, a professionally qualified and experienced social worker, was deeply committed to these goals. While their introduction indicated the standards of service delivery he had set for the Project, it can also be seen as contributing to the goal of obtaining long-term funding from statutory services, by enhancing the image of Beech House in the eyes of statutory service professionals. The incorporation of the 'new' aims of normalization and serving individual needs together with the activation of the goal of creating a comprehensive service integrated externally as well as internally, increased the demands made on the Project from that point.

PROJECT GOALS: CLARITY OF DEFINITION, COMPATIBILITY, ACCEPTABILITY

The implications of the co-existence of several official goals did not appear to have been the subject of any planning process, and there were indications of problems associated with three interrelated aspects of the nature of a goal ie. definition, compatibility and acceptability. Although the separate goals were clearly identified and frequently re-iterated, there was a lack of clarity of definition, of detailed discussion of what the implementation of this range of goals would entail in practice. What exactly was meant by a 'comprehensive' service was never established and agreed within and between the paid staff and the Executive Committee. The extent to which the Project should respond to demands for the creation of new services, including those voiced by only a few parents, was not established. The influence of the pre-existing goal of providing the services parents wanted seemed influential here.
The implications of 'serving individual needs' were not explored eg. whether this referred to the needs of the parents as defined by the parents, the needs of the handicapped person as defined by the parents, the needs of the handicapped person as defined by the paid staff, or the needs of the person as defined by him/herself. While the commitment to 'normalization' was referred to at Executive meetings, this policy was never fully described and discussed, and parents did not seem aware of what a full-scale implementation of a policy of normalization would involve.

The goal of seeking long-term statutory funding seemed less problematic than such service delivery goals with regard to definition. However, the implications for the Beech House service of the means to be employed to achieve this long-term security did not appear to be a focus for discussion within the Executive or between the Executive and the Project. Lack of clarity of definition of service delivery goals helped to blur the issues relating to the pursuit of long-term statutory funding. For example, the Executive sought to further the goal of long-term statutory funding by the promotion of Beech House in the local community. By establishing a high profile, it was felt, the Project was better placed to win political support in its fight for further statutory funding, to attract funds from the community and other voluntary organizations in the area, and to acquire the services of volunteers, thus proving the ability of voluntary organizations to build on statutory funding and obtain money and volunteer input from other sources. The image of Beech House in the local community was therefore a matter of concern to the Executive and the Project, closely related to the goal of achieving long-term statutory funding, and influential upon the achievement of the other service delivery goals. There was potential here for incompatibilities between goals, but such problems were not effectively acknowledged and discussed in the planning process. To give one illustration, the effect on a policy of 'normalization' of projecting what some participants saw as a negative image of mental handicap, in order to attract support, sympathy and funds from the community and further the goal of obtaining long-term statutory funding, was an issue still unresolved at the end of the research. Here it could be argued, the goal of 'normalization' was compromised by the pursuit of the goal of obtaining long-term statutory funding.

It is apparent that there are more problems to be solved in relation to setting goals than are answered by clarity of definition. Issues of content are crucial, in particular the extent to which the various goals are compatible when translated
into practice. However, it is possible for lack of definition to conceal incompatibilities between goals. At Beech House, the potential for incompatibilities did not seem to be effectively explored as part of the planning process. Thus, the goals of serving individual needs and promoting normalization, which seemed to emphasize the needs of the mentally handicapped person rather than the needs of the carers, fitted somewhat uneasily with that defined in terms of parents' requirements. Similarly, the goal of securing long-term funding by increasing referrals from statutory sources and becoming indispensable to the statutory sector, could be incompatible with the goal of identifying and serving individual needs, or with the goal of providing the specific services envisaged by the founding parents.

The extent to which the goals identified were acceptable to the Executive, the staff and relevant statutory funding agencies is difficult to judge, given that genuine discussion of what implementation entailed did not take place; agreement on goals can appear to exist, albeit at a general and superficial level, when discussion of possible incompatibilities between goals, on the limitations of resources, on the ordering of priorities etc., occurs rarely or not at all.

Although the Executive as a body had formally accepted the desirability of appointing a professional manager to create a comprehensive, integrated service, there was evidence of dissension among members. The family survey (see Appendix VII) indicated that there were some on the Committee who regretted the passing of the old, purely volunteer nature of the Society and were unhappy with the provision of services by a paid staff. While there did appear to be a general acceptance of the goals of providing the services parents wanted and of pursuing long-term statutory funding, there was some feeling that a more appropriate path would have been to use short-term funding to demonstrate the need for services for which the statutory sector would then have taken responsibility. The Project Manager's commitments to serving individual needs and normalization were known to the Executive and seemed to be approved as evidence of his professionalism in the field of mental handicap rather than enthusiastically adopted because of the implications of these goals for service delivery, as these were not discussed in any detail. Where ordinary Society members and non-member users in general were concerned, it is doubtful if they had sufficient familiarity with the Society and Beech House to have formed any clear idea of Project goals, given the lack of opportunity for user participation in the governance of the Project (see Chapter 6) and the experiences some of these users described in interview (Appendix VII).
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The Society was keen to stress that the initial plans for Beech House had been conceived by parents. The original bid to the charity for research funds referred to the creation of a family support service 'designed by the families it is to serve'. Observation of service provision, together with the compilation of records of service users, established that Beech House was providing for many people who had had no hand in designing the services they were using. The majority of users had never been members of the Society (see Appendix V) and therefore had no formal opportunities to design the services they used, or to participate in the planning process generally, as discussed in Chapter 6. It also became apparent that the Project Manager was operating with a wider definition of a comprehensive, integrated service than that initially envisaged by his employers, since he sought to integrate services not only internally, but also externally, with services provided by both statutory and voluntary sources.

Among the staff, the arrival of the first charity-funded Project Manager appeared to be welcomed and the goal of creating a comprehensive, integrated service generally accepted. Existing staff were aware of the policy of seeking to establish the Project in the eyes of the statutory sector and had been involved in making contacts with and seeking referrals from statutory professionals prior to the Project Manager's arrival, as well as recruiting users for those Beech House services which had not been operating to capacity. There was a general commitment among supervisors to providing the services which would improve the quality of life of mentally handicapped people and their families, and an acceptance of the history of Beech House as a service created by parents. The goals of normalization and serving individual needs, expressed forcefully and frequently by the Project Manager, seemed to have considerable impact and to generate enthusiasm but also some uncertainty and confusion in a work-force which included no other member of staff with a professional social work background. A shared commitment to the quality of life of service users does not ensure agreement on priorities or on ways of delivering a service, nor is it sufficient answer to the problems of incompatibilities between goals which, in the case of Beech House, began to appear when the resources available to the Project were no longer sufficient to fulfil the demands being made upon the services. The issue of the adequacy of the available resources is discussed in the next section.

The possibility also existed of incompatibilities between the official goals of Beech House and those goals which statutory funding agencies pursued with respect to
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the Project. For example, although the Project wished eventually to dispense with Community Programme funding it was nevertheless necessary to retain MSC support until such time as the Project could achieve long-term finance from statutory services. The need for annual re-application for the Community Programme meant the goal of acquiring secure, long-term statutory funding had to be pursued by the charity-funded managers alongside the practicalities of securing sufficient funds for the short-term survival of the Project as a whole.

Thus, while pursuing its own goals, the Project had to comply with MSC requirements in order to permit that body to fulfil its goals. These related to employment objectives, the placement of people unemployed in terms of MSC eligibility rules in projects judged to be of general benefit to the community. Eventually, the goals of the Community Programme came to be seen by the Executive Committee and by the charity-funded managers as incompatible with the Project goals relating to the delivery of personal social services.

The achievement of joint finance for the Beech House playgroup and for the Home Care/Sitting-in service was seen by the Executive and the staff as a major step in the process of acquiring long-term statutory support for the service as a whole. The goals of the sponsoring Social Services and Education Departments vis-a-vis Beech House thereby became crucial, if unclear, components of the environment of the Project. It seemed that in response to various forms of political pressure, the two Departments had agreed to the funding of services which could be seen as filling gaps in their own provision for mental handicap, providing additional services for use by their own staff. The two Beech House services had been financed, therefore, on the grounds of sponsorship by two independent County Departments, and the funding of the playgroup had been set in an educational context, rather than in the context of the total network of services for mentally-handicapped people and their families. There was marked opposition to the funding of the playgroup from some officers and practitioners in social services and education. The sponsorship of the playgroup by the education authority was not universally approved within that authority.

It is appropriate to stress at this point that, as discussed in Chapter 5, Beech House was not financed as a comprehensive, integrated service during the research. Each of the various funding sources offered only partial support to the Project. The differential funding of the various services meant the manager could not plan
ahead for the service as a whole. If the goal of a comprehensive, integrated service was approved in theory by the Project's statutory funders, it was not fully supported in practice. The use of the Project by statutory service practitioners suggested that the Project was viewed as an acceptable resource at practitioner level. However, interviews with practitioners and managers indicated that there was considerable hostility within the statutory services to the development of personal social services on the basis of Community Programme funding. There were anxieties that services initiated on the strength of such funding and without prior discussions on co-ordination with statutory services would eventually make claims on local authority budgets which were already hard-pressed. Such claims might be hard to refuse. Yet, if successful, they could conflict with the authority's own service priorities. The reception at County level of the first Beech House joint finance bid was less than enthusiastic. This suggests that the respective goals of different funding sources may conflict, further complicating a situation where the potential already exists for incompatibility between the various goals pursued by the voluntary service, and between those service goals and the goals of funding bodies.

It is not only the issues of the definition, compatibility and acceptability of various goals which are crucial, but the closely associated issue of how far goals are realistic within given resources. As previously suggested, incompatibilities between goals may only become apparent when resources are stretched. The acceptability of a particular goal may be called into question only when it becomes clear that a major portion of the available resources may be required for the pursuit of that goal, to the detriment of other goals.

GOALS IN RELATION TO RESOURCES

The resource implications of the various goals were not adequately confronted. The resource requirements of the introduction of the 'new' goals of normalization and serving individual needs were not assessed, for example, nor the possibility that the commitment to serving individual needs might have to be explicitly restricted in accordance with available resources. The demands which might be made on resources by expanding the Beech House clientele to include those living in hospital and in the community without effective family support did not seem to be anticipated when contacts with statutory services practitioners were cultivated and referrals sought in order to achieve the goal of long-term statutory funding.
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During the research, Beech House was serving a wider clientele than originally envisaged. The users receiving support were not only families but individuals, i.e. adults without families, living in a variety of situations, and adults contemplating living independently of their families. The Project Manager described one aspect of the trend to supporting individuals, in the spring of 1985:-

"We are not providing a family support system, but are supporting individuals with poor family support or no family support - either because they have no network or because relations within the family are too poor for them to cope, parents are dead, families have lost contact, or they have weak networks which have problems themselves. We are providing family support in peripheral things - occupational, respite care, leisure, the playgroup...where a family perhaps uses one part of Beech House services and no others. The major part of the services goes to individuals who have no informal support network."

Such developments raised the issue of the extent to which a Project designed by parents with the intention of serving the needs of families with a mentally-handicapped member would be able to meet those needs while also responding to the needs of unsupported individuals, given the increased demands this would make upon resources. That such a form of expansion might affect the ability of the Project to provide the services parents wanted for those with a mentally handicapped family member living at home was acknowledged within the Project, but did not appear to be a central topic for discussion between Project staff and the Executive Committee. Although topics relating to the effects on service delivery of pressure on resources might arise in Committee discussions from time to time, such matters were not pursued in any systematic way.

SETTING POLICIES FOR IMPLEMENTATION

The issues arising in relation to the creation of agreed policies for implementation of service delivery goals are closely associated with the issue of defining goals. The lack of definition of a comprehensive service, for example, contributed to unresolved problems of who should have access to Project services and how wide a geographical area the Project should serve once resources came under pressure. Policies on access to services, which would provide a guide to staff facing problems of allocating services, had not been discussed and agreed between the Executive and Project managers.
The issue of the need for appropriate policies to apply to situations where the demand for a service exceeded supply, though it increasingly arose within the Project in discussions between staff, rarely occupied the attention of the Executive Committee during research fieldwork. As a result, when 'rationing' of some services became inevitable, no policies existed which had been agreed with the Executive and which could be applied in the allocation of services eg. by determining priorities of need for services. The initial, vaguely defined, general 'open-door' policy was to prove increasingly difficult to sustain as Beech House became established (see Chapter 4). This matter will be considered in more detail in the discussion on service delivery in Chapter 9.

With regard to the introduction by the Project Manager of a policy of normalization, this policy was apparently accepted by the Executive. However, a paper prepared by the Project Manager on the principles which should underlie service delivery, intended for presentation to the Management Panel and the Executive, was never discussed. The means by which this goal would be translated into practice were thus not explored and agreed with the Executive Committee eg. the implications of the acceptance of standard principles of service delivery for the relationship between staff-run Project services and the volunteer-run leisure services organized by members of the Executive.

Although the Society envisaged a working relationship with the statutory services in which Beech House would become an indispensable partner, the lack of a specific policy on the nature of the relationship Beech House should have with the statutory sector was apparent. No clear consistent response was agreed between the Executive and the Project to the question of whether Beech House should accede to any type of request from statutory practitioners or parents for help, even where the result was to defuse demand for improvements to statutory services. A related issue concerned the extent to which Beech House should offer choice to parents by providing alternatives to statutory services. These matters testify to the development of Beech House in the absence of effective dialogue with the statutory sector on the co-ordination of service provision.

SETTING POLICIES ON MONITORING

As described in Chapter 5, policies on monitoring which were set by the Society and external funding agencies before the arrival of the first charity-funded
The manager did not provide for regular systematic monitoring of service delivery. Although the charity was exceptional in requesting that figures on service use and service users be incorporated in research reports, there were major problems in obtaining such material, as discussed in Chapter 6.

The first major source of current Project funding, the MSC, did not operate performance criteria relating to the service provided to users, and monitoring was concerned with employment issues and financial control. The managing agency took no active role in Beech House management and had responsibility only for financial aspects of the Community Programme. Another early source of Project finance, the Urban Policy grant, seemed to require only an annual financial statement.

Following the initial granting of joint finance, sponsored by the County's Social Services and Education Departments, no arrangements were requested or made for statutory service representatives to attend Executive Committee Meetings. The criteria by which the two joint financed services, the playgroup and Home Care/Sitting-in, would be assessed and the possibilities of achieving further statutory funding enhanced, were not known within the Project. No policy of requiring systematic programme monitoring was articulated by the joint finance authorities. There was no requirement by the statutory authorities for the sort of data that only systematic record keeping could provide until the Management Review undertaken in mid-1987. This was precipitated by the funding crisis due to an MSC policy change requiring Community Programme cut-backs.

It could be said that there was some evidence of statutory funding sources at a general level exercising a very limited form of monitoring of Beech House services. This was seen within the setting of the Policy Group (see Chapter 6), the body designed to promote co-ordination between Beech House and statutory services at a general level. While meetings were relatively infrequent and discussion tended to range over many issues rather than focus on Beech House, the statutory service senior managers representing the joint finance authorities did demonstrate a concern to avoid duplication of services. They were instrumental, for example, in the application of eligibility rules to the playgroup and holiday playschemes, as described in Chapter 4. These examples of the direct impact of statutory funding on the Project's service delivery will be considered in Chapter 9.
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The Society itself had a policy of monitoring the finance of the Project, through procedures described in Chapter 5, with Committee members having the opportunity to study and query figures regularly presented at meetings. Monitoring of service delivery seemed more informal and impressionistic. The figures on service use which were presented to the Committee during the research could not provide more than the most general indication of the pattern of service use.

Within the Project itself, the first charity-funded manager envisaged the Programme Planning system, described in Chapter 6, as encouraging staff to monitor and evaluate what was being provided, examining the basis of the delivery of a service.

An account of the monitoring which took place within the Project during the research is given in Chapter 10.

DESIGNING APPROPRIATE STRUCTURES

The Project Manager inherited the traditional hierarchical organizational structure established by the Executive Committee. The role of the Executive Committee as the management committee of Beech House, the Project Manager/Co-ordinator attending, was outlined in Chapter 6. Following the arrival of the first charity-funded manager, the Management Panel changed its role and became, instead of the group responsible for day-to-day Project management, a formal body for Project-Executive communication meeting far less frequently than before. In 1987, the Management Panel was re-titled the Management Sub-committee and more members of the Executive were encouraged to attend. Throughout the research, opportunities for Project-Executive communication were afforded not only by these formal structures but also through informal contacts between the charity-funded managers and the Society Chairman. The organizational structure designed by the Executive Committee had made no formal provision for the representation on the Executive Committee of paid staff, of users who were not members of the Society, or the major sources of funding.

On the arrival of the Project Manager, given the goal of creating a comprehensive, integrated service, there was a need for new structures to facilitate communication and co-ordination within the Project, between staff generally and between the
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separate service groups. As described in Chapter 6, the new Supervisors' Group replaced the Management Panel as the body concerned with the day to day running of the Project. The former brought together the Project Manager, supervisors and organizers of care services. During 1986, following staff expressions of concern about lack of communication between the separate services, 'Communications Meetings' were also added to the regular routine. To bring together all staff, not merely supervisors and organizers, the Project Manager introduced the quarterly House Meeting, intended as the forum where any member of staff could raise matters of general concern.

The introduction of Programme Planning by the Project Manager created a new formal structure to serve the goals of integrating services internally and externally, of promoting normalization and serving individual needs. When, from early 1987, Reviews replaced Programme Planning meetings, they continued to involve statutory service practitioners concerned with individual cases, in order to promote some integration of internal services with external services. Co-ordination with statutory service practitioners at a more general level was formally provided for through the Practitioners Group, described in Chapter 6.

The new manager found he needed to establish procedures to cope with a wide range of organizational tasks eg. financial management; the creation and maintenance of a system of user records central to the service; personnel management eg. a disciplinary and grievance procedure, design of job specifications, staff pension schemes, the storage and retrieval of information relating to health and safety matters, the accommodation and equipment; a staff training scheme; operating procedures eg. relating to fire safety, drugs administration. Following the departure of the Project Manager, the Project Co-ordinator continued to be actively concerned in many of these areas, especially with regard to establishing and maintaining central records, as discussed in Chapter 6.

Thus the organizational structure of Beech House became increasingly complex after the arrival of the first charity-funded manager, as new services were introduced, others expanded and joint finance was implemented for certain services. From the original division between staff of domiciliary and building-based services, initially planned by the Executive Committee, there developed further specialization in service delivery. As detailed in Chapter 6, the Project
Manager introduced a number of structural changes in response to these developments and also as a means of reallocating staff and changing job-content in the ways he saw as most appropriate in given circumstances. His successor also made changes, particularly in response to altered funding situations and problems of filling staff vacancies.

Due to the increasing complexity of Beech House operations and organization, there were considerable requirements of the planning process with regard to the design of structures at Beech House. However, the situation inherited by the first charity-funded manager was such that the Project was not well-placed to meet those demands. Relevant information from external agencies was not available to the degree necessary for effective planning, given the limited approaches to monitoring already described and the development of Beech House without adequate co-ordination with statutory services at policy levels.

Within Beech House, the Chairman and Executive Committee had devoted great energy and commitment to initially establishing the Project and negotiating joint finance for Home Care and Sitting-in and the playgroup. Until the arrival of the charity-funded Project Manager, the Chairman had taken responsibility for overseeing the day-to-day running of the Project by a succession of three Community Programme managers. Four members of the Executive Committee had been employed at Beech House during the first Community Programme.

Despite this close involvement, it is doubtful if the Executive Committee grasped the complexity of the organization they had created, nor the way in which the demands of that organization on management would proliferate given the additional aims now set, and the introduction of joint finance for some services.

The Executive Committee, having appointed the Project Manager, seemed to withdraw very considerably from involvement with 'management issues'. The Chairman did appear to maintain close contact with both charity-funded managers, however, outside the formal committee setting. The Committee, composed mainly of parents but with a few interested parties, was very much a body of amateurs in the management of organizations. The structural changes planned and introduced by the Project Manager during his period of appointment, though they were reported to the Executive Committee, tended to attract little attention. For example, the radical reorganization involving the creation of the Common
Resources Group, described in Chapters 4 and 6, was achieved without prior discussion with the Executive Committee as a whole. The Committee was notably disinterested in matters relating to financial management, which seemed to be seen as an issue for the paid staff. Items involving the expenditure of Society funds on behalf of the Project did tend to excite comment. Apart from this, the Executive seemed to function very much as a 'users committee', greatly concerned with the development of services and the way in which existing services were being experienced by those using them, though their access to the views of other users appeared limited (as suggested in the findings of the family survey in Appendix VII) and no formal structure for the representation of users on the Executive had been designed. The underlying issues relating to the goals of the service the Society had created rarely surfaced in discussion.

CONCLUSIONS

The ways in which statutory funding sources could be seen to have influenced aspects of the planning process at Beech House have been identified.

Several official goals had been set for the Beech House Project. The pursuit of statutory funding from Urban Aid, Urban Policy and the Community Programme did not appear to have led to changes in the goals articulated by the Project's founders in the early stages of development, i.e. creating the services parents wanted, acquiring long-term statutory service funding, and creating a comprehensive, integrated service. However, opposition from the joint finance authorities led to substantial modification of the Society's bid for funding from this source, i.e. Respite Care and the Information Service continued as MSC-funded provisions after their withdrawal from the joint finance bid; the manager's post and the minibus found support from non-statutory sources; plans for a new counselling and advocacy service were withdrawn and not resurrected. Adult Daycare, rejected for funding after inclusion in the final bid, continued as part of the Community Programme. The counselling and advocacy service was the main casualty of the rejection by this source of statutory funding, therefore. Plans for a Living Away from Home service were shelved for a long period after attempts to obtain funding from statutory services failed, and no further approaches to statutory funding sources were made.
In addition to consideration of the influence on goal-setting of bids for short-term statutory funding, the influence of the possibility of achieving long-term statutory service funding deserved attention. The existence of this potential source of statutory funding prompted the formulation of the goal of acquiring such funding. The decision to seek to become indispensable to the statutory services as a means of enhancing the acquisition of long-term statutory service funding was not considered, in the planning process, in terms of its implications for the achievement of other official goals. These included the goals of normalization and serving individual needs, introduced by the charity-funded Project Manager.

The problems of operating with multiple official goals were illustrated in the discussion of issues of clarity, compatibility and acceptability. The simultaneous pursuit by statutory funding sources of their own goals complicates the situation further, given the potential here for conflict between the goals of the Project and those of statutory funding agencies, and for conflict between the goals espoused by the different statutory funding agencies. Such issues, relating to the setting and the nature of multiple goals, did not appear to have been effectively confronted in the initial planning stages. Together with the issues of the adequacy of resources for the goals set, the establishment of policies for implementation and monitoring, and the design of organizational structure, they began to attract the attention of the managers and other paid staff during the course of the research. These matters are explored in Chapters 9 and 10.

The lack of emphasis on prior planning is understandable given the inexperience of the members of the Executive Committee responsible for creating the Project, and the minimal involvement in such matters of the major statutory funding sources. The limited formal opportunities for these funders to participate in the planning process once the Project was established are also notable. The Project was given a very substantial degree of freedom with regard to planning. The influence upon the Project of this lack of constraint is as deserving of attention as the influence of any formal constraints applied by sources of statutory funding.
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SUMMARY

Chapter 9 examines the ways in which statutory funding sources have influenced the Project's physical and human resources and the access of users to services provided. The receipt of current statutory funding and the possibility of acquiring long-term funding from statutory services are both relevant here.

Four issues are discussed in relation to physical resources. Firstly, the accommodation, despite many positive features, was not ideal for the provision of the wide range of services to which the Society aspired, and a number of practical limitations were observed which the funding available was insufficient to remedy. Secondly, the views and experiences of supervisors, and the family survey, suggested that the vision of centre-based services for which the Society had originally obtained funding was not wholly appropriate to the delivery of a wide range of services to a large geographical area or to the integration of individuals in their local communities; however, the funding of these physical resources, once obtained, reinforced the perpetuation of centre-based service provision. Thirdly, the climate of financial insecurity in which the Project operated, and the goal of obtaining long-term statutory funding, contributed to major differences of opinion within and between staff and the Executive Committee, regarding expenditure on accommodation and equipment. Fourthly, there was some anxiety within the Project regarding the appropriate response to donations of equipment and other gifts in kind, where these were seen as counter to the principles of normalization, yet indicating support within the community which could help further the goal of obtaining long-term statutory funding.

The discussion of human resources describes the paid staff recruited and the adequacy of the Project's human resources to meet the demands of service delivery. The paid staff were largely transitory, female, part-time, and lacking professional work experience in the field of mental handicap. The direct influence here of Community Programme eligibility rules was notable; however, the part-time employment pattern established under this scheme was perpetuated on transfer to joint finance while the extension of joint finance following the first three years funding of Home Care re-imposed the existing staffing pattern, with no discussion of the possibilities of introducing changes in the light of experience.
Examples are given of ways in which the influence of statutory funding on the human resources can be said to have enhanced the achievement of service delivery goals. Here, the Community Programme demonstrated a degree of flexibility not apparent in joint finance funding. Both these funding sources, though operating somewhat differently, placed constraints on service delivery through their influence on human resources, affecting motivation and the time and skills available, at all levels. Examples of the pressures on the paid staff are examined with regard to management, administrative and clerical support and the delivery of care services by Community Programme staff. The pressures on care services generally are considered in relation to those services where expressed demand clearly exceeded supply, notably Respite Care and Home Care, and to the integration of services via Programme Planning.

The issue of limitations on expressed demand arose with reference to access to services. Here it was shown that while certain limitations on access (e.g. the funding of building-based services where some users lived at a considerable distance, the ignorance and confusion of users about available services) can be traced to the influence of statutory funding on the nature and amount of physical and human resources, other limitations derive from the direct imposition by funding bodies of formal restrictions on the use of resources i.e. the application of eligibility rules by joint finance.

Problems due to pressure on both physical and human resources were aggravated by shortcomings in the planning process, seen for example in the lack of systematic monitoring procedures, in the unresolved issues of clientele, of rationing, of setting priorities and the principles to underlie care practice. Here it is the freedom permitted to the Project by the statutory funding sources which merits attention. It is not only the constraints, direct and indirect, attributable to statutory funding which have influenced resources. The detachment from the planning process of the initial funding sources, i.e. Urban Aid, Urban Policy, the Community Programme, and later of joint finance, especially the lack of interest displayed in providing for systematic programme monitoring, can also be seen as influential upon the resources available for service delivery.

INTRODUCTION

Effective service delivery requires the bringing together of the necessary resources at the point of delivery. It requires not only that resources are adequate for the goals pursued but also that service users and service providers have access to each
other. Chapter 9 considers the ways in which statutory funding sources influenced the physical and human resources available to the Project and the access of users to services. The consequences for service delivery are identified.

THE INFLUENCE OF STATUTORY FUNDING ON PHYSICAL RESOURCES INVOLVED IN SERVICE DELIVERY

The acquisition of Urban Aid and Urban Policy funding had allowed the Society to lease, refurbish and run for three years a Victorian vicarage for use as a centre for the provision of services. Local authority main programme funding later replaced Urban Policy as a source of finance. The MSC Community Programme also contributed to the running costs.

Three core direct care services were based in the house ie. the playgroup, Respite Care and Adult Daycare, together with the holiday playschemes and volunteer-run leisure activities. The house was also used for Society meetings. The Home Care/Sitting-in service, though domiciliary in nature, was run from Beech House. Thus the services were mainly building-based, and funding had been obtained on this understanding.

The adequacy of the physical resources for the demands of service delivery
The possession by the Society of an attractive building, set in spacious grounds, equipped and furnished in as non-institutional a style as possible, was clearly seen by many participants, parents and staff, as an asset to the Project. However, a number of problems were experienced with regard to the Project's physical resources which could be seen as constraints upon service delivery. These are considered below.

Firstly, statutory funding had been obtained for accommodation which, despite its attractions, was not ideally fitted to meet the service goals identified for the Project. Urban Aid had provided the Society with funds for accommodation well in advance of the establishment of services run by staff paid from other sources of statutory funding. Limitations of space placed constraints on service delivery in various ways. Office space was restricted, with supervisors and administrators sharing offices. The lack of privacy for confidential discussions between members was a source of concern. There were too few 'phone lines, but the cost of increasing these was judged unacceptable by both charity-funded managers. The
many changes—about of offices and access to telephones during the appointment of
the Project Co-ordinator seemed to produce no solution satisfactory to all the staff
involved, and on occasion the way such changes were initiated evoked resentment
and exacerbated tensions.

The size of the Respite Care flat and its situation on the first floor meant the
accommodation could be registered for use by no more than three people at a time.
The possibility of alterations to permit registration for a larger number of guests
was considered in 1985 but rejected as too expensive. The accommodation
contributed in a major way to the restrictions placed on the provision of Respite
Care, as did the multiple use of this accommodation by other services. On
weekdays and at weekends when no respite care was provided, the flat was used
for a range of purposes by staff, Adult Daycare and the volunteer-run leisure
services. Considerable tensions were generated, in consequence. There was some
friction between Beech House staff and representatives of the volunteer-run leisure
activities when the latter were unable to organize activities in the flat because of
the presence of visitors for the weekend.

There was a lack of 'free' space during the day when the main rooms were
occupied by routine activities. This led to the decision of the Project Co-ordinator
to convert a walk-in cupboard to a 'quiet room' for the use of staff or visitors, in
the summer of 1986. This helped take the pressure off the Respite Care flat
kitchen, which had been used by staff for drinks and lunches. It did not solve the
problem raised by a Home Care Assistant who pointed out that Home Care staff
caring for a child or adult for an extended period could not easily bring the
person to Beech House to use the facilities, because this would clash with the
routine use of the house by the playgroup and Adult Daycare. Nor did the 'quiet
room' offer the sort of accommodation which would encourage parents to use
Beech House as a casual, informal 'drop-in' point. This was seen by some staff as a
desirable role for Beech House, for they were aware that many parents had little or
no contact with the house, or with each other. The family survey had confirmed
that there were parents who had never visited Beech House. The lack of 'free'
space was particularly emphasized during the long summer playscheme,
contributing to difficulties in maintaining continuity of service for Adult Daycare
attenders. The requirement of the joint finance authorities that the playgroup be a
year-round provision put pressure on the accommodation. The holiday playscheme
had to be reduced to a three-day a week service from one available each week-day.
Such limitations of the accommodation placed some constraints, therefore, on service delivery, including the development of Beech House as a centre for parents.

Regarding the use made of the house in general, there were suggestions by staff that this resource was in one sense 'over-used' and in another sense 'under-used'. It was pointed out that on many week-day evenings the house was closed. Society members, parents and mentally handicapped children and adults made little use of the house at these times, apart from the small numbers who had attended the parents' evenings and the monthly Executive meetings. That some parents shared these views was shown in the family survey, with a small number of respondents regretting the lack of development of Beech House as a community centre for parents and children.

One staff member described the ideal situation....

"It ought to be like the playscheme periods, buzzing with children and adults all the time".

The Project Manager expressed the view that the house should be more available to the community. He felt it could be used as a resource centre involving a wide variety of community groups. This would answer the desires of younger parents of mentally handicapped children for more opportunities for integration.

There were suggestions that the house was 'over-used' in the sense that the very existence of the building and the symbolic value it held for the Society were limitations on the care services provided. This view was described by one supervisor as follows:

"There is a feeling that (the Society) has Beech House so what (the Society) does has to happen at Beech House".... "There is a groundswell of opinion of parents in the area that says 'Beech House is O.K. if you live in (the town), but we want services close to us in the villages'".

The family survey identified problems of access to services with parents unable/unwilling to make use of the Beech House building-based services because of the distance of their homes from the town, and transport problems (see Appendix VII). The suggestion was made at a Supervisors' Meeting that 'detached workers', in co-operation with specialist social workers, could organize activities at a local level, taking the Beech House ethos out into the community. In Supervisors' Meetings and Programme Planning meetings related issues surfaced from time to
time, with staff querying the justification of bringing mentally handicapped people long distances to Beech House, rather than establishing them as individuals in their own local communities. Opportunities were limited for Adult Daycare staff to go out with users to help with their independence training in their own local area. There were also worries about the extent of the mini-bus route, with staff aware that the problems of pick-up times, and the length of the journey for users of Adult Daycare and the playgroup, laid Beech House open to criticisms similar to those made of statutory service transport arrangements.

During 1986, a number of playgroup places were occupied by small, delicate, babies and toddlers in need of special nursing care. The possibility was raised by some staff that in such cases, help might be better provided to parents and children in their own homes rather than by removing the child to Beech House. However, joint finance had not been provided for a domiciliary service, but to ensure a single base for the care of under-threes which would facilitate the work of the peripatetic teachers.

It can be argued that the Society's original vision of Beech House for which funding was first obtained, that of services which would be largely building-based, produced a pattern of service provision which was not consistent with the policy of serving a wide geographical area. Questions arise as to how far this perception of the accommodation was consistent with the provision of a comprehensive service to a widely recruited clientele, or conducive to the integration of individuals in their local communities. However, a major shift in service provision from centre-based to community-based services would not have justified the continuation of running and maintaining a Victorian mansion. As the Project Manager stressed:

"It is a big expensive building, it looks nice, it is prestigious - but it is a building.... It doesn't tell you about care in the community.... Home Care could certainly run without Beech House. Daycare could be provided in other ways.... I could run Beech House from my garden shed."

Various problems arose within the Project regarding expenditure on physical resource items, with evidence of disagreement within the paid staff and between paid staff and the Executive Committee on the justification for expenditure where benefits to service delivery were not immediately apparent.

There was some feeling among staff that more money should be spent on fire escapes. A concern with fire-safety was evident at Beech House, with regular fire
practices and visits from Fire Service Officers to ensure the precautions taken conformed to regulations. Although the fire authorities did not require escape chutes or an outside fire escape, anxieties were expressed by some staff at the lack of external escape routes, especially from the attic and the rooms in the Respite Care flat. Although the argument of the Project Manager that the cost of such escape routes would be prohibitive seemed to accepted, the worries remained. During 1987 the Project Co-ordinator expressed an intention to at least explore the matter again.

One request by staff for expenditure on physical resources was particularly significant, for it involved a substantial sum of money, and concerned expenditure which would not be seen as contributing directly to care services. A proposal for the provision of lighting for the long tree-lined drive to Beech House was put forward in September 1985. A quotation of £1,600 was received for this. The issue was first raised by female staff worried about the possible dangers to Respite Care staff walking to and from Beech House at night, and about the frequent prowlers. Although the Project Manager did agree to place the matter on an Executive Committee agenda early in 1986 it received no discussion and no action was taken. The matter was not raised formally with the Executive again during the remainder of the Project Manager’s appointment. The Project Co-ordinator did resurrect the issue and when fieldwork ceased she had, on the advice of a new member of the Executive Committee, approached the local council to establish whether this body would pay some, if not all, the costs of the improvement.

Some difficult situations arose due to proposals to spend money on accommodation, equipment etc. in ways not seen as essential to the provision of care services. There was considerable variation between the Project Manager and the Project Co-ordinator in their views on this issue. The Project Manager emphasized thrift and was reluctant to sanction expenditure on items he regarded as not vital to the running of the house, given the uncertainties about future funding. The Project Manager was concerned that some of the capital items requested by staff were 'luxuries', the purchase of which he could not justify. Although there was a general acceptance by staff of the need for care with regard to expenditure, there were those who were not always convinced that the limits placed on expenditure by the Project Manager were reasonable or necessary.
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The Project Co-ordinator adopted a rather different approach, arguing that the voluntary status of Beech House was no reason for the house to appear shabby or run-down or to be unsatisfactorily equipped. As the Society had substantial funds in the bank, the money should be used. This change of approach seemed to disconcert some staff, uncertain about the justification of spending money in such ways when the future of services was threatened, worried that outside observers would be critical of such 'non-essential' expenditure.

Throughout the research period, the tendency for donors to insist that the Project should accept gifts in kind or use money to purchase items chosen by the donors, not by the Project, was very marked. On occasion, the acceptance of such resources involved the Project and handicapped users in situations which some members of staff felt reinforced a negative image of mental handicap. There was anxiety that success in obtaining funds from the community was at the price of projecting an image of handicapped people which ran counter to the aims of normalization, an image promoting them as objects of pity and charity. There was also some concern that the Executive, in its efforts to maintain a high profile in the community, attract general support and strengthen the Project's position vis-a-vis the statutory services, was not sufficiently aware of this as an issue.

THE INFLUENCE OF STATUTORY FUNDING ON THE HUMAN RESOURCES INVOLVED IN SERVICE DELIVERY

The acquisition of statutory funding by the Society permitted the employment of a paid staff to fulfil the service delivery goals set for the Beech House Project.

Staffing was supplemented in a number of ways e.g. by volunteers, casual staff and social work trainees on placement. The recruitment of volunteers, in particular, was seen as politically desirable by the Project and its founders, a means of establishing the Project's reputation in the eyes of professional observers and funding bodies and enhancing the chances of obtaining long-term secure funding from statutory service sources. It was seen as evidence that statutory funding did not mean the demise of volunteer effort, but ensured 'value for money'. However, while volunteers continued to run the traditional leisure activities of the Society, few volunteers were involved in the delivery of care services, apart from the carefully supervised school pupils and students helping on the holiday playschemes.
The delivery of care services was the responsibility of the paid staff. The numbers and type of staff recruited to the Project are described, noting the influence here of statutory funding sources e.g. the predominance of part-time posts. The adequacy of the human resources of the Project in terms of the demands made by service delivery is then considered.

The staff recruited
A dominant feature of the Beech House staff was its transient nature. The continual change in the staffing of Beech House confounds any attempt to give a static description of other staff characteristics. In February 1985, there were 29 staff posts and in June 1987 there were 41 posts. By the end of June 1987, only seven staff members had been in post, without interruption, since the beginning of February, 1985. A total of 80 different people had been employed at Beech House during the two and a half-year period. During that time, 59 staff came as new recruits and 50 members of staff left, although five later returned.

The heavy reliance on MSC funding made a considerable contribution to the number of staff changes. Of the 50 members of staff who left during the period 40 were in Community Programme places. Approximately nine Community Programme employees left early to go to other jobs, three were dismissed and five left for other reasons. Although the majority of Community Programme staff completed their placements, the staggered nature of departures and arrivals meant staff left and replacements were sought at frequent intervals.

Not all MSC employees were restricted to a maximum of one year's employment. The Common Resources Group supervisor, for example, was classed as a 'key worker' and was given an extension for a second year. Occupants of other posts occasionally received limited extensions to their contracts, when no replacement had been found. Generally, though, the one-year rule applied, and the Project Manager, by 1986, was finding extensions increasingly difficult to arrange.

Turnover was still apparent among staff in posts with longer-term funding. The first charity-funded Project Manager resigned seven months before the end of his two-year contract. The House Manager, funded by Urban Policy, also left early with a year of his contract still to run. Home Care/Sitting-in lost a total of eight staff, all joint financed, including one of the supervisors. Another occupant of a joint financed post, an administrative assistant, also left. Joint finance thus
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provided no guarantee of staff continuity. The playgroup 'lost' a supervisor on her promotion to Project Co-ordinator. Although this particular service group acquired new staff, it did not lose any more of the original joint financed staff members during the period ending June 30th 1987.

*Part-time/full-time employment*

Although the staff structure changed somewhat and new services developed, the majority of posts were always part-time. In February, 1985, the Project was composed of eight full-time posts and 21 part-time posts. The Project Manager and Senior Supervisor were both in full-time positions, as were all the other supervisory staff, with the exception of the two Home Care supervisors who each worked on a half-time basis. The great majority of non-supervisory staff were part-time.

By June 1987, the Project's staffing establishment had grown to number 41, but the whole of this expansion was accounted for by part-time posts. Thus, there were then eight full-time posts and 33 part-time posts, but now with only two full-time supervisory posts (ie. the Adult Daycare supervisor and Respite Care supervisor, both belonging to the Community Programme) in addition to the Project Co-ordinator's post. The pattern of part-time posts dominating the staffing structure was initially established by the Community Programme, due to the restrictions relating to paying the local rate for the job, and the maximum average weekly wage. The pattern was retained as Community Programme posts were transferred to joint finance and later to main programme funding.

*Male/female employment*

The staff employed during the period were predominantly women. Of the total of 80 employees, 20 were men. Only six male employees were directly involved with the delivery of care services. Approximately half the women employed at Beech House during the research were married women who wanted part-time work which would fit in with their family responsibilities. This affected the staffing pattern: for example, it was the reason why job-sharing was introduced for the supervisor posts of both the Home Care/Sitting-in service and the playgroup. It also affected the hours which some employees were able to work and limited the ability of the Project-Co-ordinator to alter or extend the hours of certain posts as she wished.
Background, training and qualifications

The writer did not undertake a close scrutiny of the backgrounds of all 80 employees who worked at Beech House during the period in question. It was possible, however, to build up a general picture from informal comment and the interviews carried out with staff.

Of the 80 employees, at least 57 had taken up their initial employment at Beech House as members of a Community Programme scheme. This meant that they had usually conformed to the eligibility rules of the MSC in operation at the time of their application and had been classified as unemployed for the requisite time. On occasion, however, the MSC did issue waivers where no person classed as 'eligible' had appeared as a suitable applicant. The Project Manager, by 1986, was finding the MSC increasingly reluctant to grant waivers. Freedom to recruit the best applicant for the job was seen as a great advantage of joint finance.

Only one member of staff, the first charity-funded Project Manager, possessed a professional social work qualification. Neither of the charity-funded managers had experience or formal training in professional management. Six or seven staff had nursing or nursery nurse qualifications. Nine were known to possess a degree and/or a teaching qualification. Other staff involved in administrative, secretarial and catering work possessed relevant vocational qualifications in those fields.

Overall, the great majority of Beech House employees had no professional work experience in the field of mental handicap, though a limited number were known to have had extensive experience in a private or voluntary capacity.

Staff motivation

The research did not aim to undertake a systematic investigation of motivation in terms of measuring performance in relation to rewards/incentives. It was the intention merely to consider whether the dissatisfactions and tensions identified by members of staff could be seen to have constrained the achievement of service delivery goals.

The comments made by staff in interview suggested that the modification of the management structure occasioned by the arrival of the first charity-funded manager had a positive effect on motivation. There was considerable enthusiasm for his social work expertise and for his introduction of standardized personnel...
procedures, and attempts to co-ordinate services. There was some feeling that his arrival had enhanced the credibility of the Project in the eyes of the statutory services. Justification for this was found in the comments of statutory service representatives. Both charity-funded managers seemed to have contributed to an improved relationship with the statutory services, by occupying a 'buffer' role and diluting the legacy of hostility between the Project and the statutory services. The second charity-funded manager also brought to the Project her own, though differing, skills which had some positive effect on motivation. Both managers gave every demonstration of high motivation on taking up their posts. Both continued to work long hours, including attending evening meetings. However, it was apparent that the Project Manager eventually became deeply frustrated by the day-to-day demands of running the Project and establishing an administrative framework. He found himself unable to devote the time he thought necessary to direct service delivery matters. The Project Co-ordinator, on her appointment, re-emphasized the need to concentrate on establishing an administrative framework, together with a simplified system of financial management. She also identified a number of problems relating to service delivery for which she proposed to seek solutions. As the financial insecurity of Beech House as a whole became the dominating issue during 1987, she also experienced frustrations due to problems of unfilled staff vacancies, low staff morale and high staff turnover. She seemed to give priority to consolidation and keeping services operating rather than to development and expansion.

Examples of problems of staff motivation identified during research are discussed below. The tensions and resentments most frequently expressed by staff related to the financial insecurity of the Project, the relationship between the paid staff and their employers, and staff-management relationships. They did not focus on any 'exploitation' of staff in terms of low pay and long hours. Most Beech House staff were paid Community Programme rates or local authority equivalent rates depending on the source of funding. These rates were not determined by the Executive Committee. There did not seem to be any explicit demands made of staff regarding working longer hours than they were paid for on a regular basis, though there was perhaps a general expectation that the charity-funded managers should not have a fixed working week but should work whatever hours the job demanded. There were occasions when some members of the Executive expressed disagreement with the decision to allow staff time off in lieu for attending special events such as the Open Day or the Annual General Meeting, together with
comments about the 'lack of goodwill' on the part of the staff. Some members of staff were aware of the expression of such sentiments, others were not. It was apparent that members of the Beech House staff, not only the domiciliary care workers, chose to involve themselves in the Project for longer hours that they were paid for, sometimes because of pressure of work, on other occasions in order to help as volunteers or to participate in fund-raising activities. The tendency of Home Care workers to 'exploit' themselves was striking (see below).

The insecurity of the Project
The financial insecurity of the Project and the transient nature of much of the employment it provided have been discussed in detail elsewhere. The constant state of insecurity in which Beech House operated, the many changes of staff and worries of staff and users about the future of jobs and services inevitably took their toll in terms of motivation. The managers themselves had no job security, and were clearly placed under strain by this aspect of the Project and the difficulties of planning ahead. These intensified in the last months of fieldwork, with the cuts in Community Programme funding and the introduction of interim emergency support for some activities, but with no news about the future. There was, at this time, even greater than usual concern about staff morale and the problems of filling vacancies for jobs which might shortly cease to exist.

For most of the research, it was the Community Programme employees who were least secure, mainly employed for a maximum of 12 months. Although those interviewed voiced anxieties about the future and their regrets at leaving after such a short time, there were also favourable comments on their placements, stressing such advantages as the enjoyment of the work, the development of self-confidence and the opportunity to consolidate their ideas on future careers.

Although joint financed staff were offered more security, as individuals, than Community Programme staff, all staff were affected by the continuing financial insecurity of the Project as a whole and the uncertainty about the future.

The staff-employer relationship
The relationship of managers and staff with the Chairman and Executive of the Society was a source of problems of motivation. Within the Project, there was some concern and confusion about the roles of the Chairman and of the Executive. The regular contacts between the Chairman and the charity-funded managers offered
the latter a source of support but were also a source of tension. The Executive Committee seemed to accept the overseeing role of the Chairman which had developed out of his earlier close involvement with the Project prior to the appointment of the first charity-funded manager. However, there were worries within the Project regarding the power of the Chairman to give instructions to staff without reference to the Executive Committee, and about situations where discussion on certain topics was not extended to include the Executive Committee. There was also uncertainty about the point of authority for staff i.e. whether this was always the manager, or whether on occasion it was the Chairman or another member of the Executive.

There was no formal provision for staff representation vis-a-vis their employers. For many paid staff other than the manager there was little or no informal contact with their employers. To some, this was a matter of concern. Others did not think the distance of the Executive from the Project was relevant to them in their daily work. However, the Executive as a managing body generally lacked credibility within the Project. Members were seen as mostly remote and ill-informed, not sufficiently aware of key aspects of Project affairs to exercise their management responsibilities effectively. It was concern on this issue which prompted the Project Co-ordinator to press for the introduction of the Management Sub-Committee. She hoped this would lead to more, better-informed, members of the Committee becoming involved in Project management and aware of the service-delivery problems the Project faced.

There were particular problems of staff motivation when the Executive rejected proposals about which the manager and supervisors held strong views e.g. a new logo, to replace one which the staff felt promoted a negative image of mental handicap, counter to the principles of normalization; insurance cover for staff responsible for administering drugs. The latter expenditure was seen by the Executive as an unacceptable use of Society funds since it did not contribute directly to care services.

The members of the Executive were seen as not representative of the large numbers of users who did not belong to the Society; there was criticism from supervisors who felt any initiative to increase parental involvement in the Project came from the staff, not the Executive. The lack of formal provision for parents to have a participating role in service management other than by joining the Executive
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Committee was raised by both charity-funded managers during their appointments. Not all parents wanted to be on committees, it was said, and some would be intimidated by them. Shortly before his departure the Project Manager announced to staff:-

"I would like to see 'Project Users' with a vote on how services should be structured".

Some months later the Project Co-ordinator voiced worries over the same issue:-

"I am anxious about users' lack of representation via the Executive. The only way to ask for things or express concern is to come straight to the staff and some parents won't do this. Not everyone wants to join the Executive and you couldn't have all users on it anyway. Many users are not Society members. Perhaps they should all be required to join the Society for their own protection, to give them a voice. There is no group other than the Executive for parents to go to".

There was some feeling among supervisors that members of the Executive saw the service more in terms of their own needs than the needs of service users in general, especially when individual members pressed for the provision of services which might divert resources the staff felt were needed more elsewhere. There were examples of staff identifying the conflicts they felt in this situation. They stressed their commitment to the history of Beech House and those who set it up and described being made to feel they had failed if they were unable to meet a request for help by a member of the Executive, or to implement suggestions for the development of new services. Staff morale seemed to suffer, also, when new services could not be sustained. Certain services which had attracted few users had been introduced, because of pressure from articulate parents eg. the short-lived Thursday Evening Club, parents' evenings. Such experimentation was encouraged by the MSC's policy of flexible use of staff and allocation of posts. The possibilities this allowed for service development added to the pressure from Committee members on paid staff to expand available services, even in the face of problems of maintaining existing services. The feeling was also expressed by certain staff members during 1987 that statutory service representatives involved in discussions on long-term funding for the Project would disapprove of further development of new services, given the current insecurity and financial crisis. There was an awareness on the part of staff of an obligation to the service as a whole, and the needs of other users. The expansion of the clientele of Beech House had brought highly dependent users whose demands on resources were such as to restrict the ability of the service to cater for the wide range of services parents
had anticipated for themselves. The tensions that arose from the failure to prepare for this situation at the planning stage were very evident in the Project-Executive relationship and had implications for the motivation of the staff, in terms of the pressures on those concerned. This illustrates the effects of the conflict between the goal of providing a wide range of services sought by parents and that of becoming indispensable to statutory services by encouraging referrals and widening the clientele, when resources are limited.

During the research there were examples of conflict situations involving members of the two groups of service providers ie. paid staff and those running the volunteer-run leisure activities, which staff saw as having detrimental effects on the service delivered to certain individuals, and which hindered the achievement of an internally integrated service. Project staff were reluctant to take these and other issues arising from the joint use of the accommodation to the Executive or to those members of the Executive responsible for running the leisure activities concerned.

Staff experiences of the management structure
A third source of problems of motivation of staff is found in the staff experiences of the management structure of Beech House. There were four main aspects of the staff-management relationship identified as of concern to staff ie. opportunities for communication up and down the hierarchy, the way changes were implemented, the existence of substantial disagreement and confusion over the allocation of resources and the allocation of services to users, and the nature of the working relationship between the Project Manager and the Deputy/Assistant Manager.

Complaints and anxieties were expressed about matters relating directly to work operations eg. alterations in job content, the demands of administration, criticisms of staff performance, and also about matters arising from other aspects of the work situation ie. general conditions of employment such as whether staff should be allowed to smoke. A key concern was the manner in which decisions, regardless of the particular issue involved, were taken and implemented. Many of the comments made by staff at all levels related to a perceived lack of involvement in decision-making.

The staff at Beech House had never been unionized. An early attempt by a member of staff to create an opportunity for union representatives to visit Beech
House to talk to staff had come to nothing. This matter had been raised shortly after the arrival of the Project Manager. The research worker was not aware that the matter had ever been formally raised again. There was no provision for a staff committee or a staff association. The one formal opportunity for non-supervisory staff to meet the Project Manager, the Deputy/Assistant Manager and supervisors, and voice their views on issues concerning their work and conditions of employment, was the quarterly House Meeting (see Chapter 6). The Project Manager made this clear at a meeting for new staff in July 1985. His response to suggestions that the staff might request that certain issues be discussed at Supervisors' Meetings and Management Panels was:

"The forum for that is really the House Meeting".

When staff views were sought, however, favourable comments on the House Meeting were confined to its social function. There were many highly critical remarks of its failure to provide a suitable opportunity for non-supervisory staff to communicate their feelings to those above them in the staff hierarchy. A typical comment was:

"The House Meeting is the worst kind of meeting. People feel intimidated. It's more of a social occasion. People get a chance to see each other, then the Project Manager tells people what is going on, what he has decided and asks for comments and no-one makes any. People express their feelings afterwards".

During 1987, the Project Co-ordinator, worried about staff morale, discussed with supervisors ways in which staff might be induced to participate more in the House Meeting.

Some of the non-supervisory staff felt that there were sufficient opportunities for them to express their views to supervisors and managers informally, so that any failure of the House Meeting as a forum for the expression of staff views was unimportant. Others, perhaps less confident and articulate, did feel unhappy with their experiences of their position in the management structure of Beech House and with what they saw as the lack of opportunity to raise matters of concern to them:

"Staff who aren't supervisors have no say in things. The tea and coffee money is one example, the toy cupboard being turned into a rest room. No-one asks you. Things happen and you don't even know they are being talked about".
Few members of staff expressed a desire for unionization, though two Community Programme members said they would have liked an opportunity to discuss the issue; however they feared that raising the matter would jeopardize their chances of getting good references. A number of non-supervisory staff referred to the 'handing down' of decisions from above, and the mysteries of what went on at meetings of supervisors and the Management Panel, together with a desire to be more involved in decision-making. Several supervisors expressed awareness of the lack of opportunities for staff generally to be involved in what went on and to give their views. There were suggestions that non-supervisory staff might feel intimidated by those above them in the staff hierarchy, and this was confirmed in interviews with non-supervisory staff. Some believed that Community Programme staff were held in low regard and were not given enough responsibility. One supervisor, regularly involved with Community Programme staff, felt criticisms directed at them were not wholly justified; given their inexperience, they coped as well as could be expected. There were members of staff, both supervisory and non-supervisory who referred to 'undercurrents' in the house, resentments over cleaning, over the rules about smoking, as indications of deeper differences over the way decisions were taken.

Throughout the research, staff were subject to many changes, introduced by the managers in response to their perceptions on the staffing structure and allocation of resources most appropriate to the changing circumstances of the Project. Some staff, both non-supervisors and supervisors, found it difficult to accept certain major changes introduced by the managers which had affected the nature of their work, or had led to different practices in a service about which they felt strongly. Although discussions took place the basic differences remained unresolved.

Many changes in organizational structure were introduced (see Chapter 6). Some of these were not universally welcomed. Examples of other issues related directly to service provision, over which some staff differed with the Project Manager, included his plans for the summer playscheme to become the responsibility of the specialist social workers of the statutory social services, the decision to withdraw a formal information and welfare rights service, the reduction of the monthly Newsletter to a quarterly publication, and his views on what the priorities should be in the nature of the service provided in Respite Care and Adult Daycare. However, it should be noted that there were cases where the staff were concerned as much with the way a change was imposed as with the nature of the change.
itself, and this applied to decisions taken and implemented in areas other than those directly concerned with service provision eg. budget control.

When the Project Co-ordinator took over and began to introduce various changes she felt were demanded by the situation, the same problems relating to opportunities for consultation, communication and involvement in decision making remained in evidence, together with unresolved differences over priorities. These were particularly apparent in relation to the Home Care service. The management style of each charity-funded manager had its critics and its supporters among the staff, in both supervisory and non-supervisory posts.

It was clear that for some individuals other aspects of their experiences of the management structure within the Project had been particularly stressful. The difficult relationship between the Project Manager and Deputy/Assistant Manager is noteworthy here, both for the tensions it inevitably induced in the two managers and also the influence of their differences of opinion on other staff. The ambiguous position of the Deputy Manager/Assistant Manager during the appointment of the Project Manager was a source of confusion for staff. Staff in certain services were unclear about which manager they were immediately responsible to.

Implications for service delivery
Before proceeding to consideration of the adequacy of the Project's human resources for the demands of service delivery it is necessary to acknowledge that it is not possible to measure the precise impact on service delivery of the tensions which derived from the situations described in the foregoing discussion of human resources. In spite of all the constraints due to problems associated with the time and skills and numbers of staff, and the resentments arising from the relationship of staff with their employers and from their experiences of the management structure within the Project, services continued to be provided. Even where staff were severely critical of certain features of Beech House, they also, almost always, expressed interest in and commitment to their work and valued the time spent with the Project. For staff who had established relationships with the families and individuals helped by the services, the sense of commitment to the users themselves was very powerful, and seemed an effective counterbalance to the dissatisfactions they felt about other aspects of their work.
If there was 'exploitation' of staff at Beech House it was experienced by staff in relation to the lack of opportunity for genuine consultation, the distance of the employers from their employees and the employers' lack of understanding of the demands made on the paid staff, and not with respect to any explicit attempts to keep pay low and hours long. It may well be that for some staff, particularly those at a non-supervisory level, dissatisfactions over lack of communication and consultation or feelings of being undervalued were channelled into the arguments which surfaced over cleaning, smoking, the tea and coffee money and similar matters. In the absence of any effective provision for the expression of views and solution of problems experienced by non-supervisory staff it is not uncommon for dissatisfactions to be focused on such apparently 'trivial' issues. For certain members of staff apparently under great stress, continuing to fulfil their work responsibilities against a background of tension and conflict, one can only speculate about the personal costs in terms of effects on health and home-life. Undoubtedly, the pressures contributed to staff turnover. However, for many staff, leaving and/or seeking alternative employment were not viable possibilities. Overall, during the research, the working environment of Beech House did not appear conducive to the creation of a cohesive staff group and an internally integrated service.

The adequacy of the human resources for the demands of service delivery

Statutory funding gave the Society a paid staff to provide a wide range of services in addition to the volunteer-run leisure activities. The Community Programme had allowed the Project to use the staff recruited in a flexible manner (see Chapter 6). This freedom had allowed the establishment of Respite Care and the development of new services either by creating new staff posts or by changing the job content of existing posts. Although some services were later withdrawn, the Community Programme, by permitting the flexible deployment of staff, had allowed experimentation in the provision of new services in a way not possible under joint finance, where funding was provided for specific services.

The staff also provided services to a wide range of users. The Project had commenced with an 'open-door' policy, with no restrictions applied by the Community Programme regarding the users to be served. Thus a wide-ranging clientele had developed, encompassing a variety of handicaps, ages, family backgrounds, and drawn from a considerable geographical area, including some families living over the County border.
This freedom with regard to 'intake' policy meant that, contrary to early expectations, the service grew far beyond the provision of 'family' support for parents with a mentally-handicapped person living at home. Increasingly, with referrals from statutory services, the service came to support individuals and couples living in the community, with or without effective family support in the background, and people living in residential/hospital accommodation. Beech House also began to provide services to people moving to live in privately-run residential homes, an area from which demand for Beech House services may increase as more private homes are established in response to hospital closures.

Home Care/Sitting-in was given an expanded staff group by joint finance, increasing the amount of Home Care officially provided and the hours of the supervisors. Freedom of recruitment was allowed. The achievement of joint finance made the playgroup a year-round provision, secure for three years in the first instance and permitting continuity of staffing. In contrast to the playgroup, turnover of Home Care staff was considerable in spite of the three-year contracts provided. All the Home Care posts were part-time and, therefore, particularly attractive to women with domestic responsibilities. However, some posts were held for a time by young single people. Such posts may not easily retain the services of enthusiastic young people wishing to pursue a career, nor the services of married women who wish to move on to full-time paid work. Even so, greater continuity of service was observed than would have been possible under Community Programme funding. Staff believed the acquisition of joint finance encouraged parents to make more use of services for which they could now see a future.

Statutory funding through its influence on staffing, could be seen to have enhanced the achievement of the goals of a comprehensive service and providing the services parents wanted. However, there were within the Project several examples of constraints on service delivery which could be traced to the influence of statutory funding on staffing, in terms of shortages of staff time and appropriate skills, and in terms of motivation.

The following discussion of the pressures on the paid staff considers first the demands made on the paid managers, the provision of administrative/clerical support and the general issues relating to the employment of Community Programme staff. The pressures on staffing are then considered in terms of the
demand for and supply of the separate services, identifying those services where expressed demand exceeded supply and where problems of allocation arose. Finally, the problems of achieving integration of services via Programme Planning are discussed.

The Managers

The two charity-funded managers were 'human resources' of the Project, responsible for staff provided by statutory funding but not themselves funded by statutory sources. The Society, in the belief that the Community Programme was unable to provide a manager with the necessary background and qualifications, had unsuccessfully sought joint finance for this post. The Society later obtained funding from the charity. Only towards the end of the research, with the expiry of charitable funding for the manager's salary in view, were statutory service officers prepared to support the case for funding the manager's post by joint finance or main programme funding.

The Executive Committee had agreed on the need for a 'professional' manager to act as lynch-pin for the range of services provided and to enhance the credibility of Beech House in the eyes of the statutory sector, thereby increasing the chances of obtaining long-term statutory funding. However, the extent of the management skills which would be required appeared to be underestimated. The Project Manager appointed was a professional social worker rather than a professional manager and had operated in a local authority setting, involved in implementing procedures and operating within structures devised and serviced by others. At Beech House he was to find it necessary to give priority to designing and introducing these procedures and structures. The Project Coordinator who succeeded him had a background in nursing and of work in the Project in other capacities, including a post of Assistant Manager. She similarly lacked professional management training.

Both appointments underlined the feelings of the Executive Committee on the skills needed to manage Beech House. Their own amateur status contributed to an underestimation of the management skills required. As suggested in the earlier discussion of planning, the practical involvement of the Chairman and other members of the Executive in Beech House, prior to the arrival of the charity-funded Project Manager, gave them insufficient indication of the problems of management which would shortly be presented by the Project. The composition of
the Executive Committee was described in Chapter 6 and the lack of professional management background of the members was noted.

During the research there were occasions where members were able to offer useful information on matters such as local authority contacts, but there was no source of professional financial, legal or general managerial expertise available to the Project Manager. The Project Co-ordinator in 1987 did insist on access to professional accountancy advice and this was finally obtained, as described in Chapter 5.

The Project Manager was appointed with a brief which included introducing changes in organization and developing new services. He had to respond to the new financial situation of the Project. The introduction of joint finance meant that staff were no longer all subject to the same Community Programme regulations, while the transfer of some previous Community Programme staff to joint financed posts led to the creation, in certain services, of groups of 'experienced', 'long-serving' members of staff in contrast with the 'transitory' MSC staff. At the same time, increased demand for some services reduced the opportunities for staff to 'help out' in other services, cutting down the opportunities which had existed in the past for staff from different groups to work together.

The introduction of joint finance for the playgroup had led to the creation of two separate staff groups for the playgroup and Adult Daycare, where previously one staff group and one supervisor had provided both services. The 'old' staff group became confined to the playgroup, the 'new' staff group taking over the day-care provision for adults. The creation of a formal, regularly provided Respite Care service only commenced early in 1985, with the new MSC appointment of a Respite Care Organizer. Prior to this, any respite care had been organized and overseen by the supervisor and staff who also provided the Adult Daycare service and the playgroup. Thus, in a short period of time, three separate staff-groups were created to provide services previously offered by a single staff group. The appointment of the first Living Away from Home worker in 1985, another new MSC post, presented an additional function. In mid-1986 the Project Manager created another MSC-funded staff group via the Horticulture and House

Towards the end of fieldwork, two new members joined the Committee who were described as possessing some expertise in financial matters, but the writer was unable to observe the contribution they made to Committee activity.
Maintenance project, aimed at providing employment to people with learning difficulties.

This proliferation of separate staff groups, composed largely of part-time workers, was encouraged by the flexible approach of the MSC to the use of Community Programme places 'freed' by joint finance. This permitted innovation and experimentation with new service developments. It also produced a situation where the needs for communication and co-ordination between the different services were greatly expanded. At the same time the opportunities were increased for the generation of different perspectives and conflicting views on the nature of particular services and the relationships between them. Add to this the complications and inflexibilities arising from the funding of the service as separate components supported by different sources of short-term finance, the growing demands on certain services, and the need to obtain future funding for the Project in an environment itself changed by the re-structuring of statutory service agencies, and the challenge to management which emerged during 1985-86 becomes even more apparent.

Both charity-funded managers possessed particular, notable skills. The Project Manager brought the social work expertise so far absent from the Project, and was also an effective communicator of ideas on caring for people with a mental handicap. His commitment and ideals were clearly a source of inspiration and motivation to many staff. The Project Co-ordinator demonstrated considerable organizing abilities and great strength of commitment to high standards of care, though her views and priorities differed from those of the Project Manager. There were staff for whom her approach also had great appeal, and was a source of motivation. However, although both managers were confronted by problems of establishing a financial and administrative framework and of introducing these and other changes to an insecure, often changing work-force, neither had prior professional training in the management of people or in financial management or business administration. The work involved in establishing systems and procedures where none had previously existed proved demanding, often frustrating, and extremely time-consuming for managers and staff. Both managers encountered major problems in getting changes accepted by staff and in creating a cohesive staff group.
The Project had been in existence for 20 months before the appointment of the first charity-funded Project Manager, operating without the benefit of any professional management expertise. This ensured that certain practices and expectations were already set with regard to service delivery and the way the Project should be managed. These proved to be highly influential within the Project during the appointments of both charity-funded managers, and contributed to the emergence of problems which were still not fully resolved as fieldwork ended, for example, in relation to the demand for Home Care and the need for some form of rationing of the service described in Chapter 4. To the management skills required to deal with the new situations of different forms of short-term finance and proliferating staff groups were added the skills required to analyze the effects of previous management practices on staff and user expectations and service delivery, and to implement alternative practices, where necessary. It is not surprising that both managers encountered major problems here.

There was a lack of statutory funding for a post of Deputy/Assistant Manager. The Project Co-ordinator, in contrast to her predecessor (see Chapter 6), decided she would not designate an official deputy. She was concerned that to continue to allocate such responsibilities to a joint financed supervisor’s post would provoke the disapproval of the joint finance authorities and jeopardize the chances of obtaining future funding from this source. The Community Programme Senior Supervisor took over unofficially in her absence. The MSC opposed the use of the Senior Supervisor post as a formal deputy to the manager, since this would involve supervision of joint financed staff. This left the Project Co-ordinator with a heavy burden of responsibility and the Project vulnerable in certain respects in the absence of the Project Co-ordinator for illness or a holiday, etc. The Society Chairman believed the organization of care services into separate branches, each with its own supervisor(s), ensured the continued provision of services in the absence of a manager. However, it was not easy in such situations to ensure the responsibilities of the manager were also fulfilled by the remaining staff in addition to performing their normal service delivery tasks. This was particularly evident after mid-1987 when only two supervisors held full-time posts. The statutory service Management Review in 1987 did not recommend the funding of a Deputy Manager post.
Administrative and clerical support

A major source of pressure on administrative staff was the establishment of central records of service use and service users. The delay in establishing such records, three to four years after the service began, created an enormous backlog of work for managers and staff.

A particular gap was the lack of administrative and clerical support to the joint financed services. Finance was available for only five hours a week for a book-keeper and fifteen hours a week for the administrative assistant. The Project Manager used the administrative assistant as his secretary, judging the MSC-funded administrative/clerical provision insufficient for the running of the Project overall. This left the supervisors of Home Care and the playgroup with no direct administrative support and an increasingly onerous burden of paperwork, especially in relation to records of service use. The funding for administrative/clerical support which had been approved in the joint finance bid was insufficient for the needs of the Project as a whole, but given the three-year period agreed, there were difficulties in obtaining increased support. This highlights the problems involved in predicting the need for staffing resources for the years ahead when the limits of demand for the services and functions involved are unknown. The Society did at one point approach the local authority for an additional amount of money to cover travelling expenses for the Home Care and Sitting-in service. This was granted, but it was an exercise the Society did not wish to repeat. It was feared that any further approaches would reflect badly on the Project and jeopardize the chances of future local authority support for the joint financed services. The existing staffing pattern was re-imposed when a brief review of Home Care/Sitting-in and the playgroup, which took place in mid-1986, led to the renewal of joint finance of those services on a tapering basis, on the original terms. The Project Co-ordinator was offered no opportunity to raise the possibilities of the need for a changed pattern of provision. In contrast, the Community Programme offered opportunities for flexibility, for change in the staffing pattern in response to experience, which were not available to the joint financed services.

The Project Co-ordinator, on her appointment, obtained money from the Society to pay for extra book-keeping time. When interim funding was granted for six months in July 1987, pending negotiations on long-term statutory finance, she also obtained money for extra hours for the joint financed posts of book-keeper and
administrative assistant. The Project Co-ordinator also recruited the services of a professional accountant on a voluntary basis.

The Community Programme staff
The consequences for service delivery of the largely unskilled, transient Community Programme staff were seen by the Project Manager and Project Co-ordinator as detrimental. The Society Chairman noted, though, that one advantage of the scheme was the opportunity to dispose of any unsatisfactory staff, after a year, while it was sometimes possible to retain satisfactory staff and transfer them to a non MSC post.

The Project Manager, in 1985, was expressing reservations about the short-term employment of Community Programme care staff and the destructive element in the lack of continuity he felt this imposed. The existing restrictions on eligibility for employment were not, however, identified as a major constraint in providing a care service. A year later the situation was very different. By then, changes in the eligibility rules, which effectively barred the great majority of married women from work on the Community Programme, had begun to have a marked impact on Beech House as vacancies arose. Part-time posts were difficult to fill, especially those of the cook and the cleaner. Certain key posts in service delivery were also vacant for several weeks even though they were full-time. The problems of coping with unfilled vacancies added to the pressures on the Project throughout the period of the research. Existing staff, including the charity-funded managers, had to undertake extra responsibilities at such times, while on occasion services had to be briefly suspended eg. Respite Care, or frozen eg. the Befriending Scheme.

By April 1986, the Project Manager had concluded that the operation of a caring service on the basis of Community Programme staffing was no longer acceptable. He argued that 60% of his time was spent on MSC-related personnel matters e.g. advertising, interviewing, references, liaison with the Job Centre. He identified the lack of skills of many of the MSC staff as resulting in high costs to the Project due to the effort demanded by training and supervision. The disruptions to the formation of a cohesive staff team, attributed to the short-term nature of Community Programme placements, were also a great concern. The manager allowed 'Living Away from Home' to be absorbed into Home Care, having decided the Community Programme could not provide the long-term commitment required. In general, the investment in training and supervision had no long-term benefit to
the Project given the frequent changes in personnel. His proposal to the Society Chairman that Adult Daycare be withdrawn, in view of these limitations on resources, was rejected.

The Project Co-ordinator, rather than proposing to eliminate a service such as Adult Daycare to reduce pressure on staffing resources, turned her attention to such remedies as arranging for statutory services to assume some responsibility for the long summer playscheme as previously advocated by the Project Manager, raising the matter of an intake policy with the Management Sub-committee, and negotiating long-term, more secure funding with statutory service representatives, as an alternative to continuation with the Community Programme scheme. Criticisms of Community Programme staff were used as an argument in negotiations for long-term funding. In a meeting, a key member of the Executive told statutory service representatives, 'We have people working here we would rather not have'. The same statutory services had originally viewed the Beech House Community Programme with considerable reservations.

The demand for and supply of services

An examination of the demand for and supply of specific services identified areas of service delivery where the availability of staff was insufficient to meet expressed demand.

The Project Manager had been associated with Beech House prior to taking up his post there. He believed that in the Project's early days demand for services had been such that the emphasis for staff in service delivery had been on filling up the house, looking busy and justifying their existence by rushing out to find clients. This view was confirmed by the memories of others involved in this stage of development. By the time the research commenced great variation had developed between services in terms of the balance between expressed demand and supply.

The supply of a number of Beech House services either matched or exceeded the demands expressed for those services. This group includes two of the volunteer-run leisure activities i.e. the Disco and Saturday Club. The care mornings and the Thursday Club attracted insufficient interest, in the judgment of the Project Coordinator, and both services were terminated. The pre-school playgroup did not always fill the number of places available; staff were aware of the reluctance of some parents to accept that their children needed special services. The joint
finance-imposed eligibility rules meant that this service could no longer be offered to children up to the age of five, but was confined to those aged three and under. Thus, the funding agency restricted access to the service by applying regulations on the use to which the resources provided may be put.

There were limited indications of unmet demand for five services i.e. Sitting-in, the Newsletter, Adult Daycare, holiday playschemes, and the volunteer-run Youth Club.

The Youth Club, as noted above, for much of the research excluded those in wheelchairs or judged to exhibit serious behaviour problems. The family survey (see Appendix VII) found a small number of families whose children were ineligible for these reasons, with parents expressing the view that their children should be able to attend. It was the Club leader's opinion that volunteers could not be asked to accept the responsibilities involved. This restriction on access was not due to statutory funding. It does indicate the problems in achieving the goals of normalization and serving individual needs where such policy issues have not been confronted by the management committee as part of the planning process.

The Newsletter was, in theory, available to Society members, service users and interested parties on request. However, the family survey identified a small number of families who received the Newsletter occasionally or not at all.

Demand for Sitting-in had been underestimated in the joint finance bid, but the supply available was increased through the Society substantially subsidizing the service, when the official budget for sitters' fees and travelling expenses overran. The Sitting-in service seemed to be largely able to meet expressed demand. The family survey did identify a case of self-imposed rationing where the parents could not afford the 90p an hour fee more than once a fortnight. If there was a problem of availability it was in the area of 'last-minute' requests which could not always be met and which some parents refrained from making because they felt this placed unfair demands on the service.

Adult Daycare was a service offering fixed entry and regular commitment, with places reserved for a limited number of identified users. The service was unable to offer help on an ad hoc, occasional basis. There was little turnover; occasionally people ceased to attend, but there were few cases of individuals
moving on to other services or into employment. There did not appear to be formal evidence of unmet demand such as a waiting list. However, most users attended on only one day a week and the family survey found examples of parents who would have welcomed a five-day-a-week provision. There were also worries whether the service would again be withdrawn in the Summer to make way for the holiday playscheme. Community Programme cutbacks were announced in the Spring of 1987. These would entail staffing cuts which meant both Adult Daycare and Respite Care would cease. The Adult Daycare service was withdrawn from the hospital residents at Easter, then restored when emergency interim joint finance was obtained for six months from June.

There was evidence of suppressed demand for the holiday playschemes. These usually recruited to the maximum, and staff sometimes instituted rationing by reducing the number of days a child could attend each week. After 1985, following the rules set by the authorities administering the 'one-off' joint finance grants, invitations were sent to parents living in the catchment area. These eligibility rules meant the service was not available to certain families who wanted to use it. Cases of such families were identified in the family survey, with criticisms raised of the playschemes they were eligible to use, seen as an unacceptable alternative to Beech House. Such regulations restricted access. As with the playgroup the regulations placed restrictions on the use made of the resources obtained.

A few services, because of their nature and/or their short life, were very difficult to assess in terms of supply and demand i.e. the employment project, the 7 - 11 Club, parents evenings, the Befriending Scheme, Living Away from Home, and the Information/Welfare Rights service.

The two services where there was clear evidence that expressed demand outstripped supply were Respite Care and Home Care, in spite of the expansion in these services since Beech House opened.

Respite Care experienced problems with both physical resources (see above) and human resources. The Respite Care service applied the strict legal limits to the number of people permitted to use the service at any one time, limits based on the type of accommodation available, fire-safety provisions etc. However, in contrast to those services operating fixed entry and regular commitment eg. the playgroup,
there was no commitment to a number of identified users over an extended period of time. Respite Care was open-access and supplied on a 'one-off' basis. Provision of Respite Care expanded greatly during the research. Following the introduction of a Community Programme-funded organizer, the service moved from an occasional provision to one available at least monthly, offering the June holiday fortnight in addition to the normal weekends. A major constraint on further expansion of the service was the problem of recruiting qualified casual staff, especially those with the nursing qualifications felt to be necessary. The general basis on which the service was provided was not flexible, though the service may have been flexible in terms of response to the needs of those who obtained it. Places tended to be booked months ahead and the service could not normally respond to emergency or last-minute requests from parents or from statutory service workers. The development, by 1987, of a long waiting-list, suggested that a demand existed to which the expansion of Respite Care had been an insufficient response (see Appendix 11). Concern about the general limitations on Respite Care was prominent in the family survey (see Appendix VII).

The Home Care service, though there was no formal limit on the numbers of users to be helped at any one time, was officially limited, from January 1985, to providing a maximum of (8 x 19) hours of Home Care each week. These limits were set by the employment contracts of the Home Care Assistants and by the joint finance which funded the service. In practice, staffing was supplemented in a number of ways. The Home Care supervisors themselves on occasion directly provided the sort of service normally provided by the Home Care Assistants. For part of the research period, an MSC-funded 'Living Away from Home' worker supplemented the staff group. The Home Care workers often built up great quantities of 'excess hours' which were officially recorded. There were also examples of Home Care staff working unpaid, undeclared hours in their own time which were never recorded (see Appendix II). The actual amount of Home Care supplied was not known, therefore.

Figures on service use (see Appendix II) show how demand for Home Care had increased. Following a slow start, Home Care had become a victim of its own success. At first, with few families using Home Care, the staff helped in other services, e.g. the playscheme, adult daycare, and were able to spend time establishing close personal relationships with those who did use Home Care. This
permitted the establishment of certain expectations on the quality of care on the part of staff and users.

After joint finance was obtained in January 1985, although staff numbers doubled as a result, the demands on the service reached a point where requests for help could not always be met. By 1986, staff were acknowledging the need to seek ways of rationing their service and of using sitters-in and volunteers to undertake certain tasks currently performed by the Home Care Assistants. The flexibility, mobility and open-endedness of Home Care had made it vulnerable to pressure from 'excess' demand. Staff were trying to respond to direct demands from carers and unsupported people living in the community, to requests from statutory service workers for help for referrals, and from supervisors of Beech House services who had identified users in need of Home Care help. As regular commitments to certain families and individuals built up, the amount of staff time officially available to respond flexibly to one-off requests became increasingly restricted, a matter which frequently arose at staff meetings. As with Respite Care, while the service might respond flexibly to the needs of the individuals who obtained it, the basis on which it was provided inhibited flexibility in allocation.

Staff were placed under pressure by the growth in demand for Respite Care and Home Care, encouraged by the policy of seeking to become indispensable to the statutory services. It became necessary to allocate scarce resources between competing claimants. Neither service kept records to show the pattern of allocation of services. The writer was able to extract information and establish this, however. Some families were found to use each service far more than others, but the way this allocation had come about was not clear (see Appendix II). Arrangements seemed ad hoc and implicit, with 'first come, first served' and responding to expressed need as powerful long-term influences on the pattern of allocation.

These problems cannot simply be attributed to the lack of numbers and skills of staff provided by statutory funding. The commitments of staff to established patterns of service allocation, and the lack of explicit policies on rationing and prioritizing need for the care staff to apply where demand for a service exceeds supply meant that these issues remained unresolved as fieldwork ended; however, they were by then being openly confronted by the Project Co-ordinator.
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As discussed in Chapter 7 on planning, the Project's Executive Committee had not displayed a consistent concern with such matters and the major sources of statutory funding operated no formal requirements for information relevant to service allocation.

The situation with regard to Home Care did illustrate that the need for appropriate skills training was not confined to Community Programme staff. The visits and on-the-job instruction received by the Home Care staff did not seem to prepare the supervisors or the domiciliary care staff for the great pressures involved when close, intense relationships are established with service users. The Home Care staff worked as individuals, isolated, exposed and vulnerable. As demands for the service increased, difficult situations arose which involved staff saying 'No', and which presented the possibility of having to remove a service/reduce a service initially supplied in the days of lower demand for Home Care. Because Home Care workers tended to have 'their' particular families, great attachments could develop between the workers and users. Parents would press for extra services from that particular worker because 'X won't stay with anyone but you'. Workers tended to assess needs of users in individual terms, not relative to the needs of other users, and to become defensive if staff in other services or the Project Co-ordinator suggested that certain people were receiving 'too much' Home Care.

The Home Care service, when founded, had stressed it would provide what parents wanted, with the emphasis on practical help in the home. Developments were such that the work undertaken had a vital social as well as a practical function, particularly when the service began to help people living alone in the community without effective parental support. It could be argued that the Home Care staff needed skilled preparation to cope with this situation, especially when the demand for Home Care was such that rationing in some form became inevitable. However, the problems of providing appropriate training to a part-time workforce where no funding has been provided for training are apparent.

The lack of this form of skill preparation of Home Care staff became observable when pressure on the service was such that the number of existing staff could not respond to it within their official hours. In the circumstances, the build-up of unpaid overtime and the uncontrolled subsidizing of the service by the unreported, unpaid work of Home Care staff was not surprising.
In such circumstances, the stresses and conflicts were predictable which became apparent when the Project Co-ordinator sought to monitor the activities of Home Care, anxious to discover how some users were having many hours of help while others in need were receiving little or none. It is arguable whether, of all the services provided at Beech House, Home Care was the one where the prior and continuing development in staff of the skills of handling relationships with users was most needed. Certainly it was the service where the pressures on human resources were such that the effects of the lack of those skills were most striking.

It should be noted that the discussion above refers to the demand for services expressed by users. The family survey (see Appendix VII) established that a number of factors were operating which could limit the expression of demand by parents, thus concealing the extent to which unexpressed demand might exist. Some families were ignorant of what was available, or confused about the way services operated. The latter was particularly true of Respite Care, where it was commonly thought that users had to wait to be invited to use the service by the organizer. Parents could be reluctant to ask for help, even though they knew services were available and wanted to use them. Some families took pride in independence and in asking very little of Beech House. The existence of a process of self-imposed rationing by parents with respect to certain services, identified in a preliminary way during observation, was confirmed in interview during the family survey. A majority of users said they rationed themselves in their use of one or more of the services where self-imposed rationing was applicable, particularly Home Care and Respite Care. These families emphasized the demands made of Beech House services and their awareness of the needs of other users. Parents could feel unable to take advantage of certain services because of problems of cost or distance or transport. There were also a small number of cases in the family survey where services the parents still wished to use had apparently been withdrawn from those families by Beech House. Thus, the family survey suggested a number of ways in which limitations could be placed on the use of services by parents and on their expressed demand for services. However (see Appendix VII), there was, overall, a high degree of satisfaction with the services provided and anxiety lest the problems identified be construed as criticisms of Beech House.

Resource limitations influenced the dissemination of information and the communication between staff and users eg. through the restricted application of
Programme Planning and through the lack of contact with some of the families living at a distance. However, the distance between the Executive and the majority of service users also seems relevant here. The absence of formal structures for the active involvement of consumers may have further hampered the effective dissemination of information to users and the communication between users and providers.

Even among regular users, though, including members of the Executive Committee, there remained misapprehensions and lack of awareness of certain aspects of Project services. Society members in general did make greater use of the available services in some ways, than did non-members. This raises the question of whether greater familiarity with the services and staff helps make users more confident about asking for help and less reluctant to express their needs to staff. Did Society members, however, make greater use of services than non-members simply because they lived nearer to the Project and had easier access? There may well have been some relationship between Society membership and the distance of families from Beech House. It should be recalled, though, that staff never raised the possibility of joining the Society with new users, lest they assume membership was a condition for access to services.

Programme Planning

A further indication of the pressures on staff is seen in the failure of Programme Planning to develop to serve all users and the problems of establishing an effective, accepted, underpinning administrative framework. During the appointment of the Project Manager no appropriate records and information systems materialized. The absence at the planning stage of provision for central records on service users and patterns of service use created a situation where, several years after the services began, such records had to be generated alongside the continued provision of services to large numbers of users, old and new. Difficulties arose here from pressures on the human resources - time, skills and motivation. The lack of interest on the part of the Executive and many staff in the information such central records would provide mirrored the attitudes of the main funding bodies, which had no requirements for the regular, systematic provision of such information. Thus, even at the end of 1986, it was impossible to establish from central records the names and total number of users of the services, let alone the pattern of service use of every customer.
The lack of development of Programme Planning was linked closely with the situation regarding central records, since there was little impetus here for the effective development of the latter. The limited application of Programme Planning to relatively few users meant the creation of a comprehensive, integrated service was seriously constrained. For the majority of users there was no framework in which the separate services, internal and external, could co-ordinate their activities in any effective way. The emphasis on identifying and fulfilling individual needs and promoting 'normalization' could not be effectively followed through, given the staffing resources and time available, and the rapidly expanding clientele of Beech House during the period. Staff acknowledged in meetings that Programme Planning had been confined to new referrals by statutory services and a few regular users. They also became aware that they lacked the skills necessary for the development of Programme Planning as defined by professional workers. This situation regarding Programme Planning inevitably contributed to the lack of familiarity of users with the services provided by Beech House which emerged from the family survey (see above in the discussion on access to services).

What had so far been in operation at Beech House under the title of 'Programme Planning' was very limited in character, not only in the numbers participating but in content. There were doubts about the viability of the much more intensive approach described in the workshops, given the restrictions on staffing and other resources at Beech House.

On the appointment of the Project Co-ordinator, references to 'Normalization' as a formal policy ceased, and 'Reviews' replaced Programme Planning. The aim was to review the situation of every user, accepting that within given resources it was better to offer some attention to each user, albeit limited, than extensive involvement to a few. The need to establish central user records was identified as a priority by the Project Co-ordinator.

CONCLUSIONS

Overall, discussion of the influences of statutory funding on the physical and human resources available to Beech House has suggested that these acted to both enhance and constrain the achievement of service delivery goals. The two major sources of revenue funding i.e. the Community Programme and joint finance, had
somewhat different influences on resources. However, it is not only current statutory funding obtained by the Project which is relevant here, but also the possibility of acquiring long-term future funding from statutory services.

Certain aspects of the accommodation/equipment and the staffing could be seen as assets to service delivery. Several sources of statutory funding had provided for the refurbishment and running costs of accommodation chosen by the Society as suitable for its purposes i.e. a large Victorian house in spacious grounds. The Community Programme had provided staffing on a flexible basis not apparent in joint finance, giving considerable freedom in allocation of staff and changes in job content, with no restrictions on the clientele to be served by staff. Experimentation with delivery of new services was allowed. Joint finance of selected services later offered freedom of recruitment, the opportunity of greater continuity of employment, and, in the opinion of staff, encouraged greater confidence in service provision on the part of users.

The physical and human resources available were sufficient to allow for the provision of a range of services which met or exceeded the demand expressed for them, including a number of services provided by Community Programme staff (e.g. care mornings, children's clubs) which ceased due to lack of support. Joint finance, supporting the playgroup from June 1985, provided a service which could be seen as generously resourced, given that vacant places were not unusual.

However, a number of constraints on service delivery were observed, attributable at least partly to the influence of statutory funding on resources. Funding for building-based services, once achieved, seemed to encourage the perpetuation of this pattern of use of the accommodation rather than critical appraisal in the light of experience and changing circumstances. Yet such a pattern of building-based services may not be appropriate to the needs of families living at a distance or to the integration of individuals in their local communities. Similarly the staffing pattern for Home Care, inherited from the Community Programme when joint finance was first obtained, was simply continued when joint finance was extended, with no opportunity offered for the discussion of possible changes. On one occasion the Society decided against requesting more money from joint finance to ease pressure on Home Care staff, lest this jeopardize the chances of obtaining future funding from this source. For the same reason the Project Co-ordinator decided to dispense with the post of Deputy Manager, previously allocated to a
joint financed supervisor without the approval of the funding authorities. No statutory funding, joint finance or Community Programme, was officially available for a Deputy Manager for the Project as a whole.

Anxieties about obtaining future funding from statutory services also contributed to differences of opinion within and between the staff and the Executive Committee on expenditure on physical resources which was not clearly directly beneficial to service provision. Such expenditure was seen by some as inappropriate given the financial insecurity of the Project and the possibility that observers influential on future funding would find cause for criticism. There was also staff concern about the acceptance of donations in kind, from the community, which involved conflict with the principles of normalization. There was anxiety that the Executive, seeking support in the community to strengthen its position regarding future statutory service funding, did not confront this issue.

A number of practical problems were experienced in the use of the accommodation which put limitations on service delivery, but which funding was insufficient to remedy. Thus, for example, there was a lack of 'free' space in the daytime, discouraging the use of the house as a 'drop-in' centre, and restrictions on the number of guests using Respite Care.

The service in general experienced practical problems in the use of staff. There was considerable turnover; much of this was imposed by the Community Programme but the experience of Home Care showed joint finance was no guarantee of a stable staff-group. The majority of Project posts were part-time, again imposed by the Community Programme, but automatically transferred on the acquisition of joint finance for the playgroup and Home Care. The part-time staffing created problems of co-ordination, supervision and training. Both managers experienced problems due to insufficient administrative/clerical support, a situation perpetuated when joint finance was extended without the opportunity for a review of staffing needs. Both managers saw the Community Programme as an inappropriate source of funding for the delivery of care services, given the burden of administration and training involved and the discontinuity in service provision due to staff departures and unfilled vacancies. Later, Government cuts in Community Programme staffing led to the temporary suspension of Adult Daycare.
Chapter 9 - Process: Implementation/Service Delivery

Respite Care and Home Care were the two services where resources were clearly insufficient to meet expressed demand. The staff of both services were presented with difficult decisions on the allocation of services, for which they were ill-prepared. The staff of Home Care, given its domiciliary and 'open-ended' nature, were placed under particular pressure. The lack of development of Programme Planning and the underpinning central records, as a means of integrating services and monitoring service delivery, also testified to the pressures on staffing in terms of motivation and of the time and skills available. The ambitions of the Society and Project Manager in terms of service delivery were not matched by the resources the Society had sought and obtained from statutory funding. Although the staff demonstrated deep commitment to the users of the service, there were problems of motivation in terms of dissatisfactions and tensions which undoubtedly contributed to staff turnover and which were a major source of stress to at least some employees.

Problems of staff motivation were identified which could be traced to the influence of statutory funding. Firstly, the financial insecurity of the Project meant that staff could not have confidence in their future employment prospects. Secondly, there were concerns about the relationship with their employers. These raised issues of the lack of personnel skills on the part of the Executive Committee, and the pressures brought to bear on the paid staff to fulfil their employers' expectations of Project services. Such demands were encouraged by the flexibility of the Community Programme, permitting experimentation with new services and changes in job-content. However, staff found it difficult to reconcile these demands with those generated by referrals from professionals while Beech House, in the pursuit of long-term statutory funding, sought to become indispensible to the statutory services. Staff experiences of the management structure of Beech House constituted a third source of problems of motivation, with concerns about opportunities for communication up and down the hierarchy, the way changes were implemented, disagreements over the allocation of resources and the allocation of services where demand exceeded supply, and the relationship between the Project Manager and the Deputy Manager. These issues again underline the need for personnel skills in management.

Consideration of the adequacy of resources to meet expressed demand for services should not distract from the need to consider limitations on expression of demand by users. Parents cannot have access to services if they do not know they exist or
believe they are not eligible to use them. Such restrictions on access were observed in relation to Project services. Some of these indicate the indirect influence of statutory funding. The pressures on staff which hindered the development of Programme Planning contributed to the restrictions on access to services due to the confusion and ignorance of some parents regarding the operation of the Beech House services. Other restrictions on access were due to the self-imposed rationing by parents of requests for Home Care and Respite Care, given the pressures they observed on these services. The distance some families lived from Beech House acted as a restriction on access to building-based services, with families unable/unwilling to use Respite Care, leisure services, the playgroup. The imposition of eligibility rules by the joint finance authorities funding the playgroup and holiday playschemes offers an example of the direct influence of statutory funding on access, by placing controls on the use of the resources provided.

In situations such as these examined in Chapter 9 there is sometimes a tendency to look for answers to problems simply in terms of the personalities of the people involved. This should be avoided. It is essential to consider the structures in which the people concerned have to operate and also to consider the past as well as the present. The appointment of a Project Manager with a remit to bring about radical change in an organization which had already been in existence for over eighteen months was likely to generate some difficult issues. A number of key staff had been in post since the early days of the Project, had been involved in setting up the first services and, under the guidance of the Society Chairman and members of the Executive Committee, had established ways of working and expectations of their own and others' services. The detachment of statutory funding sources from the planning process, and the lack of co-ordination of Project services with statutory services, are noteworthy. As a professionally qualified social worker, the only one on the Beech House staff, the first charity-funded manager was deeply committed to the achievement of particular service delivery goals. Because of his interests and commitment, and because no other staff had experience of 'Programme Planning', the Project Manager became directly involved in decisions on the delivery of care services to specific individuals and families. However, as Project Manager, his was the task of creating the environment which enabled other staff to deliver care services to mentally handicapped people and their families.
It was in this latter area that personnel skills were required. Service delivery depended on a mainly part-time staff subject to considerable turnover, operating in a state of continuing insecurity. Issues concerning staff morale, participation in decision-making, the implementation of change, and the resolution of different views on service objectives and priorities all demanded attention, as did the complexities of designing appropriate supporting financial and administrative procedures. The same problems confronted the Project Co-ordinator, intensified by the financial crisis and increased uncertainty about the future of the Project as a whole which arose during 1987. Both charity-funded managers had to work to a management committee composed mainly of deeply committed people, inexperienced in management but experienced in the care of their own mentally handicapped relatives and with strong feelings about the services they wished to see provided by the Project they had created.

The need for management skills in this highly complex situation was evident, as were the efforts expended by both charity-funded managers to develop those skills through experience, while doing the job. However, neither appointee had training or professional experience in management, an indication of their employers' assessment of the demands of this post. No statutory funding was available for a manager of the background sought by the Executive Committee.

Particularly significant for the situations in which the managers operated, increasing the potential for tension and conflict between staff-groups as well as staff as individuals, were the failures to discuss openly and deal in the planning process with such crucial issues as the pressure on resources of the range of goals to be pursued, who should receive services, how services should be rationed, how to monitor the allocation of services, and the principles which should underlie care practice. The confusion surrounding objectives and the lack of clear policies and procedures, agreed between the Executive and the charity-funded managers, left the way open for disagreements on these vital matters between managers and staff and between staff-groups, as well as between the managers and the Executive. Discussions took place, when differences surfaced, but without satisfactory resolution. As the pressure on resources increased, the Project Co-ordinator began to press the Executive to discuss such issues as an intake policy, but as fieldwork ended it was apparent that conflicts and tensions remained, with past practice and expectations powerful constraints on attempts to reconcile the demands for Beech House services with the limited resources provided to meet those demands.
It is clear from the foregoing that it is as important to consider the detachment of statutory funding sources from the Project, especially the lack of interest in systematic programme monitoring and in the planning process generally, as it is to examine the constraints, direct and indirect, placed upon the Project resources by statutory funding sources. The development of a major mismatch between resources and the goals set for the Project services can be traced to the failure to effectively anticipate such problems in the initial planning stages, or to adequately confront them in the planning process. Awareness of the extent to which supply of certain services was outstripped by expressed demand, and of other problems of access, was hindered by the slow development of self-monitoring within the Project. The monitoring which did take place is discussed in Chapter 10. The role which statutory funding sources might have played here is discussed in Chapter 12.
CHAPTER 10 - PROCESS: MONITORING

SUMMARY

There had been a notable absence of formal, systematic monitoring of service delivery, to provide the basis for self-evaluation, leading if necessary to revised goals and feedback into the planning process. For most of the research self-evaluation within the Project was generally informal and impressionistic. This was true with regard to both the outcomes of service use for the individual and family and for the pattern of service allocation. No formal, systematic approach to assessing the effects of service use for all recipients had been introduced within the Project. There had been no initial recognition of the need for a central records system, complete and up to date, offering a total picture of service use for each individual or family. Later, the task of trying to create and maintain such a system became increasingly difficult and large-scale, but without this information any effective monitoring of service delivery was impossible. Even at the end of 1986, the Project did not have adequate knowledge of where the services were going, who was receiving them, when, how much, and for how long; it could not be seen whether the Project's resources were concentrated in a few homes or spread over many. To monitor service delivery in this way is a highly complex matter, but without such monitoring, the way services are distributed among users cannot be fully established, the existence of ad hoc, implicit, rationing systems can go unrecognized and evidence crucial to self-evaluation and the revision of goals remain concealed.

The situation at Beech House is not surprising given that neither the Executive Committee nor statutory funding agencies expressed sustained interest in monitoring service delivery in any systematic way. The emphasis for joint finance was on fiscal monitoring; other criteria by which the joint finance authorities would judge the project were unknown. The MSC, while concerned with fiscal monitoring of the Community Programme, also monitored employment and training. The limited monitoring undertaken by the Executive Committee reflected the funders' lack of interest in monitoring service delivery. In 1986 the Project Co-ordinator began to pursue the issues of programme monitoring/evaluation in a number of ways. She also came to view the fiscal monitoring undertaken as not conducive to either effective service monitoring or effective budget control. Only in 1987 was there evidence of demand from statutory funding authorities for the provision of information which required
systematic programme monitoring, and this demand related not to current funding but to negotiations for future long-term funding from statutory service sources. If achieved, this long-term funding might well be accompanied by requirements for greater accountability to the funding source.

THE MONITORING TAKING PLACE WITHIN THE PROJECT - FEBRUARY 1985 - SEPTEMBER 1986

Initial planning had not provided for effective monitoring of service delivery within the Project or for the establishment and maintenance of central records on service use and service users. Although an awareness of the value of monitoring service delivery in a variety of ways became more prominent within the Project as the research progressed, an effective basis for monitoring and self-evaluation was slow to develop. At the individual level, any monitoring of personal development and of the outcomes of service use was largely informal and unsystematic, hindering the identification of the needs of users and families and constraining the achievement of the goal of serving individual needs. Within some of the services there was a gradual move to the recording of information about individual user's progress, likes, dislikes etc. Programme Planning, introduced in early 1985 by the first charity-funded manager, was supposed to develop simultaneously with an appropriate records system, and was intended to provide a means of monitoring and evaluation. However, the very limited scale of operation of Programme Planning (see Chapter 6) meant this aim was not realized in more than a few cases and the delivery of an integrated service to users was constrained. The monitoring/evaluation which did take place through Programme Planning was informal in nature and very much at the level of the individual and family rather than relating to the service as a whole. Programme Planning could have only limited impact as a tool for monitoring and evaluation.

The restricted operation of Programme Planning meant that non-crisis cases received little attention and families' needs were not considered in any regular, systematic way. Worries were expressed by supervisors from time to time that certain families/individuals already 'in the system' seemed to receive a great deal of help. There were anxieties that in some cases Beech House was creating dependence. There was also some impression that services might be going to 'those who shout the loudest' rather than to those in greatest need. As the family survey
showed, it was possible for families who were not frequent/regular users of Beech House to quietly drop out of using services and go unnoticed. At the general level, efforts to establish central records were at first intermittent and later more sustained, but after two years of the research project it was still impossible to establish accurately the overall number of service users or to monitor the pattern of service delivery.

Evaluation of the services by staff, given the lack of formal systematic programme monitoring, was generally informal and impressionistic, based on such criteria as feedback from parents and comparisons with what statutory services provided. In spite of some reservations, there was considerable satisfaction with the quality of service provided.

The attitudes of both the Executive Committee and the major statutory funding agencies are highly relevant here. In the past neither group of participants had expressed much interest in programme monitoring.

THE MONITORING UNDERTAKEN BY THE STATUTORY FUNDING SOURCES

The Urban Policy grant required no programme monitoring. The MSC was concerned with financial and employment/training matters, and these only in the confines of the Community Programme component of the Project. The joint finance authorities appeared to be concerned with annual financial audits, rather than systematic monitoring of service delivery, and until the Management Review precipitated by the funding crisis in 1987 there was no sustained interest in assessing the quality of the service being provided by Beech House other than by informal, impressionistic methods. A brief review was carried out in August, 1986, by the two sponsoring statutory services, while considering further funding from 1988. Apart from this, representatives of the sponsoring services might make informal visits, on occasion, though these seemed to be relatively infrequent. One representative of a sponsoring service, who occasionally visited the house for
reasons other than observing the service provided by joint finance, responded as follows to a question on programme monitoring:

"No.... we should do such monitoring, but I don't know of any. I might ask to see (the service) when I am there, but they always seem to be out.... doing wonderful things".

This representative relied on professional practitioners using Beech House to 'keep a check'. The views of parents were also seen as a source of information:

"You will always find out if things are not going well, through parents etc., but you should not wait for this sort of negative information...."

Another representative of a sponsoring service similarly referred to the reliance for monitoring purposes on 'consumer satisfaction' and consultation with professional practitioners regarding their impressions of standards of service. This representative had no knowledge of any regular monitoring but recalled the 'one-off' monitoring exercise of August 1986. It was also indicated that the possibility of seeking some form of representation on the Executive Committee had been considered at that time. However it had been decided that other forums existed for statutory service representation, and reference was made here to 'The Programme Planning Group'. No such 'Group' existed, since Programme Planning had involved variable attendance by a range of professional practitioners, according to the person/family concerned. It seemed possible that the Policy Group was the body referred to. As described in Chapter 6, this had existed before joint finance had been obtained. It was intended to have an advisory and co-ordinating role. Although the Policy Group undertook no regular, systematic monitoring of service delivery it could be argued that the Group, as shown in the decisions it took to avoid duplication of playgroup and playscheme services, did monitor aspects of service provision at a general level, until the changes in the Group's role and composition introduced in 1987.

The criteria in terms of which the performance of Home Care/Sitting-in and the playgroup would be judged by the joint finance authorities were not made clear to the Project, where a key aim remained the achievement of long-term statutory funding. For much of the period of the research the Executive and the staff were left to act on assumptions about what might favourably impress the relevant statutory services and enhance the chances of long-term statutory funding from this source. These assumptions seemed to focus on increasing the numbers of users
helped, or recruiting to the permitted maximum where this was specified, and the promotion of contacts with and referrals from statutory service practitioners. The situation of Beech House vis-a-vis the statutory services was complicated, during 1986, by the extensive re-structuring initiated in the Social Services Department and in the Health Authority, and the new appointments of key personnel.

Overall, the monitoring of service delivery by the joint finance authorities remained largely informal and impressionistic. Only with the Management Review of mid-1987 did there emerge a sustained, systematic attempt by representatives of the joint finance authorities to monitor service delivery at Beech House. This was in response to the financial crisis of the time and to the negotiations for future long-term funding for Adult Daycare, Respite Care and provision for the management of the Project. The conclusion of the Management Review was accompanied by references to requirements of service contracts and participation at management committee level by statutory service representatives, should long-term funding be granted.

THE MONITORING UNDERTAKEN BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Executive Committee formally monitored the Project by receiving reports from managers and staff at Executive Committee and Management Panel/Management Sub-committee meetings. Here the emphasis was on finances, the state of the budget etc., and reports on service delivery were usually brief statements on numbers of people helped in a given period by each service. This approach seemed to satisfy the Committee. Indeed there was a marked reluctance to devote much time to budget matters. The Committee tended not to initiate discussion on basic issues underlying service allocation, such as how priorities should be set and how rationing was taking place in those services where supply was exceeding demand.

Although the matter of the inability of Home Care to meet all requests for help had arisen at an Executive Committee some months earlier, there had been no sustained interest by the Committee, and no insistence that it be kept routinely informed about unmet need for services. Supervisors tended not to offer information on unmet need and rationing if it was not requested. It may be that the issues were sensitive ones for staff who were more likely to see rationing and records of unmet need as admissions of 'failure' of the service rather than as
valuable information, evidence of the need for increased resources or for more services, which could be presented to funding agencies.

Need was also concealed by the 'subsidizing' of services by the unrecorded voluntary efforts of paid staff, most significantly in Home Care but one example was found in Respite Care and it may well have happened in other services such as Adult Daycare, and the playgroup. This is not to ignore unpaid overtime worked by other members of staff not involved in direct service delivery, or the recorded voluntary efforts of staff, all of which subsidized the staffing of the Project. However, it was the unrecorded voluntary efforts of staff providing care services which effectively concealed the actual amount of need users were expressing for those services. Again, a valuable source of information on the extent to which resources were being outstripped by demand was kept from view. The failure to monitor the amount of staff time actually being devoted to a particular family/individual also raises a crucial issue of continuity of service to users. If no-one except the member of staff concerned knows the amount and type of voluntary service being provided to a family/individual (for users may be under the impression that the worker is being paid for all the time given to them) then a major problem arises when that staff-member leaves. The Project has no record of the amount of support a user has been receiving and the effects of the withdrawal of substantial, unrecorded voluntary effort may go unnoticed. A replacement worker, who confines her activities to the 'official' hours allocated to that person/family may then be judged unfavourably compared with the previous worker. Some examples of this were found in the family survey. The unrecorded subsidizing of services by staff in ways other than unpaid overtime may cause similar problems eg. not charging for petrol for outings, for refreshments etc. Such issues relevant to monitoring service delivery did not arise at management committee meetings i.e. the Executive Committee, the Management Panel/Management Subcommittee.

DEVELOPMENTS IN MONITORING WITHIN THE PROJECT - SEPTEMBER 1986 - JANUARY 1988

By late 1986, the Project Co-ordinator was looking for ways to focus the attention of the Committee on matters of monitoring and self-evaluation, rather than on the development of new services and members' personal preferences regarding the
delivery of existing services - issues more likely to attract the attention of the Committee. She also began to try to explain to supervisors and staff the need for systematic monitoring of the allocation of services. She began to investigate the issue of 'unmet need' for services instituting an 'Unmet Needs' book in the latter part of 1986. This relied on supervisors' definitions of unmet need and their ability and willingness to remember to record all examples arising. However, it was the first formal attempt to obtain evidence on this matter.

During 1987 the Project Co-ordinator, increasingly concerned about the way services were being allocated, aware that rationing of certain services was taking place in implicit ways, began to attempt to monitor what families/individuals were receiving. She introduced six-monthly Reviews replacing Programme Planning; families were thus identified who had been 'lost in the system' by Beech House. The Project Co-ordinator also decided that the Project in the past had not looked closely enough at how appropriate a service was to the needs of each user and that Reviews should take this into consideration. The rapid development of Reviewers was encouraged by the urgent need to seek statutory service funding to replace the Community Programme funding for Adult Daycare and Respite Care which was cut in 1987. The, in mid-1987, came the statutory service Management Review linked to the Project's bid for long-term statutory funding. This required information on service use and service users not previously demanded of the Project. Major efforts were made to establish and maintain a central records system to underpin Reviews. The impact of these developments in monitoring could not be studied in detail. The questions remained as to whether, once established, records could be effectively maintained, whether the information recorded would be valued by all participants, and whether it would be extracted for use in the process of monitoring, thus enabling self-evaluation and revision of goals to take place.

The Project Co-ordinator also began to scrutinize such material as workers' claims for petrol used to visit homes/take customers out etc. and the records of 'excess' hours worked by Home Care staff. The issue of 'regular' users of Home Care was raised, and the suggestion made that perhaps in future there should be no such category of user, but that allocation of the service should be looked at afresh each week, with needs of users considered relative to each other. A key-worker system was proposed for the future. As fieldwork had virtually ceased by this time the
research worker was unable to study the outcome of these deliberations, though it was clear that a radical shift in practice was being proposed.

In contrast to her predecessor, the Co-ordinator was anxious that services provided by one source of funding should not be used to subsidize activities elsewhere in the Project which those funds were not intended to support. Thus, she refused to allow the playgroup supervisors to undertake the Deputy Manager role, as described in Chapter 6, because the joint finance authorities had not approved the use of the playgroup supervisors' time for anything other than organizing the playgroup. She also had reservations about the practice of using the part-time joint financed administrator as a personal secretary, rather than providing administrative support to Home Care/Sitting-in and the playgroup as specified in the joint finance agreement. She began to seek alternatives for the provision of secretarial/administrative assistance for the Project as a whole.

The Project Co-ordinator also became anxious about overspending within the Home Care and Sitting-in service and queried the past practice of the subsidizing by the Society of overspending of the joint finance budget, to cover such items as travelling expenses. She felt this was not a system conducive to either effective service monitoring or to effective budget control and that it also concealed the extent to which the service might be underfunded by joint finance. She wished to establish a policy of financial management such that each service/function operated within the budget provided by the funding authority, with staff performing only those tasks for which they were originally funded. The Project Co-ordinator believed such an approach was essential in order to assess the adequacy of official funding for the various activities being undertaken within the Project, and to evaluate those activities in the light of available resources. It was not possible for the research to study the outcome of these developments.

Given the approach to records and monitoring of the Executive Committee and the funding bodies, it is not surprising that there was slow development within the Project of procedures which might well be seen by some members of staff and their employers as bureaucratic and undesirable, reminiscent of statutory services, a burden on already hard-pressed staff and a hindrance to the real task of service delivery. The efforts of the Project Co-ordinator to deal with this issue were gathering momentum as fieldwork drew to a close.
Chapter 10 - Process: Monitoring

THE ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF THE LACK OF EFFECTIVE MONITORING

The discussion so far has emphasized the constraints on the achievement of service delivery goals deriving from the lack of effective monitoring. However, it can be argued that in certain ways this situation was advantageous to the Project. The detachment of funding bodies from the systematic monitoring of service delivery has been noted. The emphasis was on financial accountability, with the MSC concerned in addition with training and employment issues. Financial monitoring was limited, however, in that each funding body could only require an audit of that component of funding which it provided. This permitted a degree of flexibility in the way money was moved around within the Project and allocated between the various sectors of Project activity, according to the perceived needs of particular services. No funding body had a total picture of Project funding. There were those involved in the Project who saw this situation as beneficial, allowing considerable freedom in the use of funding. The Project Co-ordinator, in contrast, wanted to achieve a clear picture of income and expenditure which she felt would ultimately benefit service delivery.

The absence of systematic monitoring of service delivery by the MSC, together with that agency's flexible policy to changes in job-content and the retention of vacant Community Programme places freed by joint finance, allowed the Project to experiment with the development of new services eg. children's clubs, Living Away from Home, the Befriending Scheme, the employment scheme. Respite Care also expanded to become a more regularly-provided service. Although the employment scheme and Respite Care were sustained, the other services thus initiated failed to develop as anticipated and were withdrawn, or suspended. Problems arose here due to limitations on resources and the lack of exploration in the planning process of this and other relevant issues eg. the level of demand for a service, the possibility of conflict between pursuing the goal of providing the services parents want and the goal of becoming indispensable to the statutory services.

The advantages that can derive from the lack of systematic monitoring of service delivery by funding bodies need to be set against the disadvantages for service delivery of the lack of effective internal monitoring and self-evaluation, which is
at least partly a consequence of the absence of any external impetus. Among the 'costs' of the lack of systematic internal monitoring are the effects on the morale of staff and users of the early demise of new services; the concealment of need by the subsidizing of Project services through the unrecorded, unpaid efforts of staff; the loss of information on demand for services relevant to bids for further funding; the problems of ensuring continuity of service when there is no record of what a family has actually received.

Without effective monitoring, the pattern of allocation of services is not fully known; families in need may drop out of using services or go unnoticed; implicit, ad hoc rationing systems go unrecognized; information which may be vital to self-evaluation and revision of aims and even to long-term survival, may remain hidden. The opportunity to innovate and develop a range of new services may have enhanced the comprehensive character of the service, and provided more of the services parents wanted, at least in the short-term. However, by the end of the research it had become clear that the official service delivery goals, even assuming sufficient resources, could not begin to be achieved without effective monitoring on the basis of appropriate records and regular, systematic reviews of users' current needs and patterns of service use.

CONCLUSIONS

This discussion of the monitoring process has suggested that an effective basis for monitoring, and therefore for self-evaluation, was slow to develop. This was true at the level of the individual user and at the general level of Project services as a whole. There were issues here of pressures on staffing resources and of the attitude to the need for systematic monitoring, with the roles of the Executive Committee and of the major funding bodies particularly relevant. Self-evaluation was generally informal and impressionistic, as was the programme monitoring undertaken by the joint finance authorities. The emphasis for major statutory funding sources was on fiscal monitoring, with the MSC also interested in employment/training provisions. For much of the research the unmet need for certain services was concealed by the lack of records and the unrecorded overtime worked by members of staff without the knowledge of their employers or managers.
While it may be argued that the lack of programme monitoring required by statutory funders and the piecemeal fiscal monitoring undertaken was beneficial to the Project in certain ways, disadvantages can also be identified. The way services are allocated cannot be fully known, rationing remains implicit, evidence necessary to self-evaluation and possibly vital to bids for future funding is concealed. The extent to which services are subsidized by staff remains hidden. Because voluntary effort is so personal in nature any suggestion that it should be monitored may well be resisted. But as long as such unrecorded subsidizing of the services continues, the real demands for the services, and the extent of deficiencies in the resources provided by funding agencies, will remain concealed. The acceptability of the subsidizing of personal care services by the unpaid, unrecorded efforts of staff will also remain an issue below the surface, never a subject of open discussion for staff, employers or funding agencies.

Changes in practice with regard to monitoring were being introduced by the Project Co-ordinator, as research fieldwork ended, and could not be studied. These included the replacement of Programme Planning by Reviews, the establishment of central records, the use of key-workers, and a new approach to budget control. A notable impetus during 1987 came from the 'Management Review' undertaken by statutory service representatives involved in negotiating future long-term funding for the Project. There were intimations by the statutory service representatives involved that if long-term funding was eventually granted to Beech House, new forms of accountability would be introduced. Conformity with contracts of service would be negotiated, as would participation by statutory service officers in the governance structure of the Project.
CHAPTER 11 - SUMMARY FINDINGS

INTRODUCTION

The aim of this thesis has been to explore the influence of statutory funding on the organizational structure and process of a voluntary service delivery organization created on the strength of short-term statutory funding. Prior to the acquisition of such funding a voluntary Society composed of parents with a mentally handicapped child or adult living at home had provided a newsletter and social and leisure activities for members. Short-term statutory funding allowed the employment of a paid staff to provide in addition a wide range of direct care services and an information/welfare rights service. Thus, the research was not able to compare the provision of Project services under two different funding regimes, for these services had not existed before the acquisition of short-term statutory funding. However, access to the Project and the founding Society for a three-year period did permit an extended study of the ways in which the search for and acquisition of statutory funding exerted influence on organizational structure and on the processes of planning, implementation/service delivery, and monitoring. It was therefore also possible to compare the impact of the two major sources of funding of staff and services, i.e. the Community Programme and joint finance.

THE INFLUENCE OF STATUTORY FUNDING ON ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE

In Chapter 7, the influence of statutory funding on structure of Beech House was considered in terms of three interrelated dimensions of complexity, formalization and centralization. It was hoped this approach would offer more than the generalized picture of structural change in organizations receiving statutory funding which is commonly found in the literature.

Complexity

Regarding complexity, vertical differentiation had not been greatly encouraged by the sources of short-term statutory funding obtained. The Community Programme had funded a manager's post but this had not ensured the recruitment of a manager of the standard acceptable to the Society, and joint finance had refused funding for such a post. The Society Chairman had retained de facto control of
the Project until funds provided by a charity permitted the employment of a 'well-qualified' manager. The arrival of this manager meant another level was created in the hierarchy, in reality if not on paper. It can be argued, though, that this appointment, while not permitted by short-term statutory funding, was influenced to some extent by statutory funding, given the Society's desire to recruit a manager who would develop an image for the Project of professionalism and competence and enhance the chances of obtaining long-term secure funding for the Project from statutory service sources. The influence of statutory funding relevant here therefore relates not to current short-term financial support for the Project but to potential sources of long-term funding.

There was little encouragement from short-term statutory funding for further overall vertical differentiation, given the lack of such funds for the post of deputy manager. The Project Manager chose to give this title and some extra responsibilities to the incumbent of a joint financed supervisor's post, without the permission of the joint finance authorities; a deputizing role vis-a-vis the Project as a whole was only undertaken in the manager's absence, however. The manager's successor dispensed with the position of deputy manager altogether, partly because of her anxiety that this unauthorized arrangement, if it came to the authorities' attention, could jeopardize the chances of obtaining future long-term funding. The MSC rules militated against further overall vertical differentiation by restricting the supervisory responsibilities of the Senior Supervisor of the Community Programme to MSC-funded staff.

In contrast, both joint finance and the MSC contributed to the increase in horizontal differentiation, though the role of the MSC was the more significant. Joint finance, accepting the funding bid proposed by the Society, provided a separate playgroup staff, no longer involved in the provision of other services. It also provided limited administrative and book-keeping support for the joint financed services, though the Society had asked for such support for the Project as a whole. The MSC, in particular, encouraged horizontal differentiation through its flexible policy towards the use of staff to develop new services, changes in job content, and the retention and reallocation of Community Programme posts 'freed' by joint finance, or seen by the managers as no longer fulfilling the needs of the Project, or abolished on the MSC's recommendation because they were difficult to fill. Thus, the increase in horizontal differentiation was not prescribed by the
sources of statutory funding obtained, but resulted from the exercise of choice by those responsible for preparing proposals to the funders.

The resulting introduction of more posts of a complex nature requiring skills rather than routine repetition, did not in this case mean the employment of a professionally qualified staff. The great majority of care staff, for example, were untrained and inexperienced in the field of mental handicap (see Chapter 9). In this sense, there was limited professionalization of staff, though it can be argued that there was professionalization of the tasks required of them.

The need to introduce integrating mechanisms, given the increased horizontal differentiation, can be seen as partly a referred effect of short-term statutory funding. However, the Supervisor's Group, the House Meeting and Programme Planning Meetings, contrary to intentions, did not adequately promote coordination and communication. Staff anxieties on this issue led to the introduction of the Communications Meetings. Eventually, Programme Planning, which had involved relatively few users, was replaced by 'Reviews', on the initiative of the Project Coordinator. Reviews were to be routine for every user, less ambitious in scope than Programme Planning but involving all users in a way Programme Planning had failed to do. A major impetus to the speed of introduction of 'Reviews' was provided by the 'Management Review' of Beech House initiated by statutory service representatives during negotiations on future funding at a time of crisis for the Project in 1987. A similar impetus was effected with regard to the establishment of the central records system, originally intended to underpin Programme Planning, but never fully developed in spite of anxieties expressed by some staff. The Management Review demanded information on service use and service users never previously required of Beech House by either of its major sources of short-term statutory funding. Thus, pressures for increased complexity derived here not from conditions attached to existing short-term funding, but from a process of evaluation set in motion by representatives of potential sources of long-term statutory funding.

**Formalization**

As with complexity, the influence of short-term statutory funding on formalization was also uneven. The formalized procedures relating to the governance of the Project were those which had existed when the Society had provided social and leisure activities for its own members prior to the acquisition of Community
Programme funding. Nor had the acquisition of this statutory funding provided any great impetus to the design of rules and procedures to direct the behaviour of staff on personnel and work-related matters. Twenty months after Beech House opened, the new charity-funded manager began to introduce such rules and procedures where none, or only rudimentary ones, had existed. Prior to this the staff, largely untrained and lacking relevant professional qualifications and experience, had exercised considerable discretion over personnel and work matters. From February 1985 there began the development of personnel records; job descriptions; procedures for the administration of domestic affairs; disciplinary and grievance procedures; budget procedures; drugs administration procedures; procedures for the maintenance of records on service use and service users; formal rules for care practice; a formal, standardized training programme. However, progress was patchy and developments in certain areas slower than in others. The second charity-funded manager pursued these matters, introducing her own changes or pressing for continuation where changes had not been fully implemented. The particular case of the staff training programme provides an example of the inconsistent influences for formalization generated by short-term statutory funding, i.e. a direct requirement by the MSC for the provision of staff training accompanied by regulations which resulted in a predominantly part-time staff difficult to organize for training purposes. Joint finance, also funding services staffed almost wholly by part-timers, a pattern inherited from the Community Programme funding of those services, did not provide for time for staff training. However, the statutory services Management Review of Beech House in 1987 had as a criterion for assessment the provision for staff development.

Evidence of the direct influence of short-term statutory funding on increased formalization can be seen in the MSC's requirement for training. However, prior to the statutory service Management Review of Beech House in 1987 there had been no direct pressure from sources of short-term statutory funding for the establishment of systematic procedures of recording data on service use and service users. The evaluation undertaken in 1987 was not a condition of a current source of short term statutory funding but part of a process of negotiating long-term statutory funding. Additional motivation to increase formalization derived from statutory funding in a less direct way, the result of the desire of the charity-funded managers to project a professional, competent image to both actual and potential funders.
The research showed the lack of a simple direct relationship between short-term statutory funding and increased formalization, while different aspects of formalization had different patterns of development. Initiatives undertaken were not always effectively followed through. The motivation of staff and the time and skills available to devote to such issues were key factors in the development of formalization (see the discussion below on human resources). Also, there were influences on formalization other than statutory funding, for example the concern of certain key members of the paid staff for the quality of service users were receiving. There was a growing awareness that effective service delivery on the scale of Beech House required competent formal organization, for example, systematic review and record-keeping procedures. Thus, by the end of the research, staff delivering services had become more restricted in the exercise of discretion in their work. There were also prospects of further limits on discretion, with staff needing to follow procedures for service allocation which had not previously existed and where some staff had formerly exercised great discretion. It can be argued that, given the scale and nature of the service Beech House aimed to provide, there was insufficient development in certain aspects of formalization, for most of the period of the research, in spite of the statutory funding of the Project since mid-1983.

Centralization
When centralization in terms of control over decision-making was considered, distinctions were drawn between decisions directly affecting work, decisions on personnel issues, and strategic decision-making. Authority for strategic decision-making remained centralized, in the hands of a small group of active members of the Executive. The Executive did not seek to extend opportunities for participation in the exercise of the responsibilities of Project management to users, employees or representatives of statutory funding agencies; nor did those sources of short-term statutory funding require the extension of opportunities for participation. Active participation was confined to the relatively small group of Committee members who regularly attended meetings, while the Chairman on occasion exercised decision-making authority outside the setting of formal meetings, with the apparent acquiescence of other Committee members. The charity-funded manager attended the Executive Committee to provide information, participate in discussion and receive the decisions of the Committee on issues debated. He/she could make proposals, including matters of strategic decision-making, which could be accepted or rejected by the Committee.
Prior to the appointment of the first charity-funded manager, when overall supervision of the Project remained in the hands of the Society Chairman, lack of formalization with regard to personnel issues and service delivery left a largely unqualified and inexperienced staff to exercise considerable discretion on these matters. Also, it can be argued that the relative lack of information on service delivery passing up to the Committee, and the lack of requests from the Committee for this information, in effect encouraged decentralization of decision-making on work-related matters. This prevented the Committee fully understanding the operation of the Project and exercising effective control.

The first charity-funded manager was delegated responsibilities for personnel and service delivery matters, previously the province of the Society Chairman, though the Chairman continued to make decisions on such issues, on occasion. The arrival of the first charity-funded manager also saw the introduction of a range of formalized procedures, though progress was patchy and variable. By the end of the research, the decision-making discretion of non-managerial staff on a range of personnel and work-related issues had thereby been substantially restricted by the establishment of formalized procedures. There was an increased flow upwards of information on service use and service users, essential for effective decision-making by the manager and the Executive Committee.

Short-term statutory funding had exercised only limited direct requirements for the introduction of operating mechanisms which restricted staff decision-making discretion, e.g. the MSC's requirements for staff training. More significant influences seem to have been the desire of managers to persuade potential statutory funding sources of the professionalism and indispensability of Beech House services, and the growing acceptance by staff that some formalized procedures were essential for effective service delivery on the scale permitted by the short-term statutory funding supporting Beech House.

INFLUENCE OF STATUTORY FUNDING ON PROCESS

Planning
The effects of statutory funding on one aspect of the planning process, i.e. the goals pursued by voluntary sector organizations, is a key concern in the literature. Other issues relating to the planning process receive less attention. At Beech
House, the impact of short-term statutory funding on the goals articulated for the Project was not clear cut. The goals set in the initial planning stages, i.e. providing the services parents wanted, creating a comprehensive, integrated service, and obtaining long-term statutory service funding, did not appear to have been modified in the pursuit and receipt of funding from Urban Aid, Urban Policy and the Community Programme. The early plans for the Project, formulated before the applications for short-term statutory funding were made, demonstrate a strong orientation to the delivery of care services. This, it could be argued, was in accord with the orientation of the Community Programme. However, modifications in goals were apparent in relation to the first application for joint finance. The Society's bid for this source of funding was substantially modified after discussions with statutory service representatives. Services/functions which were withdrawn from the bid, or refused funding though included in the bid, mostly continued with the support of funding from other sources, though under conditions felt by the Project and Society to be less than satisfactory. The exception was the counselling and advocacy service. Funding for such provision was not sought again from any source, statutory or voluntary, though other care services were later developed. A limited amount of assistance to families with problems over state benefits continued to be provided by the Project's Community Programme-funded administrative staff. Selective funding of services by joint finance emphasized the delivery of care at Beech House. The goal of providing the services parents wanted was also modified, at least for an extended period, when the statutory service authorities failed to respond to a bid for major funding for a Living Away from Home scheme. Further statutory funding for this service was not sought. Towards the end of the research, members of the Committee began to explore the possibilities of assistance from within the voluntary sector.

In addition to the direct influence on goal-setting of funding bids made, the influence of the existence of potential sources of long-term statutory service funding deserves attention. The possibility of obtaining such long-term funding prompted the setting of the goal of acquiring such funding. The decision was taken to seek to enhance the chances of obtaining long-term funding by becoming indispensable to the local statutory services. Services were developed which served not only individuals and families in the community, but residents in local NHS institutions. Referrals from statutory service practitioners were sought, encouraging a rapid growth in demand for certain services.
Chapter 11 - Summary Findings

The implications of the decision to pursue long-term statutory funding for the achievement of the other goals set for the Project, including those introduced by the first charity-funded manager i.e. normalization and serving individual needs, were not examined in the planning process. The potential for problems in operating with this range of official goals was considered in Chapter 8, with discussion of the clarity, compatibility and acceptability to participants of the goals set for the Project. The possibilities for conflict between the goals of the short-term funding authorities and the goals set for the Project internally were also noted, e.g. the employment objectives of the Community Programme came to be seen as incompatible with the Project's service delivery goals; opposition to the joint finance of the playgroup was voiced by some statutory service representatives. Matters were complicated further by the fact that the respective goals of different funding sources vis-a-vis the Project could also conflict, e.g. disapproval by statutory service representatives of the Community Programme's encouragement for the introduction of personal social services.

Such issues, concerning the setting and content of multiple goals, did not appear to have been anticipated and prepared for in the initial planning stages, while the piecemeal short-term funding of the Project by statutory sources made it difficult for the charity-funded managers to plan ahead for the service as a whole. Issues of the adequacy of the available resources for the goals set for the Project, of policies for implementation and monitoring, and of the design of organizational structure, were also not effectively confronted in the initial planning stages. Associated problems began to surface as the research progressed.

Overall, the research showed a lack of emphasis on planning by the Executive Committee which was not surprising, given the inexperience of members in the management of organizations and the detachment from such matters of the major sources of short-term statutory funding. Given the governance structure of the Project, the funding agencies were not represented at meetings of the Executive Committee, and there were no other formal opportunities for their participation in the planning process on a regular basis. The consequences of this freedom of the Project with regard to planning became apparent as service delivery and monitoring were observed.
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Service Delivery
The examination of the resources available to the Project showed the influence of statutory funding, actual and potential, on both physical and human resources and on the access of users to services.

Physical Resources
The influence of statutory funding on physical resources does not seem to have attracted attention in the literature, in contrast to the consideration paid to the influence of statutory funding on human resources. At Beech House, statutory funding from Urban Aid and the County's Urban Policy Sub-committee had provided accommodation which could be seen as an asset to service delivery in a number of ways, giving a base for the delivery of a wide range of services. However, certain practical limitations were identified which the funding available was insufficient to overcome, e.g. the restrictions placed on the provision of respite care. The funding for building-based services, once achieved, seemed to reinforce the perpetuation of a pattern of service provision which, given the views and experiences of supervisors and users, was not wholly appropriate to the needs of families living at a distance, or to the integration of individuals in their local communities. Concern that the chances of obtaining long-term funding from statutory services should not be jeopardized contributed to differences within and between the Executive Committee and the paid staff in situations where expenditure on physical resources could not be clearly seen as directly benefiting service delivery. There were also worries among staff that the Executive, anxious to gain community support to strengthen the position regarding future statutory service funding, was prepared to accept donations in kind which involved conflict with the principles of normalization. This compliance with a negative image of mental handicap was seen by some staff as compromising the goal of achieving normalization.

Human Resources
The human resources provided by statutory funding could also be seen as assets to the Project, delivering a range of services on a scale which would be beyond the scope of volunteers. The family survey found a high level of satisfaction among the users interviewed. The Community Programme had permitted considerable freedom in the allocation of staff and changes in job content, with no restrictions regarding the clientele served. Thus, this source of funding demonstrated a flexibility not apparent with regard to joint finance, allowing experimentation
with new services. Joint finance, once acquired for the playgroup and Home Care/Sitting-in, offered (in contrast to the Community Programme) freedom of staff recruitment, longer contracts of employment and, in the opinion of staff, encouraged greater confidence in service provision on the part of users.

The influence of potential sources of long-term funding on human resources was seen in the decision of the Executive Committee to appoint a 'well-qualified' manager, to develop a professional image and enhance the reputation of the Project, and take responsibility for obtaining future long-term statutory funding for the Project.

The Project staff overall was largely transitory, part-time, female and lacking professional work experience in the field of mental handicap. The direct influence of Community Programme funding was seen here in the turnover which was imposed, and the dominance of part-time posts as a response to MSC regulations on maximum average weekly wage. However, the experience of Home Care showed joint finance was no guarantee of low staff turnover, and the pattern of part-time staffing originally funded by the Community Programme was automatically transferred on the acquisition of joint finance. The part-time posts attracted married women with domestic responsibilities.

Both sources of short-term statutory funding placed constraints on service delivery by influencing human resources, affecting motivation as well as the time and skills available. Although the staff demonstrated great commitment to service users, problems of motivation arose which could be traced at least partly to statutory funding. Firstly, the Community Programme and joint finance did not provide the Project with long-term financial security, leaving staff uncertain about the future. Those with three-year joint finance posts still did not know what would happen to the Project as a whole. The charity-funded managers had to seek further funding for their own posts as well as for the Project.

Secondly, there were concerns on the part of some staff about their relationships with their employers. The role of employer was one with which the Executive did not appear to come fully to terms during the research, with the charity-funded manager cast as the representative of employees to the Committee and vice-versa. The governance structure provided no opportunities for employee participation; there was no union or staff representation. There was little contact between
employer and employee other than between the Chairman/Executive and manager. There was little evidence that the Executive saw issues of staff morale, welfare, conditions of work etc. as relevant matters for their attention and it was unusual for such issues to be raised by the Committee. The Executive seemed unaware of, or at least to underestimate, the extent to which the complexities of managing the Project were rendered more formidable by the lack of training for managers and supervisors in the management of human resources. The conflicts and tensions within the Project and between the Project staff and their employers were indicated in Chapter 9. On occasion, they were exacerbated by decisions of the Executive which were seen by staff as insensitive and an expression of the detachment of their employers from a concern with the welfare of their employees.

The demands made of the Project staff by their employers were intensified by the freedom allowed by the Community Programme to change the organizational structure e.g. to experiment with new services and change the job-content of posts in mid-contract. The demands this freedom encouraged were difficult to reconcile with those made by professional practitioners for referrals to existing services. Given limited resources, the paid staff were put under pressure by the simultaneous pursuit of the goals of providing the services parents wanted and obtaining long-term funding from statutory services by becoming indispensable to those services.

However, there was no clear-cut contrast in 'organizational cultures' of 'staff' and 'volunteers'. There were differences between staff, and between Committee members, on issues of Project goals and the means to be used to achieve them. There were, for example, staff who identified with the informal, ad hoc practices of allocating services and keeping no central records established in the early days of the Project; they found it difficult to come to terms with the procedures for monitoring, record-keeping, and allocation of services introduced later. The issue of 'decline' in volunteer effort as a result of employing paid staff was similarly blurred by the continued efforts of volunteers to provide leisure activities and the recruitment of many young helpers on holiday playschemes organized by paid staff. These volunteer activities were in contrast to the limited number of Executive Committee members actively involved in the management of the Project and the criticisms of supervisors about the lack of participation of Committee members and Society members in organizing events such as Open Days or social activities/parents evenings. It was felt by supervisors that such activities were too
often left to the initiative of the staff. The response of the volunteer Executive to the appointment of the charity-funded manager was seen by some participants to be a withdrawal from key aspects of Project affairs, leaving members even less well-equipped to exercise their management responsibilities effectively. The distance of the Executive from the Project helped perpetuate the former's lack of understanding of the complexity of the Project and the demands made on management resources. Monitoring of the Project was not pursued in any systematic way. Issues relating to pressure on resources and the allocation of services were often perceived by members in personal terms rather than in terms of the users of services as a whole. As the clientele expanded and referrals of those living alone in the community, without family support, increased, the implications for resources, for service-allocation, and especially for the types of services originally envisaged by the parents, were not fully discussed or appreciated by the Executive. Nor were they raised in discussions between the Committee, their employees and users in general.

A third source of problems of staff motivation was found in staff relationships with managers and supervisors, i.e. concerns over opportunities for communication up and down the hierarchy, the way changes were implemented, the allocation of resources and of services, and the tensions between the Project Manager and the Deputy Manager during the first 17 months of the research. There is a relationship here between motivation and skills. At Beech House, managers with no professional training for that role were left to learn the skills while doing the job, overseen by a management committee similarly lacking in those skills. This situation was accepted by the statutory funding agencies, and implicitly encouraged. Only towards the end of the research were representatives of the joint finance authorities prepared to consider supporting the funding of the manager's post. Without charitable funding the manager's position would not have continued as a Community Programme placement, unlikely to attract a recruit with appropriate experience.

The demand on management skills offers one example of the pressures on the human resources of the Project in terms of the time and skills available. Other examples included the insufficient administrative/clerical support and the problems of reliance on Community Programme staff to deliver care services. The part-time staffing pattern laid down by the Community Programme and the inexperience of many employees created problems of supervision, training and
coordination. Discontinuities in staffing led, on occasion, to temporary or extended suspension of services. Cuts in Community Programme staffing in 1987, due to Government policy, led to the suspension of Adult Daycare until interim emergency statutory service funding was obtained.

Consideration of expressed demand for and supply of services identified Respite Care and Home Care as the two services where resources were clearly outstripped by expressed demand, offering a further example of pressures on staffing. Significant here were past practices and expectations regarding service allocation and quality of service which had developed in the early days of the Project when expressed demand was low.

Given that individual needs are effectively identified, the tailoring of services to meet those needs requires more than the provision of a wide range of services. The relevant services must be available in the amount needed, at the time needed. Problems may therefore arise with regard to the availability of services appropriate to meet the identified needs. If demand for a service exceeds supply, some form of rationing will be inevitable. The lack of explicit policies and procedures to apply in this situation could be traced, at least in part, to the initial funding policy of the MSC and the monitoring of employment and Community Programme finances rather than service delivery. This encouraged the development of ad hoc patterns of service delivery suited to the situation in the first few months of the Project of too many staff for too few customers. The subsequent rapid expansion of clientele, while the Project pursued long-term statutory funding, meant established patterns of service allocation were now operating in a situation where expressed demands could not be met. Staff were presented, for example, with the dilemma that the continued fulfilment of a wide range of one family's needs would mean the non-fulfilment of any need for another. The provision of services to residents in local NHS institutions, and the introduction to the Project of highly dependent people living in the community without family support, meant services were being provided to a clientele not originally envisaged by the parents who had set up Beech House as a 'family' support service. The subsequent pressures on Project services jeopardized the ability of staff to respond to these new demands and at the same time fulfil the expectations of the founder-parents for the services they wanted for themselves. Also the double pressures for regular, consistent, high quality services and flexible, responsive, ad hoc provisions put demands on resources which could not always be
met as, for example, in the cases of Respite Care and Home Care. While a flexible response to the needs of the individuals who obtained these services was possible, there were rigidities in the basis of allocation of the services.

Home Care staff, particularly vulnerable because of the open-ended, domiciliary character of their service, were presented with especially difficult decisions on allocation of services for which they were ill-prepared. The lack of development of Programme Planning and its associated records system also underlines the pressures exerted on staffing, and the way the pursuit of the goals of normalization, serving individual needs and service integration, was jeopardized.

Consideration of the way demand for some Beech House services outstripped supply should not deflect attention from the fact that expression of demand for Project services was muted. Limitations on expressed demand were in evidence. The restricted application of Programme Planning contributed to the confusion and ignorance of parents about the Beech House services. Parents chose to ration their requests for Home Care and Respite Care because of their awareness of the high demand for these services. Some families living at a distance were unable/unwilling to use the building-based services for which funding had been obtained. Joint finance, unlike the Community Programme, directly restricted access by controlling the use of the resources provided. This was done by the imposition of eligibility rules on users of the playgroup and holiday playschemes, restricting the choice available to parents and limiting the achievement of the goal of providing the services patients wanted. The family survey showed the extent of such restrictions on access to services for the families interviewed.

Shortcomings in the planning process with regard to goals, policies for implementation and monitoring, and designing appropriate structures, can be seen to have exacerbated the pressures on Project resources. The lack of planning skills in those responsible for establishing the Project continued to have long-term consequences for Project operation. The resources available proved insufficient to meet the official goals set for the Project. The pursuit of rapid growth in the attempt to become indispensable to statutory services put great pressure on the human resources and jeopardized the attainment of other goals set for the Project. Such problems were not effectively anticipated in the initial planning stages, or acknowledged in the planning process once the Project was established. Lack of planning for effective monitoring and the delays in developments here helped to
conceal the extent to which resources were outstripped by demand and the extent of problems of user access to services.

Rapid growth rendered more intimidating the tasks of establishing a central records system and effective monitoring several years after the Project had opened its doors. The lack of planning for policies and procedures to apply to problems of allocation of scarce services left room for disagreements within the paid staff and between the managers and the Executive Committee on how to deal with related issues.

The implications for service delivery of the detachment of statutory funding sources from Project planning is therefore as deserving of attention, in relation to service delivery, as the way in which statutory funding placed constraints, direct and indirect, on the resources available to the Project and on user access. The two major sources of funding of Project care services, MSC and joint finance, offered insufficient encouragement to the identification of major problems of service delivery and to the acknowledgement of the need to formulate responses, agreed between the staff and the Executive.

Monitoring
The monitoring required by the sources of short-term statutory funding on which Beech House depended was notably limited in scope, with the emphasis on fiscal monitoring.

However, the fiscal monitoring undertaken by the statutory funding authorities was piecemeal in character, no agency being entitled to an overview of the finances of the Project as a whole. While this situation could be said to have given the Project considerable financial privacy, the multiple funding created a situation of considerable complexity, demanding financial management skills which were not available to the Project for most of the period of the research. The extent of the subsidization by the Society of statutory funded services became a matter of concern to the Project Coordinator. She believed this discouraged effective service monitoring and effective budget control, and concealed the extent of underfunding by statutory sources.

The Project's major funding sources did not require systematic monitoring of service delivery, though informal, impressionistic programme monitoring
mechanisms were employed by the joint finance authorities. It is therefore understandable if, for a considerable period, integrating mechanisms essential to such monitoring were slow to develop, e.g. Programme Planning, with Project staff giving low priority to the establishment of central records.

The use by the MSC of employment and finance-related criteria to assess the Project, rather than service delivery criteria, helped to ensure that the management of service delivery, prior to the arrival of the first charity-funded manager and the introduction of joint finance, had been developed on an ad hoc basis by the Chairman and members of the Executive Committee. The practices and expectations established during those initial 20 months by a group of people highly committed to creating services for parents, but with little or no experience in the design and management of organizations, left a legacy which continued to influence the operation of the Project as the research fieldwork ended. By that time the resources of the service were no longer sufficient to meet the demands made upon them. Acknowledgement of this situation by the Society and within the Project was hampered by the lack of programme monitoring. The lack of an appropriate administrative and financial framework, essential to underpin effective monitoring, presented major difficulties to a service where the creation of such a framework was acknowledged to be an imperative only when the organization was long-established.

The adoption by the joint finance authorities of performance criteria apparently confined to an annual financial audit and informal impressions of services funded, was similarly no encouragement to the development of effective overall management within the Project. Particularly notable, is those authorities' lack of interest in the existence of data on service delivery which a central records system would have generated. There was no source of motivation here for an amateur Executive to develop a sustained interest in such matters.

It can be argued that the lack of programme monitoring meant the Project had freedom, through the Community Programme, to experiment and innovate and try out new services where the level of demand was unknown. Home Care, first under the Community Programme and later under joint finance, was allowed the flexibility to develop from a service aimed at providing 'practical help for practical problems' to a source of support for a wide range of other needs, including social, emotional and educational needs. However, the absence of
accountability requirements for the allocation and delivery of services meant that these operations took place in something approaching a policy vacuum. As a result, staff were insufficiently prepared for the inevitability of adopting rationing procedures and denying support to some families, and information crucial to self-evaluation and feedback into planning and service delivery remained hidden.

Pressures for change came externally from the statutory services Management Review in 1987, in relation to negotiations for future long-term statutory service funding for Beech House. However, prior to this there was also pressure for a change of approach to monitoring from some members of staff, especially the Project Coordinator, who had become concerned at the lack of effective monitoring of service delivery. No formal requirements to address this issue were placed upon the Project by current sources of statutory funding. It was the desire to favourably impress future sources of long-term statutory funding which encouraged the rapid development of monitoring in 1987.

Again, as with the discussions on planning and service delivery, there are arguments here for consideration of the influence of statutory funding upon the Project which goes beyond formal accountability and other formal requirements. The implications of lack of accountability to the sources of statutory funding obtained, and of the pursuit of long-term funding from statutory services to replace the existing short-term statutory funding also deserve attention.
CHAPTER 12 - DISCUSSION

The foregoing summary of the research findings has shown the advantages of systematically examining, in a case study of a voluntary service delivery organization, the influence of statutory funding, actual and potential, on different dimensions of organizational structure and on the processes of planning, implementation and monitoring. Such an approach has not featured in the existing literature on statutory funding of the voluntary sector.

THE INFLUENCE OF STATUTORY FUNDING ON ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE AND PROCESS

The Influence of Statutory Funding on Organizational Structure

The consideration of three interrelated dimensions of organizational structure, i.e. complexity, formalization and centralization, highlighted the limitations of much of the available literature, where such dimensions are left implicit, discussion of related issues is often presented under the general heading 'bureaucratization', and terms are not clearly defined.

The benefits of examining dimensions of structure separately were shown by the finding that the influence of statutory funding operated unevenly on complexity, formalization and centralization. With regard to complexity, horizontal differentiation was encouraged, but there was little evidence of pressure or encouragement for vertical differentiation. The research did not support the view of Addy and Scott (1987) for example, that the MSC had encouraged the organization to become dramatically 'more hierarchical', if this is considered in terms of vertical differentiation.

Sources of short-term funding had encouraged horizontal differentiation by responding to the Project's requests for staffing for the proliferating services and for administrative and book-keeping support. The flexibility of the MSC was especially influential. However, the staff supported by these funding sources, while 'professional' in the sense that they were paid for their services, often lacked relevant professional qualifications, though the tasks many staff were required to perform could be described as professional, as they were non-routine and requiring particular skills. The Society and the Project sought to promote a 'professional' image, though, not least through the employment of a 'well-qualified' manager on
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the basis of charitable funding; statutory funds to support this appointment were not available. The appointment was seen as enhancing the chances of obtaining long-term statutory service funding. However, the managers appointed both lacked professional qualifications in management. Thus, while, the influence of the general trend to professionalization in the fields where voluntary agencies operate (Salamon, 1987) was apparent, professionalization in terms of a staff with relevant qualifications was relatively undeveloped at Beech House, despite the statutory funding obtained. There was little evidence of the extent of the professionalization and specialization of administrative tasks feared by Rosenbaum (1981) as a response to the 'enormous administrative burden' of applying for and accounting for government funds. This burden seemed to be largely carried by the charity-funded managers, inexperienced in financial management and with no access to relevant professional expertise in either the Project or Society for most of the period of the research. There was support in this issue for those commentators who observe insufficient professionalization in the voluntary sector (Salamon, 1987; Kramer, 1981, 1987), including the tendency to appoint managers lacking a professional management background (Young, 1987; Leat, Smolka and Unell, 1981). Their views contrast with those who observe and regret an increase in professionalization related to statutory funding. Unfortunately, discussion of this issues is complicated by the failure of some commentators to clearly define the term 'professionalization', for example, Kramer (1981), Addy and Scott (1987) and Knapp et al. (1988).

The need for integrating mechanisms, due to increased horizontal differentiation, was not effectively met for much of the period of the research, in spite of statutory funding. The Project delivered a range of care services on a considerable scale, operating on short-term statutory funds for four years, with only rudimentary development of mechanisms for service integration such as review procedures and central records. While staff concern on these issues was mounting and changes were being introduced in 1986/87, it was the influence of sources of long-term future funding rather than current funding which provided the motivation for the speed of change observed in 1987. There is support in these findings for those who argue that voluntary organizations are insufficiently 'bureaucratized' (Hartogs and Weber, 1978; Kramer, 1981, 1987; Salamon, 1987). Hadley et al. (1975), in their study of Task Force, described how little information on service provision was collected/recorded and no methods of accessing the relative needs of clients employed, a situation very similar to that of Beech House.
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The present research has shown the importance of distinguishing different aspects of complexity when considering the views expressed in the literature on increased bureaucratization, professionalization and specialization (Kramer, 1987; Addy and Scott, 1987; Rosenbaum, 1981; Knapp et al., 1988; Salamon, 1987).

Certain aspects of formalization were established more quickly than others, in response to the influence of statutory funding, e.g. certain personnel procedures considerably pre-dated the establishment of systematic record keeping on service use and service users. The consideration of formalization showed the operation within a single dimension of conflicting pressures exerted by a source of short-term statutory funding, given the inconsistency of the influences of MSC funding on staff training provisions.

Again, there was support here for those who argue that there may be insufficient 'bureaucratization' of voluntary organizations, at least in terms of the formalization of procedures required for the effective delivery of services on any scale (Hartogs and Weber, 1978; Abrams, 1981). Van de Yen (1980) advocates early formalization of procedures as a means of decreasing problems at the implementation stage. It is interesting that at Beech House, low formalization in various aspects of operations was associated not with highly skilled, trained employees, but with lack of training and experience, contrary to the prescription offered by Hendrick (1987).

Statutory funding sources exerted inconsistent influences with regard to centralization; here, some restriction on staff decision-making discretion derived from the MSC's requirements for staff training, yet the lack of interest in data on service use and service users shown by statutory funders and the Project's management committee encouraged decentralized decision-making on such service delivery issues as the allocation of services, for much of the research.

Thus, the picture which emerges of the influence of statutory funding on the control of decision-making in the Project is not wholly consistent with the predictions in the literature, of manager-dominated organizations, out of the control of their management committees as a consequence of MSC funding (Addy and Scott, 1987; Wright et al., 1985). Following the employment of a 'professional manager', the initiatives taken by this appointee and his successor with regard to formalization brought increased centralization, restricting the decision-making...
discretion of non-managerial staff on personnel and service-delivery matters and increasing the flow of information to the Executive Committee. For some years there had been a lack of information available to the Committee on service use and service users. The Committee had exhibited a disinterest in such matters which reflected the lack of concern about the generation of such data on the part of short-term statutory funding sources. The growing awareness on the part of some key members of staff of the need for certain types of formalization to ensure effective service delivery, together with the Management Review of 1987, brought a change of approach within the Project.

Authority for strategic decision-making remained centralized at the level of the Executive Committee. Contrary to the predictions of Handy (1988) there was as yet no evidence of the development of stakeholder democracy at Beech House. The active participation in governance of few Committee members, and the relatively unchanged composition of this group over several years, conforms with the views commonly expressed in the literature. While this pattern was not created by statutory funding, it seems likely that statutory funding helped perpetuate it, for there was no requirement for an extension of participation in governance. It is doubtful if there had been any need for the statutory funding agencies to require a hierarchical governance structure as a condition of funding, contrary to the views of Knapp et al. (1988). The hierarchical governance structure of the Project, while it may have been in tune with the views of the short-term statutory funding authorities, had its origins in the governance structure of the founding Society. The acquisition of funding merely extended the range of services overseen by the Executive Committee.

Overall, the examination of the influence of statutory funding on organizational structure found a lack of any simple, direct relationship between the funding obtained and complexity, formalization and centralization. This finding is in marked contrast to the generalization commonly offered in the literature. The influence of statutory funding within a single dimension of structure could be uneven, even contradictory. To say the organization became more 'bureaucratized' or more complex/formalized/centralized as a result of receiving short-term statutory funding would be a gross over-simplification. The direct influence on organizational structure of statutory funding received, in terms of formal requirement for structural change, were very limited. The considerable freedom allowed the Project on these matters was noteworthy e.g. with regard to Project
governance, and operating mechanisms. There was, however, considerable encouragement for increased complexity, given the availability of funding for the increased specialization and horizontal differentiation sought by the Project. Perhaps more generally influential was the possibility of obtaining long-term statutory funding, since decisions were eventually taken on major changes in organizational structure which were designed to enhance the chances of obtaining long-term funding from statutory services e.g. the rapid introduction of Reviews replacing Programme Planning, the establishment and maintenance of central records. This showed the impact on organizational structure of seeking, and not merely obtaining, statutory funding, a distinction not always apparent in the literature. Even without this pressure there was a developing awareness on the part of staff of the need for such structural change, an acceptance that effective service delivery on the scale made possible by short-term statutory funding required formalization of procedures, although such procedures were not a requirement of the short-term statutory funding received.

The Influence of Statutory Funding on Process

The examination of planning, implementation and monitoring in relation to statutory funding focused on aspects of process neglected in the literature. Study of the planning process allowed consideration not only of the extent to which goals set for the Project were influenced by funding bids made, an issue prominent in the literature, but also of other aspects of planning which have attracted less attention than those of the selection and displacement of project goals.

Some modifications in plans for services were observed in relation to joint finance, i.e. the disappearance of ambitions for an advocacy and counselling service. This offers an example of the tendency described by Kramer (1981) for voluntary agencies to be deflected from an advocacy role by involvement in service provision on the basis of statutory funding. It may also be seen as support for the arguments of those who predict a decline in the advocacy role of statutory funded voluntary organizations because of government reluctance to fund such activities, for example, Knapp et al. (1988), Manser (1972 and 1974). The strong commitment to service delivery which the Society articulated, prior to seeking statutory funding for the proposed Project, may well have been seen by the MSC as very much in accord with its own orientation (Hartley-Brewer, 1985) and offering no reason for the MSC to require the modification in goals observed elsewhere by critics of the Community Programme.
The formulation of the goal of obtaining long-term statutory funding proved particularly influential on Project activities, given the implications of the pursuit of this goal for the achievement of other official goals identified for the Project. The decision to seek to become indispensable to statutory services as a means of enhancing the chances of obtaining such funding encouraged the rapid expansion of demand for some services and jeopardized the achievement of other goals set for the Project. The comments of Leat, Smolka and Unell (1981) seem relevant here, identifying the possibility of over-anxiety to produce tangible short-term outcomes in the first year of grant aid, as a basis for subsequent funding. Van de Ven (1980) argues that beginning on a small-scale basis gives the opportunity to evaluate, modify or improve the design of a new programme. At Beech House, a slow start in terms of customer response seemed to be an embarrassment to be quickly remedied. It was not seen as an opportunity for establishing a sound administrative infrastructure for service delivery. The situation at Beech House has similarities to that described by Pettigrew (1975) with regard to the setting up of specialist units in commercial firms.

The lack of attention in the planning process to the confusions and conflicts which might attend the pursuit of multiple goals was notable; other issues not effectively confronted concerned the adequacy of the resources provided for the goals espoused, policies for implementation and monitoring, and the design of organizational structure.

The lack of planning skills on the part of the Executive Committee was apparent and might have been anticipated by the funding agencies concerned. These agencies did not require formal opportunities for their own participation in the planning process on a regular basis, giving the Project great freedom on planning. While some studies have provided valuable insights on such planning issues (Hadley et al., 1975; Van de Ven, 1980), the research suggests these issues deserve more attention than they have yet been accorded in the literature.

The discussion of implementation/service delivery considered the influence of statutory funding obtained on the access of users to services and on the available physical and human resources. However, as with organizational structure and planning, it proved impossible to ignore the influence of potential sources of statutory funding. The focus on physical resources, a topic which excites little
comment in the literature compared with that devoted to human resources, proved illuminating. The research identified a number of influences of statutory funding, actual and potential, on physical resources. There was some support for those commentators who see funding as a force for modification of goals in the recipient voluntary agencies (e.g. Berg and Wright, 1980; Addy and Scott, 1987; Harris and Billis, 1986); one cost of community support in the fight for long-term statutory funding was the acceptance from the community of gifts in kind which promoted a negative image of mental handicap. The influence of statutory funding here was indirect and, ironically, involved a source of support i.e. the community, which is usually seen as protecting the 'independence' of the voluntary agency. Perhaps the most significant influence of statutory funding in relation to physical resources was the way in which the funding for a particular pattern of use of accommodation, once achieved, reinforced the continuation of a form of service provision which could be seen as not wholly appropriate to users' needs. This is understandable, when expensive accommodation has been funded for which building-based services were the justification.

A similar tendency to perpetuate resource patterns previously funded was also seen with regard to human resources, where the pattern of largely part-time employment imposed by the MSC was later perpetuated on the transfer of services to joint finance. The examination of staffing patterns showed the MSC allowed the Project a flexibility regarding the use of staff and changes in job-content which is not generally emphasized in the literature. This gave the Project a freedom to experiment with new services which the many critics of the Community Programme do not lead the reader to expect.

In conformity with much of the comment on human resources in the literature, staff motivation appeared to be adversely affected by the financial insecurity of the Project, by the relationships with managers and supervisors and by the relationship with their employers. The findings on this latter issue were in accordance with the possibilities for strains in this relationship identified by a number of commentators on the Community Programme in particular (e.g. Jordan, 1987; Addy and Scott, 1987; Heginbotham, 1986) and by commentators on the voluntary sector in general (e.g. Wooller, 1988; Harris and Billis, 1986; Kramer, 1981 and 1987). However, there was evidence of great commitment to users on the part of staff, with Community Programme employees expressing positive views of their placements in spite of the problems they experienced. Maguire (1986)
identified this as a dilemma for critics of the Community Programme. The lack of management skills on the part of volunteer management committee members, given responsibility by funding bodies for administering grant aid, an issue frequently found in the literature, was apparent at Beech House. The reluctance to spend money on improving staff conditions rather than on direct service, noted by Heginbotham (1986) and Young (1987), was also in evidence. Heginbotham's general observation that management committees may fail to recognize their responsibilities as employers also received some confirmation.

Given the tensions and anxieties identified by staff, the assertion by Butler and Wilson (1990) that the question of motivating staff in voluntary agencies is largely irrelevant seems, at the very least, over-optimistic. However, contrary to the predictions of some commentators, there was no clear-cut conflict of the 'organizational cultures' of 'paid staff' and 'volunteers'. The issue of the effects of statutory funding on volunteer activity required for its consideration distinctions between the different types of volunteer effort observed (compare Richardson and Goodman, 1983, and Leat et al., 1986), showing the dangers of generalizing about 'volunteers', an issue not emphasized in the literature.

The examination of human resources in relation to service delivery identified examples of skill shortages and discontinuities in staffing, as frequently found in the literature on Community Programme funding of voluntary agencies. The problems arising from the MSC recruitment regulations were apparent. It was also noteworthy that the Project Co-ordinator's decision not to appoint an official deputy manager, in spite of the shortage of skills at this level, was related to a desire not to jeopardize the chances of future long-term funding. For the same reason, the Society would not broach the issue of insufficient administrative support to the joint finance authorities.

Beech House provided an example of the tendency noted in the literature (Young, 1987; Leat, Smolka and Unell, 1981) for management committees to appoint as paid managers people with no formal management training. Addy and Scott (1987) are critical of the application of 'corporate management techniques' to non-statutory welfare organizations, and the displacement of local volunteers by those with professional skills which they observed in MSC schemes. However, at Beech House, the introduction of paid staff through the Community Programme did not bring professional management skills to the Project, nor had the acquisition of short-term
statutory funding from this and other sources created an environment conducive to an appreciation of the nature of the management skills the Project required.

The reluctance of voluntary organizations to accept the concept of 'management' and the need for management training was stressed by the report of the Charles Handy Working Party (1981), published shortly before the development of the Beech House initiative. The mistrust of 'professional management' methods apparent among both members of the Executive and members of staff, the tendency to see 'administration' as something which detracts from 'caring' rather than supporting/enabling it, is understandable given the history of Beech House. The hostility of parents to the state bureaucracies they felt had failed drastically to meet their needs was the source of the motivation which had led to the creation of the Project in 1982/83. The belief among both Executive Committee members and staff that Beech House should be 'different from statutory services' was very powerful.

The study of human resources also permitted close observation of the pressures on staff and the effects on service delivery where demand outstripped resources, e.g. in Respite Care and Home Care; such an approach has so far been the exception in the literature where the implications for users of the statutory funding of voluntary services have been speculated upon rather than studied. The rapid growth in expressed demand, encouraged by the pursuit of the goal of obtaining long-term secure statutory funding, jeopardized the achievement of other goals set for the Project. At the same time the statutory funding obtained restricted the expression of demand for services. For example, there were various limitations on user access to services, e.g. the direct controls on eligibility. This is an example of the emphasis placed by Salamon (1987) on the regulatory conditions that can attach to statutory funding. The statutory funding received via joint finance for the playgroup had a referred effect on other services; the stipulation that the playgroup be a year-round provision meant that in the summer holidays the playscheme could only run on three days a week and the normal adult daycare service was disrupted. The lack of sufficient staffing and accommodation meant the access of users to these two service was restricted for the summer holiday period. Access to services was also limited by the considerable confusion and ignorance on the part of parents regarding Project services, attributable at least partly to the pressures on staffing.
Thus the research permitted a detailed exploration of the relationship between expressed demand and the resources made available by statutory funding, and showed how shortcomings in the planning process aggravated the situation where expressed demand for services exceeded supply.

These findings reinforce those of Van de Ven (1980). Staff at all levels experienced avoidable tensions, stress and misdirection as a result of inadequate prior planning and the employment of managers without appropriate training and experience by a management committee also lacking in management skills. Services satisfactory to users may be provided in these situations, but at great personal cost to members of the paid staff. As Miles (1980) has argued, the personal and social costs of ill-advised or improperly managed organizational creations, transformations and terminations can be extremely high.

Finally, consideration of the monitoring process showed that the statutory funders largely restricted their requirements to fiscal monitoring, as many commentators have argued (for example, Normington et al., 1986; Leat et al., 1986; Hartogs and Weber, 1978). This monitoring was piecemeal in nature, no single funder being entitled to an overview of Project finances. The Project Co-ordinator came to feel that the extent of subsidization of statutory funding by the Society concealed the extent of underfunding by statutory services and discouraged effective service monitoring and effective budget control. Her view was reminiscent of the conclusions of Hartogs and Weber (1978) and Brilliant (1973) on the financial management of voluntary organizations in the U.S.A.

The Project's multiple funding was complex (Heginbotham, 1986; Billis, 1984; Knapp et al., 1988). The situation demanded financial management skills which neither joint finance nor the Community Programme had required of the Society, or of the managers recruited. Joint finance had provided for limited administrative and book-keeping support but this was intended to assist the playgroup and Home Care/Sitting-in, not the Project as a whole. Even when long-term statutory service funding for the care services was being negotiated in 1987, the bulk of administrative support was to remain the responsibility of Community Programme staff, with all the attendant problems of recruitment and turnover.

The Urban Policy grant carried no requirement for programme monitoring. The MSC did monitor employment and training practices regarding Community
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Programme staff, but there was a marked lack of interest in formal programme monitoring; the joint finance authorities did, however, use informal and impressionistic methods to monitor and evaluate service delivery. This echoes the findings of Hatch and Mocroft (1983) and Hadley et al. (1975). The lack of interest in monitoring and evaluation on the part of the Executive Committee at Beech House accords with the views expressed by Hatch (1980), Hatch and Mocroft (1983) and Leat et al. (1986) regarding the lack of interest in monitoring their own performance which they observed in voluntary organizations. Only with the statutory services' Management Review of Beech House in 1987 came direct pressure, albeit from a source of potential long-term statutory funding, for systematic monitoring as a basis for evaluation and a source of feedback into planning and service delivery. Till then, the lack of influence of statutory funding on programme monitoring was remarkable, and the research showed that the influence of this freedom from accountability on the organization's structure, planning and implementation was as deserving of attention as any constraints exercised by statutory funding. Hadley et al. (1975) suggested that the 'fairly informal and undemanding relationship' they observed between the local authorities and Task Force had 'probably' influenced the managerial process and priorities within the latter. The Beech House research showed that the lack of programme monitoring and evaluation by the major sources of short-term statutory funding was undoubtedly a major influence on the management of the Project. A concern with the issue of equity in service provision had developed within the Project, but this had come with only minimal demands for accountability from the sources of short-term statutory funding obtained by the Project. The growing awareness of the issue on the part of staff came with experience of delivering services on the scale permitted by the funding obtained.

Overall, therefore, the examination of the influence of statutory funding on process has shown the relatively limited extent of direct formal constraints (i.e. formal accountability requirements and other formal restrictions) applied by the sources of statutory funding obtained by Beech House. However, the research showed the importance of examining the formal restrictions applied by the statutory funding bodies, and not merely formal accountability, though it is the influence of the latter which is emphasized in the general literature. There was a greater degree of formal restriction on service delivery, compared with planning and monitoring. This was seen, for example, in the restrictions on staff recruitment operated by the MSC, in the eligibility rules imposed by the joint
finance authorities on the playgroup and holiday playschemes, and the problems of supervision due to the MSC rule that the Community Programme Senior Supervisor should not supervise non-MSC staff. In addition to formal constraints, other influences of statutory funding obtained were identified in relation to process, of a type not discussed in the literature, and unlikely to be observed other than by a long-term case study of this nature. For example, the decisions by Urban Aid and the County’s Urban Policy Sub-committee to fund the acquisition and running costs of accommodation for building-based services helped perpetuate this pattern of service provision. As with the discussion of organizational structure above, the influence on process not merely of short-term statutory funding obtained but also of long-term statutory funding sought, was striking.

The Comparison of the Community Programme and Joint Finance
The systematic examination of structure and process in relation to statutory funding also made possible the close comparison of the influence on the Project of two sources of statutory funding, i.e. the Community Programme and joint finance. This again showed the dangers of generalizing about the impact of statutory funding on the voluntary sector, and the need to look closely at the particular arrangements associated with each source of funding, as indicated by Leat, Smolka and Unell (1981) and Berg and Wright (1980). For example, there were differing impacts on organizational structure; while neither source of short-term funding provided much direct encouragement for vertical differentiation, the Community Programme encouraged another aspect of complexity, i.e. horizontal differentiation, to a greater extent than joint finance. The Community Programme also exerted more pressure than joint finance for formalization in terms of provision for staff training and thereby on centralization in terms of reduced staff decision-making discretion. With regard to planning, the orientation of the Project to service delivery appeared unchanged by seeking and acquiring Community Programme funding. There was modification of goals, however, in response to the rejection by joint finance of a bid for funding for an advocacy and counselling service.

Joint finance also seemed more restrictive with regard to service delivery, for example, approval of funding of a building-based playgroup to facilitate the work of the county’s peripatetic teachers helped perpetuate this form of provision rather than encouraging discussion on whether domiciliary services to families might be more appropriate. Also, joint finance for Home Care was extended on the existing terms without consultation with the Project on the possibilities of change in
provision. Joint finance put direct restrictions on the clientele to be served, in the form of eligibility rules. The Community Programme applied no such rules on clientele and was flexible on changes in job content and in the services provided, permitting experimentation in a way not apparent under joint finance. The Community Programme, unlike joint finance, did put restrictions on staff recruitment. Joint finance offered staff more security, in the form of longer contracts, but made no provision for training, unlike the Community Programme. Finally, although neither source of short-term statutory funding exhibited much interest in programme monitoring, the joint finance authorities did at least use some informal, impressionistic approaches to such monitoring.

Different Forms of Influence of Statutory Funding Obtained

The research showed that the sources of short-term funding could exert both direct formal constraints and indirect or referred influences upon the Project. The imposition of eligibility rules by joint finance, for example, and of restrictions on staff recruitment and retention by the Community Programme, can both be seen as direct formal constraints upon the Project. The problems for the Project of coordinating, supervising and training a largely part-time workforce are referred influences of funding by the Community Programme and joint finance, with the pattern of part-time employment resulting from the MSC's limits on funding of placements inherited, apparently without question, by joint finance. The demands for financial management skills arising from the complex system of multiple funding are similarly attributable to the referred influences of statutory funding obtained. The initial funding of building-based services helped perpetuate that pattern of service provision even though it was perhaps not wholly appropriate to users' needs; while it can be argued that joint finance had a direct requirement that the playgroup be building-based, the same is not true of the Community Programme funded services.

The drawing of such distinctions in forms of influence of statutory funding is an aid to clarity, where the focus in the existing literature is upon what is influenced, and discussion tends to refer generally to 'government' or 'statutory' funding, avoiding the complications which may arise from the examination of different types of such funding and different forms of influence. To focus, when exploring the influence of statutory funding on voluntary agencies, simply on the direct effects of formal accountability and formal restrictions would give only a partial picture.
The Influence of Potential Sources of Long-Term Statutory Funding

The research also clearly demonstrated the need to identify and distinguish from current funding the influence upon the voluntary organization of potential sources of future funding. The research showed that the decision to pursue long-term statutory funding was a major influence upon the Project. Decisions were taken, affecting structure and process, which were designed to enhance the chances of obtaining this funding. For example, the appointment of a 'well-qualified' manager; the impetus to the development of 'Reviews' and of central records on service use and service users; the opting for rapid expansion in the attempt to become an indispensable resource for local statutory services; the Project Coordinator’s decision to dispense with the position of deputy manager; the Society’s decision not to seek further funding from joint finance for a service which had proved underfunded in relation to demand; the acceptance of support from the community, in cash and kind, which reinforced a negative image of mental handicap.

While the displacement of goals in the search for future funding is a prominent theme in the literature, and one which the research findings to some extent support, this research has also shown the value of exploring the influence of the availability of future funding on other aspects of planning, on service delivery and monitoring, and on organizational structure. The issue of the influence of potential statutory funding on the decisions made on structure and process has not been dealt with in the literature in any detailed, systematic way.

The Influence on Structure and Process of the Freedom from Formal Constraint Allowed by Statutory Funding Obtained

The research has also been able to highlight the consequences for structure and process of the considerable freedom allowed to the Project by its current sources of short-term statutory funding. The financial accountability required in a situation of multiple funding meant that this freedom was seen by some in the Society and the Project as an advantage bestowing a desirable flexibility in the use of funding, but the Project Co-ordinator felt the situation did not encourage effective budget control or effective service monitoring. The detachment of funding agencies from planning, and the lack of formal requirements for programme monitoring, had major implications for structure and service delivery. The lack of formalization and integrating mechanisms, permitted to an amateur management by the statutory
funding authorities in the Project's early days, had consequences for the structure and process of the Project years afterwards. The insights thus permitted by studying the history of the Project and its development over three years accord with the arguments of Dunkerley (1988), Van de Ven (1980), Pettigrew (1979), Kramer (1987) and Kimberley and Miles (1980).

A wide range of services was developed, expanding rapidly after a slow start, and serving a large area. The Community Programme operated with a flexibility encouraging experimentation in service provision. However, freedom from constraint did not mean freedom from problems. The funding authorities accorded low priority to the Project's management needs and to the monitoring of service quality; there was an absence of explicit rationing criteria, and a level of resources inadequate for the goals set for the Project. There were no requirements by the funding bodies for an extension of participation in governance to users, employers or representatives of the funding bodies themselves. This permitted the continuation of a governance structure which offered no formal opportunities for these groups to participate in decision-making on organizational structure, planning service delivery and monitoring. The exclusion of users here may have contributed to parents' lack of information on Project services.

The Influence of Seeking and Obtaining Statutory Funding on the 'Independence' of the Project

The foregoing discussion has shown the 'independence' of the Project curtailed in a number of ways, given the influence on organizational structure and on the processes of planning, implementation/service delivery, and monitoring of both obtaining short-term funding and seeking long-term funding from statutory service sources.

However, formal accountability, as many commentators have suggested, has played a relatively limited role in directly curtailing independence; fiscal accountability, albeit piecemeal, was emphasized, with employment and training criteria applied by the Community Programme; formal, systematic procedures for programme monitoring were absent.

The fiscal accountability required nevertheless permitted the Project to retain a considerable degree of financial privacy. It is interesting that the long-term policy of the Project was not to preserve or enhance diversification of funding in order
to perpetuate this privacy, but to seek total dependence on one source of statutory funding. This was seen as a guarantee of long-term security. This finding offers an interesting contrast to Saxon-Harrold's conclusion that the two 'case studies' she considered wanted to reduce their dependence on statutory funding sources (Saxon-Harrold, 1986). Diversification of funding sources is commonly regarded as a protection from loss of independence (for example, Saxon-Harrold, 1986; Knapp et al., 1988; Wolfenden, 1987; Butler and Wilson, 1990). However, the degree of protection it affords is arguable, where an organization insecurely financed by short-term statutory funding chooses to pursue long-term continuation funding from a single statutory source, and orients its operations accordingly.

As Kramer (1981) and Salamon (1987) have suggested, the application by the statutory funding authorities of formal restrictions and not only formal accountability influenced the Project's activities. Current sources of short-term funding influenced the Project by the application of such formal restrictions as eligibility rules and regulations on staff recruitment and retention.

The formal restrictions applied affected service delivery to a greater extent that planning and monitoring, hampering the achievement of service delivery goals, particularly through the enforcement of eligibility rules. With regard to both formal accountability and formal restrictions the freedom permitted to the Project by its two main sources of statutory funding was notable, however. The freedom which Beech House had enjoyed was not wholly beneficial to service delivery, indeed major problems were observed which could be traced to the lack of effective planning and monitoring.

The lack of encouragement from the major statutory funding agencies to tackle the planning and monitoring processes effectively left unresolved many issues relating to the underlying 'second-level problems' of values, relationships, goals, decisions and people emphasized in the Handy Report (Handy, 1981). This created opportunities for tensions and conflict within the paid staff and between the staff and their employers. It also helped perpetuate confusion about the Project's relationship with its statutory funding agencies. There is confirmation here for the view of Leat et al. (1986) that lack of clarity about what can be controlled and specified is as threatening to independence as the application by the funding agency of detailed specifications and controls.
A number of difficulties experienced by the Beech House Project and identified during the course of this research were rooted in the policies, practices and attitudes of funding bodies at least as much as in those of the Project and the founding Society. For example, funding bodies neglected to insist from the outset that the Project secure appropriate management skills or develop effective management systems relating to issues as fundamental as finance, personnel and user records. Indeed, the joint finance authorities specifically excluded support for a senior management post on the grounds that their resources should be concentrated on direct services - as if the two items were somehow wholly independent of each other. Similarly, neither the joint finance authorities nor the MSC required the Project to institute formal monitoring of service delivery. Indeed, formal monitoring requirements were very largely confined to matters of financial accountability. Systems for ensuring quality were at no stage insisted upon.

The consequence of these limitations was that there were few external incentives for the Project's management committee to accord such matters high priority, confirming that what Hadley et al. (1975) described as the 'undemanding relationship' with funders had major consequences for the management of the Project. This was a particularly serious weakness in a context where paid and lay managers lacked professional management expertise and could find it difficult to raise their sights beyond the Project's month-by-month survival. At the same time, however, the committee received little guidance about the expectations of funding bodies on a wide range of service delivery issues, a situation partly explained by the absence of a joint strategy in the county for developing local services for people with a mental handicap. Consequently, both the committee and its paid staff were effectively operating in a policy vacuum which they could attempt to fill only with their best guess about what would be most likely to impress the statutory authorities and, thereby, help to ensure long-term funding.

Given the absence of any clear criteria by which the statutory services would judge Beech House, the Executive Committee and Project staff had to make assumptions about what measures of assessment might be used. The choice was made to achieve indispensability to the statutory services, encouraging referrals from professional practitioners, leading to greatly increased demands on certain areas of Project resources and jeopardizing the achievement of other Project goals. There is confirmation here for the view of Leat (1986) that problems can
accompany lack of accountability, with low or variable standards, gaps and inequities in provision the price of maintaining the relative independence of the voluntary sector. Nor did community support in cash and kind bestow 'independence' on the Project, given the need for political support in the community during funding crises and negotiations for long-term statutory service funding. Thus, the lack of accountability in terms of programme monitoring offered a spurious 'freedom' from control by the funding authorities, given the Project goal of obtaining long-term secure funding from the statutory services.

The findings of this research therefore conflict with the argument of Kramer (1981) that low levels of accountability to government funders mitigate any substantial challenge to the freedom of the voluntary agency. The lack of programme monitoring left a vacuum which, given the Project's aspirations regarding long-term statutory funding, was filled by participants' assumptions about what would impress potential funders, with major consequences for organizational structure and service delivery. To this can be added the limited but nevertheless significant formal restrictions exercised by the sources of statutory funding obtained, and the referred influences of current statutory funding discussed above.

That the situation of Beech House vis-a-vis statutory funding sources might change dramatically was indicated during the Management Review of 1987. The nature of this exercise was a marked contrast to the approach hitherto adopted by the Project's current sources of statutory funding. Requirements for information on service delivery encouraged the rapid development within the Project of records on service use and service users, a major extension of Reviews to all users and the introduction of other methods of monitoring service delivery and the use of resources. There were suggestions that, if achieved, long-term statutory service funding would bring with it a contractual relationship, demands for greater accountability in terms of programme monitoring, and the participation of statutory service representatives in decision-making.

The full implications for the Beech House Project of an almost total financial dependence on statutory providers of health and social services remain to be seen. However, it is perhaps appropriate to conclude this discussion of the influence of statutory funding on the Project's 'independence', with a speculation as to how far
total dependence on statutory service funding will be conducive to changes in service provision in response to future changes in need.

The funding of Beech House services as separate entities, with their own staff groups, and especially the funding of the playgroup by the Education Department rather than by Social Services, raises questions of the ability of the Project as a whole to respond to experience and changing circumstances by re-allocating resources between services or altering the nature of a particular service being provided. Should it be decided, for example, that a domiciliary, Portage-type service to very young children and their parents would be more appropriate in some cases than attendance at the playgroup, will the statutory funding of that service be sufficiently flexible to permit the use of playgroup staff in such a way? If demand for one service is such that it appears to be over-resourced, would the conventions of statutory funding with its pattern of departmentalization, allow resources to be re-allocated to another service under pressure? Due to the piecemeal transfer of services from MSC funding to joint finance, a staffing pattern was created of almost wholly part-time workers arranged in separate service groups. It is not necessarily the pattern which would be deemed most appropriate if the service was to be reviewed and funded as a coordinated whole. Such an opportunity for overall review could ensure that any inflexibilities derived from the funding policies and mechanisms to date are not automatically transferred and perpetuated by the pattern of funding of the Project in the future. As voluntary sector services initiated under short-term funding schemes achieve funding from other statutory sources, to allow their continuation on a long-term basis, there is an argument for the use of a critical review to ensure that avoidable problems deriving from earlier patterns of short-term funding are not inherited and perpetuated.

Finally, this thesis has shown the benefits of using a long-term case study to explore the influence of statutory funding on a voluntary sector service delivery organization founded on the strength of short-term statutory funding. The opportunity to study the history of the Project and observe at first-hand its development over a period of three years has shown the extent of the changes experienced by the Project in this time and how decisions on structure and process were influenced by sources of statutory funding, actual and potential. Practices and expectations with regard to service delivery which were established when the Project began proved to remain highly influential several years later when
resources were no longer adequate for the demands being made upon them. The effects over time on organizational structure, on planning, monitoring and service delivery, of the Project's undemanding relationship with its sources of short-term statutory funding were striking. However, the implications of statutory funding for structure and process were such that it was impossible to sustain Kramer's (1981) argument that lack of formal accountability to statutory funders ensures the independence of voluntary sector recipients.

ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION BY FUNDING BODIES AND VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS

Discussions with other research workers evaluating recent initiatives in care services in both statutory and voluntary settings have made clear that problems in setting up new services which were observed during the research are not unique to Beech House. For example, problems in establishing and maintaining the records systems essential to effective monitoring of new initiatives are not uncommon. Staff may not have the time or the skills to devote to this task, once pre-occupied with service delivery, and may not accept that records systems have any role to play. One research worker, speaking at a seminar at the Policy Studies Institute in June 1987, related how staff of a voluntary agency being studied had asserted "We only have to keep records because of the research". However, if voluntary sector agencies are to become involved on any scale in providing personal care services, the consequences of the insistence that 'records don't matter' for service delivery, for monitoring and self-evaluation, are all too apparent. Such attitudes of staff to record-keeping will not be discouraged when their employers are unaware of them, or even share them, and where agencies providing short-term finance do not require systematic procedures for monitoring and self-evaluation aimed at assessing the pattern of allocation of services and their impact on users.

The management problems relating to the Beech House Home Care service are echoed in the account of the problems and achievements of the Community Care Worker (CCW) service of the Cardiff NIMROD project as described by Lowe, de Paiva and Humphreys (1987). This presents a number of parallels with the Beech

1The issues for discussion with which this section is concluded are based on a series of recommendations included in the final report of the 'Beech House' research, following discussions on the findings of that research with Mr Gerald Wistow, the research director.
House Home Care service, even though the NIMROD scheme was a statutory-funded initiative, part of the 'All Wales Strategy'. The nature of the relationship between the CCW and the family is a case in point:-

"Some families can become very dependent on individual CCWs and are loathe to agree to the service being withdrawn even though it might appear to have outlived its usefulness. This is one result of offering the CCW service to all families regardless of need for an indefinite period. That is, the service is not offered for a specific purpose over a specified period of time. Naturally enough the initial intensity of CCW contact with families sets a precedent from which it is difficult to withdraw... the Service must address the issue of the appropriateness of paid staff becoming involved in personal family relationships..." (Low, de Paiva and Humphreys, 1987, Part 2, p.8).

They also note the way in which a service can conceal the short-falls in other services, such as provision for day-time activity, and the dilemma this poses for a service which:-

"... on one hand wishes to provide a service to clients, but which also wishes to highlight service deficiencies for future service planning" (Low, de Paiva and Humphreys, 1987, Part 2, p.22).

The authors go on to emphasize the crucial role of training for a group of workers operating independently of a staff base, and the need for continued support and advice, not only from line managers but from their peer groups and from specialist personnel. The reasons why similar problems in the operation of a domiciliary service should appear in both the voluntary and statutory sectors, and whether there are any dissimilarities, would require a comparative study of a type not possible in this research project. The tendency of domiciliary workers to 'exploit' themselves is not confined to voluntary care services, therefore, but may be seen as a likely accompaniment to the development of a more flexible domiciliary care service responsive to individual need. As such, it needs to be anticipated in training procedures and in the development of operational guidelines.

The expansion of voluntary sector, not-for-profit service provision, together with increased private provision, advocated in the White Paper 'Caring for People' (1989), carries with it the requirement for monitoring and evaluation of contracted services by local authority social services departments, cast in an enabling rather than a service-providing role. It is expected that public funding agencies will develop an increasingly contractual role with the voluntary bodies they fund. With local authorities given the duty of encouraging the development of community care
services by the voluntary sector, the prospect is raised of many more voluntary organizations moving into service delivery on the basis of statutory funding. At the same time the White Paper 'Charities - A Framework for the Future' (1989) seeks to ensure that government grants are given for 'properly defined purposes' with funds being 'effectively and efficiently deployed'. This accords with the predictions of Leat (1986), Holroyd (1988), Groves and Mellett (1988) and Gutch and Young (1988), anticipating closer accountability of voluntary agencies to their statutory funding sources with development of the contractual relationship.

More research on the impact of statutory funding on the recipient voluntary service delivery organizations, comparable to the Beech House research, could be illuminating and very relevant to the implementation of Government policy on community care and the future funding of the voluntary sector. It would be useful to consider, for example, whether organizations with similar funding patterns to that of Beech House, but which through history or by co-optation had access to professional expertise, show different patterns of development. Comparison with voluntary service organizations which have sought to avoid total dependence on statutory funding by diversifying their funding sources could also be enlightening, given the decision at Beech House to seek total dependence on statutory funding and the implications of this decision for service delivery.

In conclusion, the finding that neither the sources of short-term statutory funding nor the Project's management committee promoted effective management is particularly significant in the context of Griffiths' (1988) recommendations for strengthening the management of community care and expanding the scale of non-statutory provision. The continued provision of services by Beech House staff, through many crises and despite tension, conflict and perpetual insecurity, is indicative of management effectiveness in certain crucial respects. This has been achieved, however, in a funding environment not conducive to the development of the management skills appropriate to the service delivery goals pursued, and at the cost of the effects on individual staff members of seeking to fulfil the often great demands made upon them. For all its success in establishing an extended range of services, the experience of the Beech House Project suggests the need for careful consideration of the conditions under which Griffiths' twin objectives might be simultaneously realized. This thesis ends, therefore, by identifying a number of issues for consideration by funding bodies and voluntary organizations, which have been drawn out of the Beech House research. They may achieve a wider
significance with the implementation of the proposals of the Government White Papers 'Caring for People' (1989) and 'Charities - A Framework for the Future' (1989). They are presented bearing in mind the need expressed by Leat (1986)

"... to clarify the conditions under which voluntary organizations may ensure maximum autonomy consistent with equity in provision and public accountability."

Issues for Consideration by Funding Bodies

i) All parties should recognize the legitimacy of, and necessity for, adequately funding the management function; it should be viewed as an integral element in the delivery of high-quality services and not as a luxury which reduces the resources available for direct service provision.

ii) Appropriate management consultancy skills could be made available to voluntary bodies entering the business of service delivery. Such consultancy would assist them in:

a) initial preparation and submission of funding bids, covering such issues as the nature of appropriate management structures and skills; the interdependence of such matters with the delivery of high quality services; safeguarding quality through monitoring and evaluation; the recruitment of management personnel; their relationship to - and the proper role of - management committees;

b) subsequent organizational and management development to enable a more effective response by projects to operational pressures as they emerge from internal and external sources.

iii) The availability of appropriate consultancy skills may be insufficient motivation to voluntary organizations to accept the need for them. It may be that funding agencies should insist on their use as a condition of obtaining funding, as the MSC (now the Training Agency) did in the development of the Open Tech (1983/84).

(iv) Funding for such consultancy services would need to be identified separately. Voluntary organizations beginning to adopt a service delivery role may be unable
to purchase them from within their own resources, unlike the major voluntary organizations.

v) To assist the acceptability and credibility of those consultancy services, consideration should be given to locating them within the voluntary sector, perhaps as a core element of a newly-defined post-Griffiths role for intermediary agencies (such as Councils for Voluntary Service).

vi) Wherever such a service is located, it would need to incorporate substantial experience of the voluntary sector and be sensitive to the needs to user groups with limited expertise in, or understanding of, the development and organization of service delivery systems. Consultants with only industrial and commercial experience would probably not be perceived as being able to provide an appropriate service, though the appearance of advertisements in the press and in voluntary organizations' mail suggests that the voluntary sector is increasingly seen as an attractive market for consultancy.

vii) Funding bodies need an awareness of the dangers of encouraging new service delivery organizations to be over-ambitious and develop too quickly. A period of controlled development could be beneficial during which there is an open acknowledgement by all parties that systems are being bedded down and will be reviewed for their appropriateness to management and service delivery tasks. This is, perhaps, analogous to the commissioning period of a new industrial venture. New organizations should not be placed - however unintentionally - in situations where they perceive their long-term funding to be dependent on the over-rapid expansion of their clientele or where they are unable to be open about their difficulties and seek assistance from appropriate bodies. Such understandings should be built into formally agreed accountability procedures from the outset.

Issues for Consideration by Service Delivery Organizations in the Voluntary Sector

i) User groups, perhaps most particularly, need to accept from the start the importance of management skills and structures as necessary underpinnings of the high quality services they are seeking to establish. Provision for monitoring and evaluation should be agreed. Past experience of apparently inflexible statutory services and their perceived "unnecessary bureaucracy" means that this can be a difficult message to promote. The initiators of services in the voluntary sector may need to be convinced, therefore, that what they require is not necessarily less
organization but more effective organization than their statutory counterparts. Indeed, the creation of more flexible services attuned to individual needs is managerially more demanding than the delivery of a limited repertoire of routinized provision.

ii) Management committees need to be prepared for the necessity of tailoring goals to available resources through the introduction of allocation criteria (rationing) and/or the modification of goals. The inevitability of needs exceeding resources must be understood from the outset so that appropriate policies can be developed and staff and users prepared to meet this situation. This is likely to be a major area for organizational development and consultancy.

iii) Management committees need guidance on the performance of the employer's role. They, themselves, as well as the managers and supervisors they appoint, will require skills in "people management". Advice is likely to be especially necessary on establishing appropriate patterns of employer-employee relations.

iv) The danger of staff "exploitation" needs to be anticipated and appropriate policies designed. The ethos of work in a voluntary organization may lead management committees to expect too much of staff and lead staff to expect too much of themselves. As a result, staff may slide into working unpaid, unrecorded overtime due to their personal commitment to users. Domiciliary staff are particularly vulnerable in this respect. Staff training should prepare all staff for such pressures and continuing support should be provided to help resist them. Project managers are also under very substantial pressure and likely to become over-committed. Management committees should monitor their workloads and provide appropriate support for what may be an isolated and isolating role. The organization of a network for information exchange between managers in different voluntary sector projects could offer a valuable source of support. Funding bodies might usefully consider sponsoring the establishment of such a network.

v) Lay management committees must recognize that they are not the only voice of the user and that a more broadly-based expression of users' experience must be actively sought out. Users need to be encouraged to break the "grateful silence" and provide critical assessment of the service they are using.
vi) Similarly, management committees, which are necessarily made up of activists, need to recognize the reluctance of many users to ask for services. In such circumstances, staff also need to be trained to help parents accept services without the latter experiencing a loss of independence and self-respect. In addition, staff and management committees should give high priority to establishing the most effective methods of publicizing available services; this research encountered considerable ignorance and misinformation among users, notwithstanding the Project's being a parent-led initiative.

vii) Management committees need to be aware that funding arrangements can create organizational inflexibilities, for example the creation of separate staff groups and organizational forms for individually funded services which allow few possibilities for adjusting the allocation of resources to changes in demand. The achievement of long-term funding may reinforce such unnecessary rigidities unless the opportunity is taken to rationalize structures and staffing patterns.

viii) The initiation of services provided by the voluntary sector may tend to conceal deficiencies in statutory provision. Voluntary organizations need to maintain a clear view of the totality of the services they aim to see provided as well as of the parameters of their own direct contribution to the system of care.
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APPENDIX 1 - PARENTS INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Name of parents: Date:
Address:

SPF: Yes/No

BACKGROUND DETAILS OF CHILD/CHILDREN

1. D.O.B.
2. M/F
3. Siblings living at home
4. Does X live at home?
   If Yes
   Does X currently attend (specify where appropriate)
   Playgroup
   Special school
   Ordinary school
   Day centre
   In employment (establish whether sheltered or open)
   Other
   If No
   Where does X live (specify)
   How often at home?

5. Do you receive/have you received any (other) services from the health authority or the council because X has a mental handicap eg. respite care, holidays, support in your home?

Do you use/have you used any other local voluntary service because X has a mental handicap? (eg. Handicapped Group, leisure activities).

6. Would you mind telling me if you receive any type of financial benefit on his/her/their behalf (I'm not asking about the amount).

   Mobility Allowance
   Attendance Allowance (establish whether higher or lower rate)
   Severe Disablement Allowance
   Supplementary Benefit
   Invalid Care Allowance
   Other (specify)
FIRST CONTACT WITH BEECH HOUSE AND SERVICE USE

7. How were you first introduced to Beech House?

8. Do you know which organization runs Beech House?

9. Are you members of the Society?
Since when?

10. Which Beech House services have you and X used?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Date of first use</th>
<th>Date ceased use</th>
<th>Pattern of use</th>
<th>Reason for ceasing use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting-in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respite Care (w/e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respite Care (holiday)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer playscheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easter playscheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgroup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents evenings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information &amp; Welfare Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional services eg. Care days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-11 Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday PM Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Befriending Scheme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday PM Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Taking each service used in turn

Name of service:

(i) How did you approach this particular service?
(eg. directly, via an outside agent such as a social worker, through one Beech House service approaching another service on your behalf?)

(ii) What have been the benefits for you of using this Beech House service? For example, do you have any particular problems in caring for X which have been eased by using this service?

(iii) What have been the benefits for X of using this service?
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(iv) Have you or X experienced any problems/anxieties over the quality of this service? (eg. staff attitudes, nature of activities).

(v) Have you or X experienced any problems over the availability of this service? Here, I am thinking of:

Were you able to have this service when you asked for it?

Were you able to have as much as you asked for?

Have you ever been refused this service? If so, when was this, what reason was given and how acceptable did you find the reason?

Have you ever been offered a different service to the one you asked for eg. Sitting-in instead of Home Care? Was this acceptable?

(vi) (Where appropriate) Do you feel free to approach Beech House as often as you would like, to request this service or do you 'ration' yourselves? If the latter, can you say why you feel this way?

(vii) (Where appropriate) Are you aware of any changes in this service since you first started using it? If so, what are they and are they for better or for worse?

(viii) Have you ever experienced any mistakes/confusion in the way this service is delivered eg. requests for assistance receiving no response, transport not turning up, staff not arriving or coming at the wrong time, any instances of the left hand not knowing what the right hand is doing, any instances of poor communication between Beech House staff?

(ix) Considering the Beech House services you have used are there any improvements you would like to see introduced?

(x) Do you know if there is a statutory service similar to this Beech House service?

If No

So was/is this Beech House service used because, as far as you know, nothing similar is provided by the statutory social services?

If Yes

Have you ever used it? (get details)
Have you tried to obtain it and been refused? (get details)

So have you used this Beech House service because, although a similar statutory social service exists you were refused it?

Have you chosen to use this Beech House service because you prefer it to this similar statutory service? (say why)

Have you used this Beech House service as well as using this similar statutory service? (say why)

(xi) Are you aware of any other local voluntary service similar to this Beech House service?

If Yes

Have you ever used it (get details)

Have you tried to obtain it and been refused? (get details)

So, have you used this Beech House service because you were refused this other voluntary service?

Have you used this other voluntary service because you prefer it? (say why)

Have you used this other voluntary service as well as the Beech House Service? (say why)

GENERAL IMPACT ON X AND THE FAMILY

12. Can you imagine how you would have been coping by now if the services provided by Beech House were not available?

13. Are there problems you experience in caring for X with which Beech House has not been able to help at all? Is there any new service which you would like to see introduced by Beech House to help with these problems?

14. Are there any services provided by Beech House which you feel you do not wish to use? Can you say why?

15. Do you anticipate that in the future you might need to use another Beech House service/services which you haven't yet used?

16. Do you anticipate that in the future you might need to make more use of a Beech House service you are using at the moment?
17. Do you feel there are rewards for you in caring for eg. do you get satisfaction from knowing you are able to make him/ her/them happy or comfortable or from seeing the development of a new skill?

Is it possible for you to say whether these satisfactions have increased since you and X began to use the Beech House services?

18. Have you experienced any new problems in caring for which you feel might be due to the use of the Beech House service? If so, can you describe them and how you cope with them? Do you feel they are outweighed by the benefit you and X receive from the Beech House service?

OPPORTUNITIES FOR INVOLVEMENT/COMMUNICATION

19. Are there enough opportunities for you to talk to Beech House staff about the service(s) you and X receive?

20. If you had any criticisms or worries for suggestions for changes would you feel able to express them to the staff. Have you ever done this?

If Yes were you happy with the response?

21. Are there enough opportunities for parents generally to meet staff and express their views about Beech House and the service provided?

If No What opportunities would you like to see made available?

22. Are there enough opportunities for the mentally handicapped people themselves to express their views about the services they use?

If No What opportunities would you like to see made available?

23. Do you feel you have as much contact as you want with other families who use Beech House?

What sort of contact would you like?

24. Do you feel you have as much contact as you want with (other members of) the Society?

How could this be changed?
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25. If you had any worries about the Beech House services, would you approach the Society?

If No: Can you say why?

If Yes: How would you go about this? (Have you ever done this? Were you satisfied with the response)?

General Evaluation

26. If 'Founder-user' of Beech House:

When Beech House opened, what did you hope it would provide?

(a) For you and X in particular

(b) For other families with a mentally handicapped member in general

27. How far have your expectations been fulfilled?

Have you been disappointed in any way with what Beech House has provided so far?

Have your expectations been exceeded in any way?

For All Users

28. Can you remember what your feelings were about the statutory services at the time Beech House opened / when you first used Beech House?

29. What are your feelings about the statutory services today? Have you seen any improvements in statutory services in the period since Beech House opened / since you first used Beech House?

If Yes: Can you say what they are? What might be the reasons for these improvements?

30. Are there any other changes you would like to see made at Beech House that we have not discussed already? For example, changes in the way it is staffed or managed or funded, any services that you do not need yourself but which might be useful to other families?

31. Does it make any difference if a service is provided by the statutory social services or by a voluntary organization eg. if you were told that (name the services they have used) would in future be provided by the statutory services and not by Beech House, what would your feelings be? (Stress the Playscheme and Information Service if possible)
32. Looking back over the last (choose an appropriate period, depending on when they first used Beech House) do you feel the quality of your life as a carer has been improved in any way, has it declined in any way, or have things stayed much the same?

If there have been changes, what are the reasons for them?

33. Looking back over the same period, do you feel the quality of X's life has been improved in any way, has it declined in any way, or have things stayed much the same?

If there have been changes, what are the reasons for them?

34. Is there anything at all you would like to add which we haven't covered already?

(Postscript: how well informed did interviewee seem to be about the range and nature of the Beech House services)
EXAMPLE OF INTERVIEW SCHEDULE USED WITH INFORMED OBSERVER

1. When did he first become aware of Beech House? Was he aware of the views of other services at that time?

2. Involvement in the initial decision to grant joint-funding to the Beech House playgroup. What part did he see Beech House playing in the total network of special education provision? Is the policy vis-a-vis the School working? What other similar provision is available in the County for young mentally handicapped children?

3. Involvement in the decision to review the playgroup; joint funding.

4. Criteria used in deciding on continuation of funding. Does any regular system of monitoring exist?

5. How long have you attended the Policy Group and does it serve any useful purpose?

6. The role of the professional Project Manager. Aware of any changes at Beech House attributable to this appointment? Aware of any changes; attributable to the new occupant, in the views of colleagues, other services?

7. Aware of any weaknesses in the organization. Has the change of Project Manager affected peoples' views?

8. Does he see a long-term future for Beech House?
EXAMPLE OF INTERVIEW SCHEDULE USED WITH STAFF MEMBER

22nd January, 198

1. Check hours of work
   NB. Are fund-raising activities like the Christmas Fayre classed as work or own time?

2. Can she recall what the original job description was? What has the content of the job turned out to be.
   How has her job changed over the year?
   Could she outline a 'typical week' and how does she go about arranging a care weekend?

   What contacts with parents and does she get feedback from them?
   Does she get praise/criticism re. Respite Care provisions?

3. Resources: does she feel she has the resources required to do the job effectively? (budget, equipment, staff, accommodation)
   NB. the lighting for the drive.

   Has she ever had to turn down requests for Respite Care?

4. Contacts between her and Respite Care staff

5. Contacts between her and other Beech House staff and services:–
   (i) Management
   (ii) Other services i.e. Common Resources Group
       Under-Fives
       Activities Co-ordinator
       Home Care
       Day Care
       Living Away from Home
       Horticulture and House Management
   (iii) Leisure services: Youth Club, Saturday Club, Disco

   How effective is communication between her and other Beech House services?
   any examples of overlap/duplication?

6. Contact between her and outside agencies.
   e.g. statutory services, voluntary organisations. Are they helpful and cooperative. Has anything changed over the year.

7. The relationship between the paid staff on the Project and the Society and the Executive.
   How does she see this relationship - how satisfactory is it?
   Are there sufficient opportunities for staff to meet the Executive, express their views to the Executive?

8. Are there sufficient opportunities for staff to express their views within the Project, to management?
   NB. The cleaning issue. Any other similar issues.
   Does she agree with argument that people who work for a voluntary organisation should expect to be involved in activities over and above what they are employed to do?

9. Are there enough opportunities for parents to be involved in Beech House - parents of users, not just Society members?
10. How has being on an MSC programme influenced her and how have parents reacted to her departure?

11. Has she noted any changes taking place at Brack House over the year, e.g., service provided, place to work, which could be attributed to professional management? (NB. she was not here before X)

12. Has she experienced any difficulties/problems in doing the job, which have not been mentioned.
APPENDIX II : THE DEMAND FOR HOME CARE AND RESPITE CARE

(a) The Demand for and use of Home Care

The Home Care Assistants offered a wide range of services at any time in the week, including evenings and overnight. Transport, domestic tasks, gardening, shopping, help with hospital visits, outings, and physical care of the mentally handicapped person, were among the types of assistance provided. The service was used not only by families with a mentally handicapped member, but by individuals with a mental handicap living alone in the community. The increase in referrals from the statutory services introduced such users to Beech House; Home Care staff became involved in teaching domestic and social and personal hygiene skills to mentally handicapped people left alone after the death or incapacity of a carer. Statutory service workers also introduced to the Home Care service families in which not only the children but the parents themselves had learning difficulties, with Home Care staff called on to assist with a wide range of situations, including, for example, mediating in family quarrels. Home Care staff took responsibility for helping the parents as well as the children, in the care of the house, budgeting, washing, cooking, dealing with correspondence, officialdom, health and legal matters. The time-consuming nature of such work is easily imagined. When the Living Away from Home worker and her clients moved into the Home Care service in March 1986, such pressures intensified.

Referrals for Home Care came from parents, the statutory services and also other Beech House supervisors. Requests were made for assistance with transport by the supervisors of Adult Daycare and the pre-school playgroup, encouraged by the mobility of the Home Care staff, almost all of whom had cars. In addition, Home Care staff were sometimes asked to make early calls to help prepare a mentally handicapped person for departure for daycare at Beech House. As the Adult Daycare and playgroup services also increasingly received referrals from professionals, staff encountered families or individuals who could benefit from Home Care and would request help from the latter service on behalf of these users.

Thus, demands on Home Care began to multiply, and by April 1986 it was being acknowledged within the Project that the Home Care service could no longer meet the demands being made upon it. Most of the Home Care staff had accumulated in their work records large numbers of excess hours worked (over 50 hours, in some cases) through consistently working more hours than their official average of 19 a week. Even so, all the requests for help could still not be met; there were cases of staff working unpaid, unrecorded overtime in order to fulfil the needs of service users. Regular commitments were absorbing so many 'Home Care hours' that requests for 'one-off' occasional assistance might have to be refused, not only requests for longer-term commitment.

At an Executive Meeting in May 1986, a Home Care supervisor attended to present a report and answer questions. She explained, in response to a query, that increasingly of late, Home Care was having to say "No". Staff were having to look at their regular commitments, perhaps only offer help one morning a week instead of two, cut out weekend outings, ask themselves if spending an extra half-hour talking to parents was really necessary. So far, however, no records of unmet need had been kept. In discussion, the possibilities of using sitters-in and volunteers for childminding and outings was raised, as was the potential of the proposed Befriending Service for easing the pressure on Home Care. The Project Manager afterwards suggested that mothers who used the free Home Care provision for childcare to enable them to go out to work should be asked to pay for Sitting-in instead. This was done, but seemed to affect only a small number of families. At a Management Panel a few days later, the matter surfaced again. The Society Chairman felt Home Care had reached a watershed which was full of dangers.
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The Executive needed to be kept informed so that parents who complained at the refusal of a service could be told that the Executive had been consulted on this issue by the Beech House staff. A record should be kept of all the requests for help which had to be denied. However, the research worker was not aware of the introduction of any systematic approach to the recording of unmet need for Home Care or any other service as an immediate consequence of these discussions. About two months later, following discussions on records with the research worker, the new Project Co-ordinator instituted an 'Unmet Needs Books' (see Appendix VI).

The high demand for Home Care and the extent to which families and individuals had unmet needs for this service remained key issues for the final year of fieldwork. The Project Coordinator, by 1987, was concerned to establish the precise working patterns of Home Care and to identify the allocation of service resources and the way 'rationing' was taking place.

The figures on service use presented to Society meetings etc. were often in the form of a running total of families/individuals using Home Care since it began, rather than separate yearly figures. Thus, towards the end of 1985, two years after the service started, 66 different families/individuals were described as having been helped by Home Care Assistants, while a year later the figure had increased to 84. However, this running total gave no indication of the number of current users or of the number who had ceased to use the service.

The Home Care supervisors kept private records, which were not available in the central files. The format for these records changed during the research, such that the figures for 1986 were not comparable with those for 1987.

When the researcher studied the Home Care records in December 1986, weekly figures were kept on the number of families helped, the number of staff hours worked and the number of home visits made by the organizers, together with details of training undertaken. Unfortunately, the records for 1986 referred only to the period January to June, due to the six-month backlog of administration which existed in the Home Care service at that time. These figures on service use are presented in Table AII:1.

Table AII:1 shows the fluctuation in the pattern of use of Home Care from week to week and from month to month. However, problems arise in seeking to draw conclusions from these figures about the variation in expressed demand for this service. The number of days available for work differs according to the calendar month. Allowance also has to be made both for staff shortages and for the allocation of staff hours to activities other than direct contact with families i.e. not only to training, but to time off in lieu, holidays, sickness, meetings at Beech House. Nor do the figures in Table AII:2 give any indication of the extent to which the resources of Home Care may be concentrated on certain users i.e. whether there was considerable customer turnover or whether the same families were benefiting each week. Without such information, figures of this type are of limited value as a tool for monitoring service delivery.

In 1987, the format of Home Care records was changed. The supervisors devised three categories of patterns of use of the service.

- Category (1): Families using the service weekly
- Category (2): Families using the service regularly but not weekly
- Category (3): Occasional users i.e. less than monthly

Each month, the names of users in each category were listed. Although it was impossible to undertake further detailed work on the Beech House records after December 1986, the research worker was given, in June 1987, the new forms for Home Care records for January to April and the figures derived therefrom are presented in Table AII:3. They show a variation in the number of users within each category, from month to month. However, the overall total remained the same.
### Table AII:1 Use of Home Care Service January - June 1986

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Week</th>
<th>No/families and individuals</th>
<th>No/hours worked</th>
<th>No/home visits made by supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21)</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>Total 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>pw 21</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>Total 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>137.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>pw 24.50</td>
<td>117.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Total 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>110.75</td>
<td>Total 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>120.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>pw 19.4</td>
<td>96.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>Total 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Total 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>123.75</td>
<td>Total 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>pw 21.75</td>
<td>109.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>131.75</td>
<td>Total 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>106.50</td>
<td>Total 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>115.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>pw 20</td>
<td>103.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Total 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Total 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>108.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>pw 19.4</td>
<td>151.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>141.75</td>
<td>Total 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Total 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table AII:2 Use of Home Care January - April 1987

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY OF USE</th>
<th>JANUARY</th>
<th>FEBRUARY</th>
<th>MARCH</th>
<th>APRIL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Weekly</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Regularly but not weekly</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Occasional i.e. less than monthly</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no/users</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total no/hours spent with families/individuals</td>
<td>338.75</td>
<td>502.25</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>418.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home visits made by organizers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
until April when the increase in Category (3), the occasional users, can perhaps be accounted for by the additional needs experienced by some families over the Easter holidays. There was considerable variation in the number of hours worked each month, however, as was also shown in Table AII:1.

In other respects the two Tables AII:1 and AII:2 are not comparable as the new forms give the number of different families/individuals receiving help each month, while the previous forms gave the number of users helped each week regardless of whether the same families/individuals were involved, thus rendering any monthly total meaningless.

Space was allocated on the new forms to record hours spent on training, holidays, sick leave and help in Beech House. However, in spite of the changes in the format for record-keeping, important information was still subsumed within the figures. The new records did not show which families were using Home Care more than once a week, nor did they indicate the amount of staff time each user was receiving. As had been the case in the past, this information did exist but was lodged elsewhere, in the personal work records of the Home Care Assistants and in the central files on families and individuals, where these existed. Considerable research would be required to extract this information in order to create a composite picture of the use of the Home Care service.

While the names of the users were listed each month, this new approach did not relate one month to another and it was not easily apparent, on scanning long lists of names, to identify those users who received help every month, those who had moved from one category of use to another, which users had received most of the Home Care resources and which the least, during the four month period. Even the total number of different users over the period was concealed.

To investigate these issues, the names of all the families using Home Care, during the period January - April 1987, were analysed in terms of the patterns of use adopted.

The total number of different users who received help at least once during the period was identified as 62.

There was only a limited degree of overlap in pattern of use i.e. 48 families/individuals out of the 62, when they made use of Home Care, were always allocated to the same category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category (1) only</th>
<th>Category (2) only</th>
<th>Category (3) only</th>
<th>Categories (1) and (2)</th>
<th>Categories (1) and (3)</th>
<th>Categories (2) and (3)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of users, therefore, were consistent in their pattern of use of Home Care. However, some families used Home Care every week of the four month period, while for other users there were months when their names did not appear at all. In an attempt to obtain some guide to the allocation of Home Care resources, the overall patterns of use adopted by each of the 62 families/individuals were scrutinized. The results are shown in Table AII:3.

A total of 17 different users had some help from Home Care in every one of the four months considered. A core of 7 families/individuals had help every week during those four months, while a further 3 had help every week for three months, with some help in the remaining month though not on a weekly basis. At the other end of the continuum are the 16 families/individuals who had help in only one month out of the four, 14 of these being occasional users. It is a reasonable assumption that the users in Group A were receiving more of the resources of the
### Table AII:3 Frequency of adoption of the various categories of pattern of use of Home Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern of use of Home Care (actual)</th>
<th>No/families or individuals adopting this pattern of use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A Every month</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 x (1)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 x (1) and 1 x (2)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x (1) and 3 x (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 x (2) and 1 x (3)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 x (2)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B Three months out of four</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 x (1)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 x (1) and 1 x (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 x (1) and 1 x (3)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 x (2)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x (2) and 2 x (3)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C Two months out of four</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x (1) and 1 x (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x (2) and 1 x (3)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 x (2)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 x (3)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D One month out of four</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 x (3)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total no/different families/individuals</strong></td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Category (1) Weekly
(2) Regular but not weekly
(3) Occasional i.e. less than monthly
Home Care service than the users in Group D, the groups being very similar in size. It is harder to make judgements about comparisons with the remaining groups B and C. Are the people receiving help on a weekly basis for three out of the four months receiving more or less of the service's resources than those receiving help every month on a regular though not weekly basis? Clearly, the information available through the new forms would need to be combined with information on the number of hours help received by each family/individual each month, before any such assessments of actual resource allocation could be made. It was not possible for the research worker to undertake this task in the time remaining for fieldwork.

The way in which fluctuations in the use of Home Care over time affected the staff of the service can be seen in Table AII:4. The information in this table was obtained in December 1986 and applies to the period from January to the first week in November, complete data not being available after that point. Table AII:4 shows the extent to which the staff could quickly build up excess hours through working unpaid overtime. Although Home Care Assistants were officially employed for 19 hours per week and the two supervisors for 18.5 hours a week, staff could work fewer hours than this, on occasion, while at other times the official maximum would be greatly exceeded. These figures offer a more vivid picture of the fluctuating demand for Home Care than the other data referred to so far, though it should be borne in mind that the members of staff were not equally able to work hours far in excess of those in their contracts. Also, the figures in Table AII:4 only refer to the working hours reported by staff-members, and formally recorded. Some members of the Home Care staff worked additional hours on a voluntary basis which went unrecorded.

The extent to which excess hours could quickly accumulate is shown in the case of Home Care worker C, who over a three month period worked so many extra hours she was owed over four weeks time off in lieu by the beginning of November. Other cases eg B, G, H, N, O, suggest that once accumulated, considerable numbers of excess hours could be difficult to eradicate and were often carried for months. Some workers eg. A and K, did not seem to build up high amounts of excess time worked, but this could be as much a reflection of their ability/willingness to work hours far beyond those specified in their contracts as of the needs of their particular customers.

Staff comments indicated the pressure to work overtime, recorded and unrecorded: "I choose to work some hours and not claim for them. We are told 'keep the chatting down' but it's a worthwhile part of the job... I don't have to stay and chat. If I do stay, it's my choice". - and, from another member of the Home Care staff: "Nineteen hours a week are not enough really. When we started, X said it was not going to be like the professionals, just in and out. In the beginning it was great, you could spend loads of time with a family. Recently, there has been pressure because of excess hours. It in and out, it is getting too slick, just what Home Care was trying to avoid in the first place..... There is more demand now. We really need two or three more Home Care Assistants. I am owed over 50 hours at the moment". This member of staff also regularly worked some hours without claiming payment - "I sometimes feel mercenary, thinking 'I'm not getting paid for this'".

The pattern of working hours of Home Care staff during 1986 suggests an imbalance, with the demands made on the Home Care service at times greatly exceeding the staffing resources officially available. It suggests the possibility of a degree of 'unmet need' for this service, which is impossible to quantify, but which could be at least partially explored in interviews with families.

Where staff share the desires of parents to provide services which are different from statutory services, the latter being perceived as impersonal and inflexible, there is great pressure to be flexible and responsive and to develop close personal therefrom for both parties. The dilemma, then, is whether training for
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table A11:4 Home Care, Workers Hours 1966</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>HOME CARE STAFF</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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staff which helps to protect them from the intensity which can characterize such relationships would jeopardise the provision of a service parents would value? Is it acceptable for a voluntary organization to rely on this sort of commitment from staff in order to produce the sort of service parents want, or is it exploitation of staff who feel such a sense of personal obligation to their customers?

Overall, the allocation of Home Care resources to users had become a problematic area, with the service needing to respond to direct expressions of demand from both carers and individuals living in the community with no family support, as well as to the requests of outside statutory service professionals and the supervisors of other services within Beech House who had identified users of their services as being in need of Home Care help. At the same time, staff had developed their own expectations of what the service should provide for the needs of families/individuals. A number of families had standing arrangements with Home Care. However the development of such regular commitments restricted the opportunities to allocate resources flexibly on an ad hoc, irregular basis.

(b) The Demand for and Use of Respite Care

Demand had notably increased by mid-1986. In January, 1986, there was no 'waiting list', although sometimes a particular weekend might already be fully booked so that an alternative date had to be offered. By June, 1986, there was a waiting list of about twenty individuals and there were discussions among the staff about the possibility of increasing the number of weekends available.

The issue of deciding priorities for respite care arose at the last Supervisors' Group chaired by the Project Manager in mid-June, 1986. The Project Manager raised the possibility of providing respite care once a month on a long-term basis, for a family with particular needs. This proposal derived from his attendance at a case conference held by representatives of statutory social services concerned with the family. The Respite Care organizer responded that she already had a waiting list and to offer one weekend a month (which was all the respite care currently provided at Beech House) to this family would mean turning other people away. The Project Manager seemed enthusiastic about providing for the family, saying "The parents need this relief" and suggesting that "the Society will have to decide its priorities". The Respite Care organizer raised the possibility of running two respite care weekends a month and it was agreed she and the Assistant Manager (shortly to become Acting Project Manager) should discuss this. In the event, although it was agreed that additional respite care weekends could be organized, it was decided that Beech House did not have sufficient resources to devote one respite care weekend every month to one family.

Demand for Respite Care remained high during the last months of fieldwork. By the end of December 1986 weekend bookings had been arranged until the beginning of May, and all the places for the June fortnight had been taken. For the first time a week had been set aside for three children, leaving one week's holiday for adults instead of the customary two. Thus, three families with children received a new service, but families accustomed to leaving an adult relative at Beech House for a fortnight experienced a reduction in the service. Some additional weekends were arranged but it proved impossible to offer a weekend every fortnight. The supervisor was finding it increasingly difficult to recruit sufficient numbers of the necessary casual staff. Some local hospitals were expressing disapproval of their nurses working elsewhere in their time off, while the pre-deduction of income tax from casual earnings was also seen as a possible deterrent. Staffing crises could arise at the last minute when a member of the Respite Care casual staff withdrew through illness and no substitute could be found. It sometimes proved impossible to recruit sufficient staff for a weekend, or to cover for Community Programme staff holidays. In November, 1986 and May, 1987, weekends had to be cancelled.
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The way in which the very limited provisions of respite care were allocated was not clear. While no family received a large amount of the service, due to the restricted number of weekends etc. available, there was certainly an uneven distribution of the service between users. In some cases it seemed to be a matter of 'first come, first served', with staff responding to the expressed needs of users. At other times, the Respite Care organizer contacted certain families to invite them to use the facility, because they had been brought to her attention as being in need or because she had observed that the family had not asked for respite care for a long time. Arrangements seemed to be ad hoc and implicit, there being no identifiable policy on the amount of respite care a family should receive in a given period, or how users of this scarce resource should be selected. The existence of a six-month waiting list suggested there was more demand articulated for this service than could be easily met. Whether there was also a degree of unexpressed need was another issue. These were matters to be explored with parents in interviews.

During 1985, 11 weekends were organized together with a fortnight in June. Weekends began to be organized more frequently than in the past in the autumn of 1985, with two each month in September, October and November and one in December. The Respite Care organizer's records for 1985 showed that 16 adults and 20 children had received respite care. However these figures did not relate to different individuals, some guests having stayed on more than one occasion.

In the year commencing January 1986 twelve respite care weekends were provided, a further weekend being cancelled due to the unavailability of casual staff. Longer-term respite care was provided during the June holiday fortnight.

The respite care records were in the form of lists of names for each weekend or holiday arranged. They were not organized to give a picture of the allocation of the resources of this service, to show whether the service was being shared equally by the users, for example, or whether certain families were using it more often than others.

Figures compiled by the research worker on the basis of respite care records showed that during 1986, 26 different families were helped in this way. Given the number of weekends held, together with the holiday fortnight, at least 39 families could have been helped. One family used the service on four occasions, one family used it on three occasions, 6 used it on two occasions and 18 used the service only once. Of the four holiday guests during the 1986 June fortnight, three also stayed for a weekend at least once during 1986. Comparable information for 1985 was not available.

A waiting list had been generated and by the end of December 1986 weekend stays had been booked as far ahead as May, 1987. The two holiday weeks arranged for June, one for adults, one for children, were also fully booked.

The six weekends arranged for the first half of 1987, together with the June fortnight, were to accommodate 19 different people. One would stay on three occasions, three would stay on two occasions and 15 on one occasion. All three adults booked for the week's holiday in June had also stayed at Beech House for respite care during the June fortnight the previous year. Seven of the guests booked for 1987 had stayed for at least one respite care weekend during 1986.
### APPENDIX III

**Funding Sources February 1st 1985 - January 31st 1988**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Service/Activities Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Fixed-term grant</td>
<td>Grant towards the maintenance and running costs of the house and to cover the salary of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(approximately £12,000p.a.)</td>
<td>part-time House Manager, for three years from April 1983 - March 1986. The grant for this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>post was retained and re-allocated to cover other running expenses of the house. When the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>grant expired it was renewed until March 1988, after which the running costs which it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>covered would become the responsibility of the County Social Services Department (ie. a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>main programme funding provision).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) 'one-off' grant</td>
<td>To furnish and equip the respite care flat in 1983.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(£14,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Manpower Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Programme (C.P.)</td>
<td>Typist/receptionist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Administrative staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activities Co-ordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Horticulture/House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Re-imburses employees'</td>
<td>House Care Assistant(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wages up to a maximum;</td>
<td>one post initiated during the 1985-86 C.P.; two posts included in the C.P. commencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>currently, of an</td>
<td>September 1987.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>average of £67 per week;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>also provides £440 p.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for each place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>filled to cover overheads,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>materials and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equipment, an amount</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>remained unchanged during</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the research)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kitchen Assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>one post initiated during the 1986-87 C.P., then eliminated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Living Away from Home worker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>initiated during the 1985-86 C.P.; included in 1986-87 C.P.; but not re-filled when</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING SOURCE</th>
<th>SERVICES/ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.S.C. cont.</td>
<td>Respite Care Organizer (FT) for the period February 1985 - June 1987, after which a part-time post was funded until December 1987 by interim joint finance, (later extended to June 1988). Respite Care Assistant - initiated during the 1986-87 C.P., then eliminated Adult Daycare staff (including Cook(s) and Driver) - for the period February 1985 - June 1987, after which interim joint finance was arranged until December, 1987, (later extended to June 1988). (NB. during the period February - June, 1985, one staff group provided both daycare for adults and the pre-school playgroup).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Finance (i) fixed-term grants (Total on commencement in 1985 equivalent to approximately £53,000 p.a., index-linked thereafter)</td>
<td>Play-group staff (including Cook and Driver) - originally approved for the period mid-June 1985-June 1988, creating a new staff group responsible for the pre-school playgroup Home Care and Sitting in Service) Book-keeper (5 hours p.w) Administrative assistant (15 hours p.w.) - for the period January 1985 - December 1987 (NB. at the end of 1986 the County Joint Consultative Committee approved joint finance on a tapering basis for these two services for a period of 4 years commencing December, 1987. Thereafter the full costs were to be picked up by the County's Social Services and Education Departments i.e. main programme funding. However, it is the understanding of the research that up to June 1988 this had not been ratified by the Education Department, and the future of the playgroup remained uncertain).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUNDING SOURCE</td>
<td>SERVICES/ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Finance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cont. (i) Short-term interim support (approximately £50,000)</td>
<td>Adult Daycare staff group for the period July - December 1987, while negotiations on long-term joint-finance in progress.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Respite Care Organizer (part-time) Administrative Asst's hours doubled to 30 p.w. Book-keeper's hours doubled to 10 p.w. from joint finance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Occasional grants have been obtained for special items during the period eg. bathroom improvements. Playscheme expenses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity</td>
<td>Project Manager Charity provided full salary during appointment of this manager February 1985 - June 1986, when he resigned with seven months of the two-year contract to run.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Co-ordinator Charity contributing towards salary of the August 1986; Appointed September 1986 on a two-year contract) Project Co-ordinator for this period. Joint finance sought for the future.*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Department-</td>
<td>£800 p.a. from April 1986 to cover travel expenses for Social Services residents of that area attending Beech House for Day care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>County Social Services Department Some contribution to costs of employing casual staff in Respite Care, but no regular basis for this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* It is known that after the research ended, this interim support was extended to June 1988; main programme funding by the Social Services Department and the Health Authority would from then on support the continued, though reduced, provision of these two services, together with the Project Co-ordinator's salary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Services/Activities Supported</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary contributions both unsolicited and as a result of fund-raising</td>
<td>May be acquired as direct contributions to the services provided by paid staff (e.g., Under Fives' Opportunity Group), to the Project Co-ordinator's salary and to volunteer-run leisure activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Society</td>
<td>Uses voluntary contributions to subsidise various areas of Beech House activities e.g., payments to casual Respite Care staff, subsidies to Sitting-in service, transport costs for volunteer-run leisure activities, replacement of capital goods. Underwrites any 'overspend' on annual budget. From October, 1986, agreed to pay the wages of a House Care Assistant for, one year. Payment of 5 hours p.w. of the Book-keeper's time from July, 1986; from the appointment of the Project Co-ordinator this money was for administrative convenience, drawn from the Project Co-ordinator's salary account. The Chairman of the Society stated that it would be re-imbursed by the Society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingo Club</td>
<td>Paid repairs of mini-bus, which vehicle it 'gave' to the Society. This arrangement was to cease towards the end of 1987; as fieldwork ended there was uncertainty about the ownership of the mini-bus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX IV

SOCIETY BALANCE SHEET as at 30th September, 1987

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSETS EMPLOYED:</th>
<th>1987 £</th>
<th>1986 £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT ASSETS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance at Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current account</td>
<td>1519</td>
<td>2271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposit account</td>
<td>11902</td>
<td>25297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business reserve account</td>
<td>10404</td>
<td>27568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET CURRENT ASSETS</td>
<td>23825</td>
<td>27568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funded by:

Income and Expenditure account

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1987 £</th>
<th>1986 £</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accumulated Surplus brought f/wd.</td>
<td>27568</td>
<td>18048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add - surplus for year</td>
<td></td>
<td>9520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deduct deficit for year</td>
<td>(3743)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mini-'bus fund- now incorporated in Income and Expenditure a/c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23825</td>
<td>27568</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:

The following commitments have been made at 30th September 1987 towards financing the Beech House Project. No provision has been made in the above accounts for this expenditure.

- Cleaning costs £1,500
- Clerical etc. salaries £371.83
- Manager's expenses £500
- Furniture/fittings £235.00
- Computer £720.00  £8563

AUDITOR'S REPORT:
The foregoing balance sheet and income and expenditure accounts have been prepared from the books and vouchers produced and are in accordance therewith to the best of my knowledge and belief.
## Income and Expenditure Accounts for the Year Ended 30th September 1987

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3965. 80. painting &amp; decoration</td>
<td>3548. 67.</td>
<td>117. 00. Members subscriptions</td>
<td>261. 60.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200. 00. cleaning services</td>
<td>907. 24.</td>
<td>111460. 00. Donations and grants (see App. 1) 9192. 92.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1271. 84. computer</td>
<td>736. 75.</td>
<td>225. 53. Flag Day</td>
<td>239. 94.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4165. 80. other</td>
<td></td>
<td>135. 00.</td>
<td>239. 35. Musical evening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440. 00. Other subscriptions</td>
<td>445. 00.</td>
<td>131. 00. Parachute Jump</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. 50.</td>
<td>15. 00.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315. 21. sitting service</td>
<td>793. 80.</td>
<td>107. 50. Mountain Climb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2557. 48. respite care</td>
<td>5384. 00.</td>
<td>18. 65. Miscellaneous income</td>
<td>305. 95.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960. 00. salaries &amp; wages</td>
<td>720. 00.</td>
<td>1200. 00. Transfers other accounts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216. 84. travelling expenses</td>
<td>12. 84.</td>
<td>1183. 22. Bank interest</td>
<td>1533. 10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215. 99. postage, stationery, telephone &amp; advertising</td>
<td>377. 36.</td>
<td>143. 64. Transfer from E. H. a/c</td>
<td>105. 00.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317. 50. accountancy charges</td>
<td>10. 88.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Balance of expenditure over income (deficit) for year 3743. 01.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>275. 81. miscellaneous expenses</td>
<td>337. 72.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100. 00. Employers liability insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9520. 41. balance of income over expenditure (surplus) for year</td>
<td></td>
<td>18398. 25.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19102. 54.</td>
<td>15598. 35.</td>
<td>19102. 54.</td>
<td>15598. 35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX V: PART I - THE CENTRAL RECORDS

In December 1986, a detailed scrutiny of all user files was initiated. At that time these totalled 246, covering the cases of 240 different families and individuals.

There was no record of any service use following initial contact with Beech House for 40 out of these 240 different families/individuals in the files. Such cases involved an enquiry about services, or a request for information leaflets to be sent, or a home visit from a supervisor, all with no indication of any further contact with the people concerned. It should be borne in mind that at this time the 'private' records of the Home Care service were six months out of date. Hence there was no information in the central records for this service beyond June, 1986. Also, changes in the Common Resources Group meant that records of use of the enquiry service were no longer kept. It was possible that some of the 40 families/individuals concerned here might have made some use of the Home Care service or the enquiry service in that June - December period but there was no easy way of ascertaining this. For the purposes of the research, therefore, these 40 cases had to be eliminated from consideration.

The 200 remaining families/individuals were known to have used some type of Beech House service at least once in the period June 1983 - December 1986.

The information available on these users has the following limitations. Those users on whom no files existed are not represented. The writer had found at least 42 users identified by service supervisors, on whom central records had never been opened. Many of the files which did exist were lacking in basic information and were not up-to-date. It was often not clear when a family/individual had started to use a particular service or whether there had been any breaks in the use of a service. The 200 families/individuals included 210 people with some type of handicap. Twenty people belonged to families where two adults or two siblings had a handicap.

Characteristics of Users

Initial referral

Although provision was made on the official referral form for details to be recorded on how a family/individual was initially referred to Beech House, this information was not always available in the central files. However, details were present in sufficient cases to suggest that referral by professional workers in statutory services was a common occurrence, indicating a considerable degree of acceptance of the Project by fieldworkers in statutory agencies. The information available is presented in Table AV:1 and shows the dominant role of professionals in referral. Leaving aside the group of parents classed as 'founder-members' of Beech House there seems to have been only a limited degree of self-referral by parents or other carers. It is not possible to draw firm conclusions on this latter point, though, given the numbers for whom no information is available.

Nature of handicap

Information on type of mental and physical handicap was included on file only at the discretion of staff and many files had little or no information of this nature. Although the majority of users had a mental handicap, there were some users with a solely physical handicap. Eight of the people on file were known to the research worker to belong to this latter group but there may well have been more.
Table AV:1 Source of initial referral to employee-provided services June 1983 - December 1986

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of initial referral</th>
<th>No/families, individuals referred</th>
<th>% of total referrals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist social worker</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health visitor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist health visitor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental handicap hospital</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other outside professional</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary organization</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduced by Society member</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founder member of Beech House</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beech House Information Service</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other member of Beech House staff</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-referral by parent/carer</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table AV:2 Society membership/non-membership and service use by age of mentally handicapped person

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Society members and service users (Figures for Executive Committee members only in brackets)</th>
<th>Non-members</th>
<th>All users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under-5</td>
<td>1 (0) 1.4% (0%)</td>
<td>24 17.0%</td>
<td>25 11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-19</td>
<td>34 (10) 49.3% (71.4%)</td>
<td>35 24.8%</td>
<td>69 32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 19</td>
<td>27 (3) 39.1% (21.4%)</td>
<td>55 39.0%</td>
<td>82 39.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age unknown/deceased</td>
<td>7 (1) 10.1% (7.1%)</td>
<td>21 14.9%</td>
<td>28 13.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eliminated from consideration 6 4.3% 6 2.9%

Total 69 (14) 100% (100%) 141 100% 210 100%

*One member of the Executive Committee known to be a user of the Beech House service was absent from the central files.
Appendix V: Part I - The Central Records

Age of users
The 210 people were classified, where possible into three age groups

(i) Under 5 in December, 1986 - 26 (12.4%)
(ii) 5 - 19 in December, 1986 - 71 (33.8%)
(iii) Over 19 in December, 1986 - 84 (40.0%)

There had been two deaths, and it was not possible to ascertain the age group of a further 27 users.

Home circumstances
Much information on home circumstances was not recorded on file in any systematic way. References to such matters as parents' employment, whether parents were foster-parents or single parents, parents' health problems etc. were included at the discretion of members of staff if such information was felt to be relevant to the delivery of a service. Significant changes in home circumstances eg. marital breakdown, could go unrecorded, as the research worker was aware in individual cases with which she was familiar.

Information was generally available within the files regarding whether the handicapped person was living at home or elsewhere. This aspect of home circumstances was considered in terms of the three age-groups previously identified.

Of the 26 children recorded as belonging to the Under-5 age group, two were living in some form of residential accommodation while they/their families used a Beech House service, with the remaining 24 apparently living at home.

Five of the 71 children known to belong to the 5 - 19 year age-group were living in some form of hospital accommodation. A further five were known to be living in voluntary sector or social services residential accommodation. While it is impossible to be sure that the remaining 61 children (ie. 85.9%) were all living at home with their families, there was no evidence on the files to the contrary.

Of the 84 people recorded as being over 19 years, 23 were resident in some type of hospital accommodation; 12 people, in nine households, were living in their own homes in the community; four were living in some form of supervised hostel accommodation or as part of the County's Community Accommodation Project.

So 39 people, almost half of this age group, were not living at home with a parent or other carer, while the remaining 45 were apparently still living at home.

Thus, a substantial minority (ie. 51, or 24.3% of the 210 people considered) were not living at home with their families and did not conform to the type of clientele for which the Society had originally planned to provide.

Society membership
From the point of view of examining the extent to which parents and users might be involved in decisions about the services provided by Beech House it was useful for the research to establish which families/individuals belonged to the Society which had designed and set up the services they were using. The original referral forms for the central files made provision for this information, partly because Beech House had reportedly been criticized for restricting services to Society members, anxiety on this point being expressed at the Executive Committee. However, staff disliked asking people about Society membership in case users might feel they were obliged to join, when this was not in fact so. When the referral form was re-designed in mid-1986 the question was dropped. The information on Society membership had not been systematically recorded prior to that point, anyway.
The writer therefore compared the names in the central files with the Society's official membership list as at November 1986. According to the official membership list the Society had 180 members in November 1986. Of these 180, there were six who could not be definitely identified as users. A further 12 Society members were possible service users; although their names did not appear in the central files families with the same surnames had appeared on other lists of past and current users. No record of any use of Beech House services was found for 90 Society members, though, either in the central files or elsewhere. Thus, there remained 72 Society members who appeared in the central files as service users. Of these, five families/individuals had no record of service use beyond an initial enquiry. This left 67 families/individuals clearly identified as Society members, representing 69 different people with some type of handicap. So, only 33.5% of the 200 families/individuals with a service record were associated with membership of the Society.

The 210 people identified as having a service record were divided into two groups relating to Society membership/non-membership, and compared in terms of the age-distribution of the handicapped individuals concerned. The results are shown in Table AV:2. Six families who were Society members but who could not be clearly identified as those families with the same surnames in the service records only appear in Column 2 under the heading 'Eliminated from consideration'. The figures in brackets in Column (1) refer to the members of the Executive who appeared in the central files as recorded service users in December, 1986.

Table AV:2 shows that, according to the available data, almost 12% of all users were families of children under five with a handicap but only one family with Society membership using the service had a child in this age group and no such families were represented on the Executive Committee. The biggest single group of users were families/individuals where the handicapped person concerned had adult status, being 39% of all users, 39% of nonmembers/users and 39.1% of Society members/users. However, only 21.4% of the Executive Committee members who were recorded as service users were from families with a handicapped member of adult status.

Of all users 32.9% were families with handicapped children in the 5-19 age group. Such families represented 24.8% of the nonmembers/users, but 49.3% of the Society members/users and 71.4% of the members of the Executive Committee who were service users. This group of families seems very prominent when opportunities are considered for service users to be formally involved in decisions concerning the services they use; the families of children under five are apparently particularly under-represented.

Patterns of use of Beech House services provided by paid employees June 1983 - December 1986

This topic proved extremely difficult to investigate, given the quality of the data in the central files. In many cases it was not possible to establish when a family/individual had first started to use a particular service, or to identify whether/when breaks in the use of a service may have occurred, or when a family/individual ceased to use a service. Records of service use seemed to be most complete for Home Care/Sitting-in and the Information/Welfare Rights enquiry service, but there was little information in the central files after June 1986 on the use of Home Care or the enquiry service. It should also be remembered that there were known to be a number of service users for whom no central files existed. Also, there was no systematic record of the pattern of use of the volunteer-run leisure services included in the central files. These major reservations must be recalled when considering Table AV:3, where figures are presented on the use of the services, taken separately.
### Table AV13
Families/individuals recorded as using the Beech House services, considered separately, on at least one occasion during the period June 1983 - December 1986.

(Society membership in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>No./families/individuals using this service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information/Welfare Rights</td>
<td>72 (21 ie 29.2% all users of this service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Care</td>
<td>96 (39 ie 40.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting-in</td>
<td>52 (30 ie 57.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playschemes</td>
<td>47 (22 ie 46.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgroup</td>
<td>24 (4 ie 16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respite Care</td>
<td>43 (28 ie 65.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Daycare/Children's Ward group</td>
<td>54 (5 ie 9.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total no/families, individuals considered: 200 (67 ie 33.5%)

### Table AV14
Users of one service only and frequency of use June 1983 - December 1986 (Society membership in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>No. users</th>
<th>One occasion recorded</th>
<th>More than one occasion but not both regular &amp; frequent</th>
<th>Regular use at least once a week basis</th>
<th>No information recorded</th>
<th>Last recorded use 1985</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information/Welfare Rights</td>
<td>17 (4)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Care</td>
<td>18 (3)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting-in</td>
<td>4 (1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playschemes</td>
<td>7 (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Not Known</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgroup</td>
<td>3 (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respite Care</td>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Daycare/Children's Ward group</td>
<td>39 (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals: 90 (13) 21 14 43 12 25
Home Care was the service recorded as being used by the greatest number of different families/individuals, followed by the Information/Welfare Rights service. The playschemes, the playgroup, Respite Care and Adult Daycare all have legal and/or physical restrictions placed on the numbers which can be served, in ways which do not apply to the other three services listed.

When Society membership was considered, Society members were found to be the majority of service users of Sitting-in and Respite Care, while they were greatly in the minority as users of services provided by the playgroup and Adult Daycare. The dearth of Society members with a child under five in November 1986 has already been noted, also the existence of many Adult Daycare users not living at home with parents. The willingness of families to request services and the way separate services were obtained were discussed with parents in interview.

**Frequency of service use**

Of the 200 families/individuals with service records in the central files 90 (45.0%) were recorded as having used only one service provided by Beech House employees (See Table AV:4). Of those 90 'single service users' 25 (27/9%) had not used that service since 1985. Almost half of these 'old users' had been customers only of the Information/Welfare Rights service. At the other end of the spectrum were 43 regular weekly users, the great majority of whom were found in Adult Daycare.

When Society membership overall was considered it was found that though Society members constituted 33.5% of all recorded service users, they were only 14.4% (ie. 13 out of 90) of single service users, partly because hospital patients using the daycare services were concentrated in the category of single-service users.

There remained 110 families/individuals who had used more than one service provided by paid employees. Table AV:5 shows that fifty-four of these, (27% of the 200 families considered) had used two services, either simultaneously or in succession, 29 (14.5%) had used three, 18 (9%) had used four and six (3%) had used five services.

When age was considered, it was clear that the majority of families/individuals where the handicapped person was over 19 were to be found among the 'single-service users'. The prominence here of the hospital residents has been noted. Their presence complicates any discussion of the extent to which the use of Beech House services indicates differences in expressed need between families/individuals in the three age-groups. One third of the families of 5-19 year olds were found in the single service users and just over a quarter of families with a child under five.

When Society membership was considered it was found (see Tables AV:4 and AV:5) that while 14.4% of the 'single service users' had been Society members, almost 50% (ie 54 out of 110) of the multiple service users had been Society members. Society membership had been established for a minority of the families/individuals with a service record in the central files (ie 67 out of 200, or 33.5%). However, when use of the range of services was examined the figures suggested that not only were Society members more likely than non-members to use a number of the services provided by Beech House, they were also more likely to use the greatest number of available services. Table AV:5 indicates an increasing tendency to Society membership as the total number of services used rises. This is to some extent explained, as discussed earlier, by the prominence among the single-service users of those attending Adult Daycare, many of whom were hospital residents and not associated with the Society. The family survey (see Appendix VII) provided an opportunity to explore the possibility that other factors influencing the pattern of service use might be associated with Society membership/non-membership eg. the distance families lived from the town transport facilities.
Table AV:5 Use of the range of available services by families/individuals June 1983 - December 1986, showing distribution according to age group of handicapped person. (Society membership in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age-group</th>
<th>1 service</th>
<th>2 services</th>
<th>3 services</th>
<th>4 services</th>
<th>5 services</th>
<th>Insufficient Information</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No/families, individuals using Information, Welfare/Rights as one service</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No/families, individuals not using Information, Welfare Rights</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>126 (Unknown 3) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>90(13)</td>
<td>54(18)</td>
<td>29(18)</td>
<td>18(11)</td>
<td>6(5)</td>
<td>3(2)</td>
<td>200(67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age-group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1(+1)*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>67(67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 19</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown/deceased</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29(29)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One family with a child in this age-group had a second child with a handicap included in another age group.
Given the limits on time and resources for the research it was not possible to attempt to consider the extent to which services were being used simultaneously or in succession, for the 110 families/individuals concerned. It was also impossible, given the difficulties involved, to attempt to make any quantitative assessment of the total amount of Beech House resources allocated to each family/individual user. Use of a wide range of available services does not necessarily mean that a user is being allocated more resources overall than a user of one or two different services. It all depends what the services are and what are the separate patterns of use over time. However, given the nature of the Home Care service, it is possible for a user to obtain a frequent and considerable provision for an extended period of time, unlike any other employee-staffed service at Beech House. It is therefore a reasonable assumption that families/individuals with a substantial record of use of Home Care and who also use other care services at Beech House are receiving a higher proportion overall of the total resources of Beech House than families who do not use Home Care in this way. The extent to which substantial use of Home Care might be associated with the use of other care services was therefore explored.

An analysis of the range of services used by each of the 200 families/individuals identified 18 single-service users who had used Home Care alone. There were five examples where a use of Home Care had been combined with a use of the Information/Welfare Rights service. Only 11 families/individuals had used two or more direct care services where Home Care was not included while there were 73 where use of Home Care had been combined with use of one or more other direct care services.

Table AV:6 shows that just over 52% (ie. 38) of these 73 families/individuals had used only one other service in addition to Home Care, the most frequent being the Sitting-in service. The same service was again prominent among those used by the 31.5% (ie. 23) of families/individuals combining Home Care with two other care services, as was Respite Care. Only 16.4% of the group had combined Home Care with three or four other care services, where Sitting-in again featured prominently.

When Society membership was considered, it was found that 42.1% of those who combined Home Care with one other care service were Society members, compared with 60.9% of those who combined Home Care with two other care services, and 58.3% of those who combined Home Care with three or four other care services. These figures suggest that not only was Society membership associated with a tendency to use a number of the different Beech House services (as previously indicated in Table AV:5) but it was associated with the use of two or more care services in addition to Home Care.

The records of the 73 users who had combined some use of Home Care with other care services were then examined to establish the amount of Home Care received. Some users could not be categorized according to the extent of their use of Home Care either because they were relatively new users with no discernible pattern of use over time, or because they were old users with no recorded use of Home Care after June 1985. For the rest, the number of hours of Home Care received over the nine-month period selected for consideration (ie. June 1985-March 1986) varied widely both within and between individual patterns of use. While one user might receive in excess of 100 hours in one quarter but lesser amounts in others, there were families who consistently received considerable amounts of time eg 70 or 80 hours per quarter and others who used the service little and often or little and infrequently. It was felt that this highly complex picture of the use of Home Care would render arbitrary any attempt at simple categorization for purposes of analysis, and this approach was not pursued.

However more refined analysis of the allocation of Beech House resources than has been possible here would require some form of quantification of the
Table AV:6, divided into three sections a, b and c shows the combination of the use of Home Care with the use of one or more other care services.

Table AV:6  Combination of use of Home Care with other care services (Society membership in brackets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Combination with one other care service</th>
<th>(b) Combination with two other care services</th>
<th>(c) Combination with three other care services/four other</th>
<th>Total no/ families, individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other care service</td>
<td>No/families individuals</td>
<td>Other care services</td>
<td>No/families individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting-in</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Sitting-in and Respite Care</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respite care</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sitting-in and Playscheme</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playscheme</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Playscheme and Respite Care</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgroup</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sitting-in and Playgroup</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Day-Care</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Adult Day-Care and Respite Care</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
extent of use of every service by every user. An accurate assessment of the pattern of use of every service for each family/individual and the total amount of Beech House resources each receives in a given period was a project beyond the scope of the research. A pre-requisite is the systematic recording of the necessary information on service use. Without such an approach it is impossible for an organization providing a wide range of separate services to know the consequences of the allocation of total resources to users.
APPENDIX VI - RECORDS OF UNMET NEED

An awareness of the emergence of unmet need for Project services and of the desirability of some form of monitoring of service allocation was demonstrated by the Project Co-ordinator. In June 1986, when Acting Project Manager, she instituted a record of unmet need. Service supervisors were asked to record in an 'Unmet Needs Book' those occasions when a request for a service had to be denied and the reasons why help could not be provided. Up to this point such situations had gone unrecorded, with no inclusion of information on unmet need in the central files on service users. The new system, the first formal attempt to identify the extent to which expressed demand for the various Beech House services, did not relate to the central users' files, but to a single source of information which could be centrally available to staff. The information it contained would depend on supervisors remembering to enter the relevant examples in the book, and on their interpretation of what constituted an 'unmet need'.

For the year commencing 25th June, 1986, the Unmet Needs Book contained a wide range of items, covering not only requests denied but arrangements cancelled, and situations where alternative services were offered, or where supervisors felt certain families were not being provided with a service suited to their needs. There were 36 entries, concerning 29 different families. Thirteen of the entries concerned Respite Care, 15 concerned Home Care, one referred to the Sitting-in service and seven to the playschemes. In the case of Respite Care, there was often a need to deny requests for the service or to cancel arrangements. In the case of Home Care, a number of refusals concerned requests made at short notice or for extended periods of assistance, the remainder relating to families the supervisors felt were not getting enough help from Home Care to meet their needs. The one reference to the Sitting-in service concerned a request made at short notice. The entries on the playschemes concerned two families whose requests for playscheme places had to be denied because of the catchment area rules, three to whom only a reduced number of days for the Easter playscheme could be offered because of the demand for this service, and two who were offered an alternative service because of the particular circumstances.

While no firm conclusions on the extent of unmet need can be drawn from this source of data, the fact that it existed is noteworthy, as is the awareness among supervisors that the demand for their services was, at least on occasion, exceeding the resources available.

The extent to which families had experienced services being unavailable, or had been offered alternative services were topics for discussion in interviews with families. To be meaningful, an exploration of the allocation of service resources should be undertaken in relation to the needs, however defined, of those receiving the services. Beech House employed no formal system which attempted to assess the perceived needs of one family/ individual relative to the perceived needs of other users/ potential users. There was considerable reliance on expressed need as a mechanism for resource allocation. In such a situation, are those receiving the largest proportion of service resources also those in greatest need? Are there families/individuals apparently in great need who are receiving little support?
APPENDIX VII: THE FAMILY SURVEY
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Appendix VII: The family survey

By considering the material generated in interviews on such matters as the range of services the families had used, the amount of help received, the availability of services and the place of Beech House in the total network of services used by the families, it was hoped to usefully supplement the data drawn from written records and to throw light on some of the issues raised in the examination of that data.

The interview programme

Personal interviews were conducted between February and May 1987 with 36 families who had, according to available evidence, made use of Beech House services. The families interviewed did not constitute a random sample. An appropriate sampling frame did not exist. Requests for interviews were sent to families drawn from lists of users of Beech House and all those accepting were interviewed.

A number of factors were borne in mind in selecting the families to approach. Representatives of users of each of the separate services were sought. It was important also to include families who were not Society members as well as those who did belong to the Society, since non-members were the majority of users. The research worker also wished to talk to families living on the fringes of the borough i.e. those for whom Beech House was not a 'local' service, as well as families living near to Beech House. It was considered that the three age-groups of handicapped dependants i.e. under-5s, 5-19s, and over-19s, should be represented in the families interviewed. Finally, it was important to talk to families who had made little use of Beech House as well as to those who made substantial use of the services.

A 'free' choice of which families to approach, given the above considerations, was not possible. The research worker was aware of the existence of a number of families with current personal crises whom it would be inappropriate to approach. The Beech House supervisors provided the names of families who should not be included, for this reason. A further restriction was the presence of a final year university student who had been given permission by the Society Chairman to carry out a survey of parents' views on a particular topic at the same time as the writer was approaching parents to request interviews. The research worker, believing the goodwill of parents towards surveys to be limited, eliminated from consideration all families she had been informed the student had approached for interview. This was an unfortunate restriction on the family survey.

Twenty-nine known Society members were approached, and 22 accepted. Thirty-one families believed to be non-members were approached and 15 accepted, but one of these was found to have joined the Society some months earlier and was therefore transferred to the group of Society members. Another was found not to have made use of Beech House services after the initial introduction and was excluded. The response rates were, therefore, for Society members 23 out of 30 (76.7%) and for non-members 13 out of 29 (44.8%). One family applied to join the Society shortly before the interview and was left in the group of 'Non-members' for the purposes of the research. The 36 families represented 37 handicapped people.

Little was known about those 23 families either refusing to be interviewed (6 families; 1 member, 5 non-members) or failing to respond to the request (17 families; 6 members, 11 non-members). At least two families had moved away leaving no forwarding address. Four wrote to say they did not wish to participate because their contacts with Beech House had been minimal, or non-existent (although central files had been opened on these families at Beech House). Information was available, however, on the ages of the handicapped relatives of the families who refused/failed to respond. Table AVII:1 shows the age
### Response of parents to requests for interview by age-group of handicapped dependants and Society membership/Non-membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Society members</th>
<th>Non-members</th>
<th>Total No. accepting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. approached</td>
<td>No. accepting</td>
<td>No. refusing or no response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One family with a dependant in another age group also had a second dependant in this age group. The 36 families therefore incorporated 37 handicapped people.

### Sources of initial referral/introduction related to Society membership/non-membership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of initial referral/introduction</th>
<th>Society members</th>
<th>Non-members</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist social worker</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health visitor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist health visitor</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other professional</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founder members</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-referral on learning of service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another Society member</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Beech House staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can't remember</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### The number of different services used by families

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Services Used</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of referral/introduction</th>
<th>Society members</th>
<th>Non-members</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social worker</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist social worker</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health visitor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist health visitor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Founder members</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-referral on learning of service</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another Society member</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Beech House staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can't remember</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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distribution of the handicapped people concerned related to the response of parents to requests for interview.

The figures in Table AVII:1 suggest that the parents who did not belong to the Society were less willing to be interviewed than the Society members, with the parents of under-fives being the least enthusiastic group of non-members. Unfortunately there were no families of Society members with children under five with which this particular group of non-members could be compared. The research worker, using the official Society membership list available in November 1986, had been able to identify only one family with a child under five at that time, where the parents were Society members with a record of service use. In the event this family was among those it was not possible to approach.

One factor influencing the willingness of parents to participate in the research may have been the degree of familiarity with Beech House and with the history of the research project. Some of the Society members interviewed were members of long-standing who had been involved with Beech House from the early days and knew something of the reasons behind the research. Given that Beech House opened in mid-1983, it is unlikely that parents of young children, who were being approached for interview in 1987, would have the same familiarity with the origins of Beech House and the research. There may be other reasons, however, why young parents were reluctant to be interviewed about the services they used. At the same time, non-members with children in other age-groups were also less enthusiastic than their Society member counterparts about helping with the research.

The composition of the final group of families interviewed

The group was not a microcosm of the total population of 200 individuals/families who were service users. Society members constituted only 33.5% of service users (ie. 67 out of 200) whereas, partly because of the greater willingness of Society members to be interviewed, the final sample is heavily weighted towards them, with Society members being 62.2% of interviewees (ie. 23 out of 37). Also, given the direction of the original research proposal, it was necessary to pay substantial attention to the views and experiences of those families who had been involved in setting up Beech House, especially to the extent to which they felt the original aims had been achieved. Since the writer also wished to include Society members who had not been involved in this way, a sizeable sub-group of Society members was required.

A gap in the family survey is the omission of the views of the handicapped people themselves. Although they were sometimes present, it was not possible for the writer to include the handicapped users in the interviews in any systematic way. She had neither the communication skills nor the time to establish the relationships with the handicapped users which would be essential to eliciting their own views, in addition to those of their parents.

The views presented are therefore those of the parents. In eight of the 36 family interviews, both parents were present. For the remainder, it was mainly the mother alone, though in a few cases the father alone was interviewed. Nine of the families were single-parent families at the time of the interview. The interview schedule was structured, employing open-ended questions to explore the families' use of Beech House provisions, statutory and other voluntary services, together with their views on service use and the responsibilities of caring. The questions used are listed in Appendix I. The findings of the survey relevant to this thesis are detailed below.
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Characteristics of users

Society membership

Twenty-three of the 36 families interviewed were Society members. The majority of these were members of long-standing who had joined in the years before Beech House existed. Six of the families had joined later, after starting to use the services, out of interest and/or because they had a sense of obligation, believing they should not use the services without joining the Society.

Initial referral/introduction

The sources of initial introduction/referral to Beech House are identified in Table AVII:2 according to Society membership/non membership. The biggest single group in terms of initial introduction/referral was that of 'founder-members', who constituted almost one third of those interviewed. Non-members had depended more than members on an initial referral by professional workers (8 of the 13 non-member families compared with 5 of the 23 Society members). Three of the non-member families could not remember the source of their introduction to the Beech House services.

Age group of handicapped family member

The age distribution of the survey population can be compared with that of the total group of users as follows:

(i) Under 5 in December 1986
4 ie. 11.1% (12.4% overall)
(ii) 5 - 19
18 ie. 50.0% (33.8% overall)
(iii) Over 19
14 ie. 38.9% (40.0% overall)
Not known/deceased
0 ie. 0.0% (13.8% overall)

Parents of handicapped people in the 5 - 19 age group are somewhat over-represented among the interviewees compared with the total population.

Home circumstances

A total of seven of the 37 handicapped people were living in some form of residential accommodation most of the time. The remainder were living at home with parents. Further details about the age-groups of users, Society membership/non-membership etc. cannot be given, for such information could offer clues to identity.

Distance from Beech House

Of the 36 families interviewed 16 lived in the town where Beech House was situated or in nearby villages and settlements. All of these were Society members. The remaining 20 families were scattered from the farther outskirts of the County town to the County borders about thirty miles to the north. Of this group, seven were Society members and 13 non-members. Eleven families did not possess a car (ie. 6 Society members and 5 non-members). Of these, nine (ie. 4 Society members and all 5 non-members) lived long distances from Loughborough. No nonmember 'local' users appear in the group of interviewees.

It was impossible to trace the addresses of all non-member users on the lists employed as sources of names of interviewees, so the number of 'local' non-member users is unknown and no comparison of the patterns of residence of Society member and non-member users is possible, overall. However, of the 67 Society members with a record of service use at Beech House, 41 could be described as 'local' users. Thus, overall, 61.2% of Society member users lived locally, as did 69.6% of the Society member users interviewed.
Use of Beech House services by the families interviewed

The range of Beech House services used by the families will now be examined, together with patterns of use of the individual services, where appropriate. The routines adopted by families for obtaining certain services will also be considered, and the related issues of availability of services and self-imposed rationing by families discussed. Finally, indications of the extent of the parents' knowledge of Beech House will be described and the implications of these findings for parents' evaluations of Beech House noted before concluding with an account of these evaluations.

In interview it was possible to explore the use of services in a way not permitted by the written records. However, because of the reliance on parents' memories of past events the information thus obtained is dependent on the accuracy of these recollections.

Number of services used

The maximum number of service categories which a family could have used is 14. Holiday playschemes and summer adult activities have been considered together, as have the staff-run clubs and the Befriending Scheme as the numbers involved in using some of these services have been so small and the identities well-known to staff.

Table AVII:3 shows the number of different services used by the families, with particular reference to those who had used the Home Care service in addition to other care services/leisure services.

Table AVII:3 shows the maximum number of services used by a Society member as 12, the maximum for a non-member as seven. Nine Society members had used eight or more services but there were no non-members in this category. The minimum number of services used by a Society member was three, the minimum for a non-member was one. Nine non-members (69.2% of this group) combined the use of Home Care with additional services, a very similar proportion to Society members, of whom 16 (69.6%) used Home Care as only one of a number of care/leisure services. Only two families out of the 36 were 'single service users' and both were non-members using only the Home Care service. One additional non-member family used Home Care as the only direct care service, in conjunction with Information/Welfare Rights.

Overall, therefore, these figures echo those derived from the information on 200 service users in the central files. Although the non-members seemed no less inclined than Society members to use the Home Care service in addition to other services, the non-members used fewer services than the Society members.

This matter was explored further by examining the extent to which members and non-members used each of the different services.

The use of Beech House services

Findings on this topic are presented in Table AVII:4. They show only the extent to which each individual service was used relative to other services, in terms of the numbers who had used each service since Beech House opened. No indication is given of the amount of service used/regularity of attendance etc.

Overall, Table AVII:4 shows the Newsletter as the service reaching most families, with Home Care as the direct care service used by the greatest number of families. The playgroup was the service least used, not surprising given the problems of recruiting parents of young children as interviewees and bearing in mind the limited numbers legally permitted to use this service at any one time.
## The Use of Beech House Services by Families Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SERVICE</th>
<th>SOCIETY MEMBERS</th>
<th>NON-MEMBERS</th>
<th>TOTAL FAMILIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N=23</td>
<td>N=13</td>
<td>N=36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Care</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting-in</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respite Care w/end and/or holiday</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holiday playschemes or Adult Activities</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgroup</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Daycare</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information/Welfare Rights</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-run Clubs and/or Befriending Scheme</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care mornings</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents evenings</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disco</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Club</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday Club</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Over 60% of families had made some use of the Information/Welfare Rights service, with only a slightly lower proportion using the holiday playschemes or the summer provisions for adult activities. Over half the parents had used the Respite Care service, with Sitting-in being used by exactly half of those interviewed.

The figures for Society members were compared with those for non-members. A number of notable differences between the two groups of users can be seen in Table A VII:4. A higher proportion of non-members used the Home Care service, the Sitting-in service and the playgroup. The proportions of members and non-members using Information/Welfare Rights and the Disco were very similar. For the remaining nine types of service, a lower proportion of non-members used each service. Indeed in the case of the staff-run clubs for children/ the Befriending Scheme there were no non-member users at all. Four non-member families had never received the Newsletter, which all the Society members had received (although one described its delivery as sporadic, perhaps once every six months). The greatest contrasts between the two user groups were in the attendance at the Saturday Club, at parents' evenings, the use of care mornings, the clubs/Befriending Scheme, and the holiday playschemes/adult activities. Here, not in the use of the central direct care services, lay the greatest differences in the use of services, between Society members and non-members.

While the predominance of children under 19 in the non-member families may help explain some differences in service use, this does not offer a total explanation. Although the Youth Club and Disco were designed for the older age-groups, the Saturday Club (a family event with no apparent age restriction) had only been used by two out of 13 non-member families (15.4%) compared with 15 (65.2%) of the Society members. The staff-run clubs and the Befriending Scheme had not benefited any of these non-member families, although the clubs were specifically intended for the pre-Youth Club groups of children. The gap between members and non-members in the use of the children's holiday playschemes and summer adult activities is especially marked.

Length of association with Beech House does not offer a complete explanation either. Table A VII:3 and A VII:4 show there are a number of Society members who have used only a very limited range of services, with several never having used the core direct care services of Home Care, Sitting-in or Respite Care, and it was clear from interview that among those making least use of Beech House overall were people who had been familiar with the service from the start. Among the non-members were parents who had used the service from the beginning of Beech House. Both groups contained users who had only commenced service use in recent months, and it was notable that there were parents among the comparatively new users who were long-standing Society members.

The distance families lived from Beech House may be a relevant factor. As noted in the earlier discussion none of the non-member families interviewed were local residents, compared with almost 70% of the Society members interviewed, and this may have influenced the number of services used e.g. where children from outside the catchment area are excluded from attending holiday playschemes. Possible reasons for the variations within and between the two groups of Society members and non-members emerged from the parents' discussions of their experiences of the services and will be considered in the final section of this Appendix.

Patterns of individual service use

Families varied, not only in the number of different Beech House services used, but in the amount of each service used. Allocation to categories of amount of use is not justified, for some parents could not be precise about exactly when/how much a service had been used, and it was often impossible to find any
corroborative written evidence in the records. There were families interviewed for whom little or no information on service use was recorded, and others for whom the information was several months out of date. Some parents were confused about which service had been used e.g. the distinction between Home Care and Sitting-in, especially where a Home Care Assistant had done the 'sitting'. One parent believed the family had used Respite Care, but on discussion it seemed this service had been arranged by a member of staff on a voluntary basis, and not formally through the Beech House Respite Care service. Some parents were not clear about the extent to which the Home Care assistance they had received had been performed on a 'paid' or 'voluntary' basis by the Home Care Assistant.

It was at least possible to examine whether certain services had been used regularly or occasionally or with a varying pattern and whether a family had ceased to use a particular service.

**Home Care**

Of the 27 Home Care users (16 members, 11 non-members) 15 (nine members, six non-members) only recalled using the service occasionally, often for special events or emergencies. The remaining seven families (three Society members, four non-members) had had some predictable, standard arrangement for the period of use of Home Care, ranging from once a week to several times a week.

When the combination of Home Care with the use of other services was examined for those who had made regular use of Home Care, it was found that none of the five Society member families involved had used less than five other services in addition to Home Care. Of the four non-members, two had used three other services, one had used only the Information service and Newsletter in addition to Home Care and one used only Home Care. Although the numbers involved are small, there is a clear contrast between the members and non-members in the patterns of overall service use of those who had had a regular arrangement with the Home Care service, with the non-members using fewer additional services.

Only two Society members could be described as having ceased to use Home Care, both because changing circumstances meant the service was no longer needed. Four non-members were no longer receiving Home Care. In each case this was because the service had been withdrawn; in three cases the parents seemed unclear about the reasons for the withdrawal. In the fourth case, although the family understood why the service had been withdrawn and accepted the justification for this decision, the family needs remained as before and no substitute service had been found.

**Other direct care services**

The use of Sitting-in varied widely, as had the use of Home Care, with one family reporting relying on the service two or three times a week, while others recalled using it only once in several years. A small number of families were using this service to enable a parent to work. The amount of variation was considerable for both members and non-members. Two members had ceased to need the service and one non-member had had the service withdrawn.

A few families had relied considerably on Respite Care, using the service as often as it was available to them, but although most of the 19 users reported using Respite Care on at least two or three occasions, there were six families who had only had one Respite Care weekend, in some cases several years ago.

The numbers using some form of Adult Daycare service were small, a total of six, and only two had attended on more than one day a week. One person had left because of changed circumstances. The number of playgroup attenders was also small, all being past users, with three of the four using the playgroup two days a week. A total of 21 people had attended holiday playschemes/summer adult activities at Beech House. A total of five families found themselves ineligible for
the playschemes, due to the application of catchment area rules, although the Beech House playschemes had been used in the past.

The staff-run clubs and the Befriending Scheme had catered only for small numbers and had ceased to operate by mid-1986. Attendance at the care mornings seems to have been only occasional for the majority of the 11 users, and the current service had also ceased by the time the interview programme finished.

The volunteer-run leisure services

The great majority of the 24 different families using the Disco, Youth Club and Saturday Club were Society members. Four families had used all three services at least once, five had used two of the services and the remaining 15 had used only one. At least nine families had ceased to use one of these three services. In one case this was due to changed home circumstances but for the rest the provision had been judged unsuitable by the family or the service had not fitted into the family routine, or the person concerned had been considered unsuitable for the Youth Club, which had operated certain eligibility rules.

Routines for obtaining a service

Where relevant, parents were asked to describe how they arranged to obtain services on a routine basis, as distinct from the initial introduction to Beech House. The responses showed that, where services were such that parents could take the initiative in approaching a service, there was great variation in behaviour within both members and non-members.

Most of the families using Home Care and Sitting-in made their arrangements directly with the service supervisors, initiating the contact themselves. Some had a different approach, however. One parent waited for the Home Care staff to get in touch to ask if help was needed, as the family was reluctant to ask for a service they believed to be short-staffed. Six families had some sort of standing arrangement for either Sitting-in (three families) or Home Care (three families). There did not appear to be any notable differences between Society members and non-members in the routines used for obtaining Home Care and Sitting-in.

Parents generally waited for the standard invitations to be issued for holiday playschemes, but one family who wished to ensure they could use the service on specific days took the initiative themselves. The few parents who had required adult summer activities for their handicapped family member had made an approach themselves.

Of the 19 families using the formal Respite Care service, 13 had used it more than once. Five of these families (four Society members, one non-member) approached the service organizer to ask for respite care, after the first use of the service. The remaining eight families (five Society members, three non-members) had adopted the practice of waiting to be asked by the service organizer if they needed respite care. This was a practice which contrasted with the initiative taken by most users of Home Care and Sitting-in in requesting these services.

Parents did not need to decide whether to wait to be invited individually to such services as occasional care mornings, volunteer-run leisure activities, parents evenings etc. as these were advertised generally in the Newsletter. However, Society members tended to respond far more than non-members to such general invitations.

Availability of services

Parents were asked about their experiences of the availability of various services, in terms of the extent to which requests for services had been refused, and whether they had always been able to have as much as they asked for, at the
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times required. Any remembered instances of services being refused were recorded, as were any examples the parents recalled of alternative, substitute services being offered.

Home Care
The majority of the 27 users of Home Care had experienced no problems of availability, with some parents stressing that they asked for little anyway, but 11 families had some problems in obtaining the service. For example, one family had been refused a request for a specific type of assistance on the grounds that it was for the parents' benefit rather than that of the handicapped person, an argument the parents did not accept. One parent had been disappointed when asking for help at short notice, while understanding the reason for refusal. Four parents had on at least one occasion been asked to use the Sitting-in service instead of Home Care, because of pressure on the latter service. One family, with a standing arrangement for a period, had found the hours unsuitable but had been told this was the only time available. Three parents had found the Home Care service they had been using had to be reduced for a period or withdrawn permanently. One parent had understood that the reason was pressure on Home Care, the others seemed unclear as to why the service had been removed. In each case the impact of service reduction or withdrawal had been considerable.

Other direct care services
Of the 18 users of the Sitting-in service, three families had been refused help on at least one occasion when requests had been made at short notice, and a fourth had been asked to use an alternative service provided by Beech House. Four of the 19 users of Respite Care had experienced some problems of availability, e.g. because dates requested were already booked, or cancellation due to staffing problems. It should be recalled that the majority of users had never been refused because they waited for invitations to use the service.

Four parents said they had experienced problems with the availability of staff-provided services for adults, due to the withdrawal of the normal Adult Daycare service in the summer, to the limited Beech House provisions available in day centre holidays to those who normally attended a day centre, to the restricted opening hours of the Adult Daycare service, and to the limitations on the number of days a week the handicapped person could attend Beech House.

One family would have liked a second day each week at the playgroup for their child, in addition to the one day a week provided, but had been refused for a reason the family accepted. Five families who had used the summer holiday play scheme in the past had found themselves outside the catchment area for future playschemes when the new rules were introduced, and referred by Beech House to playschemes organized elsewhere. The demise of the care mornings and of the Befriending Scheme were seen as problems of availability by two families.

Volunteer-run leisure activities
Only one family mentioned a refusal of one of these services, occurring in the period before the Youth Club eligibility rules were changed.

Overall, 25 of the 36 families concerned (15 out of 23 Society members, 10 out of 13 non-members) had experienced some form of problem of availability in connection with at least one service, with non-members somewhat more likely to experience such problems than Society members. Although the number of families experiencing problems of availability was small for each of the services mentioned, there were cases where the consequences of refusal, as experienced by families, should not be underestimated.
References have already been made to the fact that parents do not necessarily ask for the services they feel they need. From observation, the research worker had formed the impression that problems of availability of services were not confined to those families experiencing some form of refusal of a service. The interview programme confirmed that for some families a process of self imposed rationing was operating, with respect to certain services. This issue is discussed below.

Self-rationing

Parents were asked "Do you feel free to approach Beech House as often as you would like, to request this service or do you 'ration' yourselves? If the latter, can you say why you feel this way?"

A majority of users interviewed ie. 23 out of 36 (15 out of 23 Society members and 8 out of 13 non-members), said they did ration themselves to some degree at least with respect to one or more of the services where 'rationing' was applicable. The proportions adopting this approach were very similar for both members and non-members. Six families made comments about both Home Care and Sitting-in to the effect that they did not ask for as much help from these services as they would like to do. A typical remark was: "I feel guilty about asking for too much because I always feel someone else needs it more than you do. Then there are the emergencies when it's last minute and you can't really ask and they wouldn't be able to find anyone in time anyway".

Some parents could recall particular instances eg. a short holiday away, or a period in hospital, or a need for a regular arrangement, where they had made a conscious decision not to ask for Home Care/Sitting-in.... "I realized it would take all the hours of four Home Care Assistants for a week". "I didn't want to be a nuisance. I wasn't sure it was the sort of thing they could do, looking after X while my husband was at work and I was in hospital".

Remarks about the needs of other families were quite frequently made: "Other families might need 'one-off' help and be denied it because Beech House had made a regular commitment to me". "I was worried about how much we needed when others needed it too".

One family decided to start using a Social Services-provided respite care service, to avoid too much reliance on Beech House Home Care and Sitting-in services.

A further six families referred to rationing their requests for Home Care, as distinct from Sitting-in. One of these always waited to be asked if they needed help by the Home Care organizers, while a second family said they had recently adopted this practice after being made aware of the amount of demand for the Home Care service. Again, references to the needs of other families were common...."You can't ask for a free service on demand. If it is given to us it is not given to someone else". "I always feel I must ration myself. It is such a good service. You don't want to abuse it. Other people need it as well".

There were those who felt unhappy about asking for help, or for help of a particular type from Home Care:- "You don't like to ask people to do skivvying for you and you don't ask unless you are desperate as there are families who need help more". "I feel guilty about asking for help. I don't like putting on people".

Respite Care was the other service which promoted a self-imposed rationing response from parents. Thirteen families used this approach to Respite Care, the majority (eight) never asking for the service but waiting for an invitation. No family asked for as much of this service as they would have liked. Even those who were prepared to ask for respite care said they wished they could have more, and felt they could not ask often for this service. On parent remarked: "I have only asked about once a year. I feel there are a lot of others who need it. I did ring
and ask if there was anything available this year. I know they have problems fitting people in."

Again, there were references to restraint because of an appreciation of the limited places and the needs of others. One family, however, aware that some families used the Respite Care service more frequently than others, described having feelings of jealousy about those who used the service regularly.

One parent, a Society member, was reluctant to ask for Respite Care because of fears about being unable to afford the 'hotel fee' for the weekend. The family had not discussed these worries with Beech House and seemed unaware that the Project could offer financial help in such situations. Two families had developed a practice of using statutory service respite care provisions in order not to add to the demands on the Beech House service. As one remarked: "We don't ask for Respite Care as we know how much pressure there is on that service and we have alternatives we can use".

Within the group of non-members interviewed were three families who could not be said to have made a conscious decision to wait for an invitation to use Respite Care. Two of these had used the service but from their comments it was clear they did not know it was possible to make a request for the service. "I didn't really know you could approach them. I thought you had to wait for them to ask you".

The third family had never used Respite Care at Beech House because it had not occurred to them to do so. Although aware of Beech House since it opened they had never approached it for help of any kind and had only used the Home Care service at the suggestion of a social worker.

A fourth non-member family hoped to use Respite Care at Beech House in future but it was clear they did not know how to go about achieving this. At the time of interview the future of the service was in the balance and the family was aware of the financial crisis through local press coverage. They asked the research worker "How will we know when it starts again?" The family lived a long way from Beech House and had never received the Newsletter.

Overall, therefore, Society members were as likely as non-members to exercise some form of self-imposed rationing regarding the Respite Care service. What did emerge in the non-members' group was the existence of both misapprehension and a lack of information about Respite Care and/or Beech House in general which may well have acted as a further source of restraint on the demand for Respite Care, in addition to the operation of consciously self-imposed rationing by parents.

The only other example of self-imposed rationing offered by parents concerned transport. One Society member of long standing, who did not possess a car, explained the lack of attendance at parents' meetings and lack of use of volunteer-run leisure activities in terms of transport problems. The parent had made a conscious decision not to ask Beech House for transport because of the high value this parent placed on independence.

The same emphasis on the desire to remain independent was found in the responses of some of the 13 families who had not consciously rationed their use of Beech House services in some way. (ie. eight members, five non-members). While there were included in this group a few whose need for Respite Care had not been expressed due to misapprehensions and lack of information about service provision, there were also examples of parents who took pride in asking very little of Beech House, stressing that they could manage without much outside help. One or two families had help from relatives such that little assistance from Beech House was necessary. Only three families said they felt no need to ration their use of any Beech House services without adding a qualifying comment about how little they actually used or needed. As one remarked: "No, I don't feel I have to ration myself. I feel free to ask for help. I feel at ease. I know most of the staff, and X has been going there for so long...."
To summarize the findings on self-imposed rationing by parents, it did appear that the majority of families were making a conscious decision to ration their use of at least one of the services they used, either by waiting for staff to approach them, or by restricting the number of requests made. Overall, the proportions operating some form of rationing were very similar for both members and non-members. The services which elicited this response from parents were Home Care, Sitting-in and Respite Care. In the latter case, no family felt able to ask for the amount of Respite Care they would have liked, and the majority of those who had used the service more than once waited to be asked rather than taking the initiative. What did emerge from comments on Respite Care was the existence of a small group of non-members who were very vague or ill-informed about the way the service operated. Consumers cannot identify specific problems of availability or operate self-imposed rationing procedures if they do not know the services exist or if they do not request a service because they do not know how to or because they feel somehow these services are not meant for them. It was therefore thought useful to record during the interviews any such examples of confusion about the services provided by Beech House. These are discussed below.

Parents' knowledge of the Beech House services

Four families (all non-members) had never received the Newsletter, and one Society member only received the Newsletter about once every six months. These families thus lacked easy access to news of service developments, and to information on arrangements for parents' evenings, the details of volunteer-run leisure activities etc., especially as these families all lived at a considerable distance from Beech House.

The great majority of those interviewed did receive the Newsletter, and 23 of the interviewees were Society members, some of long-standing. It would be wrong to assume on this basis, though, that most users were well-informed about the range of available services. This was not the case. The existence of a great deal of misinformation and ignorance concerning Beech House came to light in responses to interview questions, especially regarding a request to parents to say which services on a list of those available had been used by the family. The research worker was surprised to find that many respondents needed to ask questions about the services she identified, concerning how they could obtain this service, the names of organizers, whether payment was involved. Others had simply not been aware of the existence of various Beech House services. The research worker kept a record of all such comments.

Eleven of the families interviewed (ie. eight of the 23 Society members and three of the 13 non-members) could be described as apparently well-informed about the services provided by Beech House, as discussion on the list of available services elicited no questions or comments demonstrating confusion or lack of knowledge about the range of services and access thereto. The remaining 25 (69.4%) families interviewed did exhibit some lack of understanding of the available provisions.

The existence of a degree of ignorance about the operation of the Respite Care service has already been identified. Further examples of parents' lack of knowledge of this service emerged in the course of the interview programme, in addition to the assumption that one could not ask for Respite Care but had to wait to be invited. For example, one family (Society members) had not realized a week's holiday for children would be available for the first time in the summer of 1987. At the time of the interview the week was already fully booked. Another Society member was surprised to find it was possible for children to stay at Beech House for Respite Care weekends, having believed only adults could use the
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service. Another parent, also a member of the Society, who felt the activities arranged for the mentally handicapped family member during a Respite Care weekend had been unsuitable had nevertheless not raised the matter with Beech House saying it was not right to criticise "...because they are all voluntary, aren't they?". The parent was surprised to be told of the existence and role of paid staff.

Four families (3 society members, 1 non-member) were confused about the operation of Home Care and Sitting-in, unclear about the distinction between the two forms of service and/or vague about the rules relating to obtaining the services. A fifth family (non-members) only discovered the existence of the Sitting-in service from the writer.

Thirteen families (six Society members, seven non-members) did not know of the Befriending Scheme although an article on this new service had appeared prominently in the Newsletter in January, 1987. Two families who had had some contact with Beech House about the scheme continued to be unclear about how it was supposed to work. This was a service only recently introduced at the time of the interviews, and already in demise due to the departure of the staff-member responsible. Small numbers of families did not know about the existence of a range of other services, including the long-established Youth Club, Saturday Afternoon Club, Adult Daycare and The Information/Welfare Rights service.

In other cases, parents seemed to have misconceptions about the services available. One parent (Society member) believed that both holiday playschemes and Adult Daycare were capable of responding to emergencies, and could take in people for odd days or cope with the one-off request. Another family had assumed their handicapped family member could not use the Adult Daycare service because they had no car. They did not know Beech House could make arrangements for transport.

Some examples of general lack of information about Beech House were also identified, in addition to confusion/ignorance about specific services. A number of non-members seemed particularly ill-informed. Four of these were the families not receiving the Newsletter, but there were five other families who did receive it who still seemed greatly lacking in information. One of these living a considerable distance from Beech House and with no car, made the following comments: "We don't really know what they do at Beech House... We did go to the Saturday Club once for a look around"... "We don't really know what is going on about opportunities for parents to get together with staff"... "Our only contact with the Society is the Newsletter. We would like to know more about what the Society does. No one tells us what else goes off".

Another family from whom Home Care had been withdrawn, seemed very vague about the other services it might be possible for them to use. They did not receive the Newsletter and said: "We don't really have any contact with Beech House now we don't have Home Care any more". They asked the research worker how they might get information on other relevant services. Although this family appeared to be experiencing some substantial problems they did not seem to have considered contacting Beech House again to ask for help.

One parent, explaining that the family had never visited Beech House, asked the writer to describe whereabouts it was situated. For several of the non-member families, the distance which they lived from Beech House, combined with transport problems, seemed to have contributed considerably to their lack of familiarity with Beech House and the services provided there.

Five parents made specific comments about the funding of Beech House indicating misconceptions which could well affect the views parents held of their experiences of Beech House. The example of the parent who refused to criticise the Respite Care service because of a belief that staff were unpaid has already been mentioned. Another example of such misconception was the parent with the
mistaken impression that some Beech House services were questionable because they were staffed by 'YTS youngsters'.

With regard to the relationship between Beech House and the Society, all but one of the 36 parents interviewed were aware that the Project was a non-statutory service. All the Society members knew of the responsibility of the local Society for the running of Beech House, together with five of the 13 non-members. The remaining non-member families were more vague about the organization responsible for Beech House. However, four of these were able to give an approximation of the name, a fifth proffering a hesitant suggestion. Four non-member families did not receive the Newsletter. Of these, two knew only that some sort of voluntary organization ran Beech House, and the third appeared to know nothing about the organization of Beech House saying, when prompted, "The Society? We have never heard of them".

To summarize the findings on the parents' knowledge of the Beech House services, the interview programme revealed an unexpectedly high degree of ignorance and misconception among both non-members and Society members, even including some of those parents initially involved in establishing Beech House. This was true not only for services recently introduced, but also for the long established services, especially Respite Care. This lack of information and/or the existence of misconceptions seemed rather more pronounced for non-members and suggests some reason for the differences in patterns of service use of members and non-members. The distance from Beech House to the homes of many non-members, combined for some with transport problems and/or non-receipt of the Newsletter may offer at least partial explanation for the confusion and lack of knowledge of this group of users. The same factors probably contributed to the lack of knowledge exhibited by some families, especially among the non-members, regarding the funding of Beech House and the role of the Society as the body responsible for the Project.

Use of statutory services and other voluntary services

In interview, parents were asked about the place of Beech House provisions in the total network of services used by the family. The particular statutory and voluntary services used in addition to Beech House were identified. The role of the various Beech House services used was then considered, to establish whether the family was using a service to supplement external services (where an acceptable statutory/voluntary service equivalent exists but not in sufficient quantity) or complement external services (where Beech House provides a distinctive service with no statutory/voluntary equivalent in the local area) or in preference to an external service (where an equivalent service exists but is judged unacceptable by the parents and/or the user).

All the families were relying on services other than Beech House, especially statutory services eg. through the receipt of financial benefits, the use of long-term residential facilities, attendance of the handicapped person at school/college/day centre. Beech House could not offer a totally comprehensive service to families in the sense of providing for all the educational/development/employment/financial/social and accommodation needs of handicapped people of all ages. Inevitably, families used Beech House in conjunction with other services, statutory and voluntary.

An examination of the place of the Beech House services in the total network of services, statutory and voluntary, used by the families showed the extent to which certain Beech House services had no statutory or voluntary equivalent while the existence of other Beech House services permitted families a degree of choice in service use.
Home Care and Sitting-in

Home Care and Sitting-in, the former being the direct care service used by the greatest number of families interviewed and the latter by half the families interviewed, had no statutory or voluntary equivalents in the area. These services were distinctive and could be described as 'complementary' to external services. No other Beech House services could be distinguished quite so clearly from external provisions, apart from the Newsletter, which was the official publication of the Society.

Holiday playschemes

The Beech House holiday playschemes were a special case. There was no statutory or voluntary equivalent available within the official catchment area which operated simultaneously with the Beech House playscheme. A local special school provided accommodation for a parent-run playscheme which took place in the first two weeks of the summer holidays, before Beech House playscheme began, thus allowing those families who wished to use both playschemes. The application by the funding authorities of geographical catchment area rules, meant that seven families interviewed became ineligible for the Beech House summer playscheme, although five of these had used this service in the past. Several families expressed their unhappiness with the local summer playschemes, some organized by statutory service professionals, which they were now expected to use. One family did not know how to establish whether or not they lived within the Beech House playscheme catchment area. Those families outside the catchment area had thus been denied access to a Beech House services they would have been free to use in the past.

The Easter playscheme seemed to have more opportunity to take children from outside the catchment area than had the summer playscheme, but because of the former's brief duration some parents did not seek to use it and the Easter playscheme did not appear to have the significance for parents of the long summer playscheme.

The Playgroup

During the course of the research the Beech House playgroup also became a special case, in a similar way to the holiday playschemes. Prior to the implementation of joint finance, it could be argued that a statutory alternative to the playgroup had existed in that the local special school had accepted children from the age of two years, sometimes on a part-time basis. There were cases among the families interviewed where children had, at least for a time, attended both the special school and the Beech House playgroup. After the implementation of joint finance came the official ruling that children under 3 years should attend Beech House and children over 3 years should attend the special school. Thus, families lost the opportunity for choice which had existed beforehand, with the Beech House playgroup becoming formally 'complementary' to statutory provision in the local special school, rather than a 'supplementary' service (in that parents could use both together, where the days available in the two organizations did not clash) or an alternative service (in that parents could choose to use one or the other).

Throughout the research a voluntary counterpart to the Beech House playgroup did exist i.e. a Red Cross creche, approximately 10 miles away. This, however, was only open for two mornings a week. Four of the families interviewed had used the creche at the same time as their children had attended the Beech House playgroup, thus treating the two services as supplementary to each other.

One family had found a place in an ordinary day nursery for their child and had not needed the Beech House playgroup. One parent was using a local 'Mums and Toddlers' group and had not approached the Beech House playgroup, believing
transport problems would prevent the child attending. One family had ceased to use Beech House on obtaining a place in a statutory-run nursery which was more suited to the child's particular needs.

A range of other services provided by Beech House did have some statutory and/or voluntary counterparts also available to families i.e. leisure activities, care mornings, the Befriending Scheme, parents' meetings, the Information/Welfare Rights service, Adult Daycare and Respite Care. Through interview, it was possible to establish whether families were using Beech House in addition to these external services, or instead of these services, or whether any of these external services were used by parents in preference to Beech House.

**Leisure services**

In the field of leisure activities, Beech House provided the staff-initiated childrens' clubs, of limited duration, and the long-established volunteer-run activities. It could be argued that certain aspects of the Beech House leisure provisions were distinctive in nature e.g. the scale and regularity of the monthly Disco, and the exclusive character of the 7 - 11 Club. However, many of the families interviewed chose to use leisure activities provided by external agencies, these being almost wholly voluntary, sometimes in addition to using the Beech House leisure services, but sometimes in preference to them.

Six families made use of leisure services provided by voluntary organizations as well as using at least some of the Beech House leisure activities. Four of these families belonged to the same voluntary group for handicapped people. Two people were attending a disabled swimming group. One person was attending a local Youth Club but travelled to Beech House for the Saturday Club. Another attended a local Youth Club as well as attending the Beech House Youth Club and other leisure services. One person was attending a 'special needs' evening group at a community college, initiated by statutory service staff, as well as using some of the Beech House leisure services.

Seven families were using alternative leisure services in preference to Beech House. All these alternatives were provided by other voluntary organizations. Two people were attending a local Youth Club Club instead of the Beech House Youth Club. Three families belonged to the same group for handicapped people already mentioned. One family had chosen to use local church-based groups instead of Beech House. One family preferred to use the opportunities available to them through a local group for people with a particular handicap.

Eleven families had used only Beech House leisure activities, all but one of these being Society members, and a twelfth family had briefly tried one voluntary organization's leisure provisions, since when Beech House had been their only source of such services. It cannot be assumed that all these families had consciously chosen to use Beech House leisure activities in preference to others available, since it is possible that opportunities for leisure activities elsewhere did exist, but the families were unaware of them.

It is clear that families varied considerably in the role occupied by Beech House leisure activities in their respective networks of services used. From the families' responses it appeared that at least 13 families had perceived alternative leisure opportunities to those of Beech House and had made choices about whether to use these in addition to the Beech House provisions or instead of the Beech House provisions. There were, however, one or two cases where the ability to choose had not existed because the families concerned had used an external source of leisure activity while being ignorant of what Beech House provided in this field.

One service associated with leisure activities is the provision of holidays away for the handicapped individual, and the provision of holidays which can also involve the parents, together with their handicapped family member. This was an
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area where the day centres and special schools had traditionally been active, as had certain voluntary organizations, national and local. Seventeen families had benefited from such provision and others expected to do so in the future as their children grew older. Although the Beech House Youth Club occasionally organized a weekend trip away, the paid staff had never become involved in providing holidays away on any scale, although occasional help may have been provided to mentally handicapped people in the community in the making of holiday arrangements. Thus, this was an area where Beech House had played no significant role and parents found such services elsewhere.

Befriending Scheme and Care Mornings

The short-lived Beech House 'care mornings' and 'Befriending Scheme' seemed to have some form of counterpart in the services already provided by the local group for handicapped people to which several families belonged. The local voluntary group had been in existence for several years, operating a 'special visitor' scheme and other provisions which could both involve parents and given them a break. Two families were found to have used the Beech House care mornings and/or the Befriending Scheme in addition to belonging to the local voluntary group for handicapped people. One family seemed to have used Beech House for such services after operating a conscious preference, but it was not possible to draw the same conclusion for other families who used these Beech House services and did not belong to the voluntary group for handicapped people, for not all families knew of the latter's existence.

Parents' meetings/parents' groups

Opportunities for parents to get together for support/information/pressure group/social purposes had not been provided in a consistent way at Beech House for service users in general for more than the limited period when a programme of parents evenings was organized by staff in 1986. The Saturday Club, which seemed to attract older parents, was seen as a social/leisure activity rather than a parents' support group, though it may have played a mutual support role for some participants. Formally constituted 'parents' support groups' were in existence in the area during the course of the research, two of these initiated in recent months by statutory service workers. Five or six families were becoming actively involved in such groups at the time of the interviews, with some parents participating in a 'spin-off' group for mothers of younger children, organized on a 'drop-in' basis.

This seemed to be an example of statutory and voluntary efforts directed towards developing a form of service which was not available at Beech House.

Information/Welfare Rights

The Information/Welfare Rights service did have statutory counterparts providing a similar service, including professional service workers in various fields eg. social work, health visiting, who provided advice on a range of topics to families. Nine families recalled using statutory sources for such matters as information on benefits, obtaining help from the Family Fund etc. as well as using the Beech House service. In one of these cases the Beech House service had recommended the family to use the Social Services Department Welfare Rights service, after an initial approach to the former. Two families who had used both forms of enquiry service had operated a division of labour, using Beech House for general enquiries and/or specific issues such as 'wills and trusts' and using statutory sources for advice on financial benefit claims. Five families had used only a statutory enquiry service, one after recommendation by Beech House, one preferring to rely on a social worker and three because they did not know a Beech House enquiry service existed. Of the 13 families remaining who had used the Beech House Information/Welfare Rights service, none recalled using other
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external enquiry services. Several families had, however, only used the Beech House service once. One family voiced a conscious preference for the Beech House enquiry service, seeing the only statutory alternative as the DHSS, an organization they were unwilling to approach for advice.

Overall, therefore, the majority of users of the Beech House Information/Welfare Rights service used no statutory alternative in addition, though a sizeable minority did do so. Of the small group who had used only statutory sources of this type of service, some did so in ignorance of the existence of such a service at Beech House. This was not a type of service to which parents seemed to feel the need for frequent access. Few families had used the Beech House service on more than two or three occasions, and five or six had used it only once, perhaps over a period of several years.

Adult Daycare

This service provided approximately 25 places for three days each week, the majority of users attending for only one day a week. In this sense, therefore, it is not comparable with the five day a week service provided by the day centres. However, there were five families interviewed whose handicapped member had attended Beech House for daycare in preference to attending a day centre, perhaps because the person concerned had been unhappy at the day centre, perhaps because parents were convinced of the unsuitability of the day centre for their son/daughter. To such families, the limited amount of daycare provision at Beech House was preferable to the day centre service. In these cases, the Beech House service was seen by families as a genuine alternative, a substitute for a statutory service with which they were dissatisfied. It was possible for people to attend both Beech House and a day centre, thus reducing the number of days each week spent at the day centre, or for the person to attend only for Beech House daycare. Examples of both approaches were found, but where the two forms of daycare were used together, Beech House was seen as a substitute for rather than a supplement to statutory services. There were, among the families interviewed, eight people attending a day centre who did not also attend daycare at Beech House. From these parents' comments, it seemed that Beech House was not seen as a viable alternative to the day centre provision for their mentally handicapped family members at the time of the interviews, although there were cases where considerable reservations about day centre services were expressed by parents.

Respite Care

This service is the final example of services with a statutory/voluntary equivalent available to families, and is also the most complex regarding parents' views of the place of this Beech House service in the total network of provisions, due to the range of alternatives available and the number of families involved. Parents varied in their perceptions of the Beech House Respite Care service, with some treating it as a supplement to existing statutory services, some using it instead of statutory services, and others having developed routines for using only statutory services because, for various reasons, they preferred these to using Beech House. A small number of parents perceived the holidays and weekend trips etc. organized by the local voluntary group for handicapped people as a form of respite care, and equated this service with the Beech House provisions, thus extending the range of respite care choices available.

Twelve families had developed a practice of relying on respite care services other than Beech House, mainly from statutory sources. One further family had used statutory service funds to purchase private respite care. Five of these thirteen families had used Beech House Respite Care provisions in the past, but had decided not to do so in the future. A sixth family had relied on other sources
because at the time respite care was required, Beech House only provided the service on an occasional basis.

There remained seven families in this group who had always relied on sources of respite care other than Beech House, these sources being mainly statutory but in one case holidays away for the handicapped person organized by a voluntary organization were defined as a form of respite care by the family. Five families, for various reasons, preferred not to use Beech House Respite Care service, and in the cases of two families who had not been invited to use the Beech House provision, it seemed the possibility of asking for this service had not occurred to these parents.

Seven families had developed the practice of only using Beech House Respite Care service, with an eighth family having used a service provided on a voluntary basis through a member of the Beech House staff. Several of these families had had experience of statutory respite care provisions in the past and had decided not to use these in the future.

Seven families used a combination of Beech House Respite Care service and statutory forms of respite care, thus using Beech House to supplement existing, equivalent services.

**Parental evaluation of Beech House**

The family survey indicated a high degree of ignorance and misconception on the part of both Society members and non-members with regard to both Beech House in general and the services provided. While this was most pronounced for non-members, a few of whom had no knowledge of the parent-led origins of the Beech House service, there were also five members of the Executive Committee who, although they were involved in Beech House both in service management and as service users, demonstrated a lack of knowledge or some confusion about the actual services provided eg. arrangements for obtaining Respite Care, the distinction between Home Care and Sitting-in. Thus, the confusion and ignorance of parents about available services, identified for example by Glendinning (1983) with regard to statutory provisions, can also exist in relation to a voluntary service, even one initiated and led by parents.

The general lack of awareness of the full range of available services and the mistaken impressions of the way services operated must inevitably have been an influence not only on the way families made use of the services, but also on their evaluations of the services they used. This must be borne in mind during the following account of parental evaluations of Beech House services.

**Survey findings on opportunities for contacts with the Society, other parents and staff**

No formal 'users' or 'consumers' groups existed for Beech House service users, either parents or mentally handicapped people themselves. Families could join the Society if they wished, with the possibility thereby of influencing service management through the formal channel of elections to the Executive Committee. Observation of two Society AGMs suggested that few 'ordinary' Society members took advantage of this opportunity.

For non-members (the great majority of service users) there remained the possibility of influencing services through a limited range of formally-instituted procedures ie. the Programme Planning/Review procedures (described in Chapter 6), the single Open Day organized in the autumn of 1985, and the formal feedback system, employing questionnaires, introduced in 1986 for the holiday playschemes.

There were also possibilities of parent users bringing informal pressure to bear on the staff and/or the Executive Committee. Contacts between parents may
generate pressure-group activity and influence services. Contacts at an informal level between individual parents and members of the Executive or between parents and members of staff may allow parents opportunities to influence services. In addition to these 'consumer' activities, parents may also wish to have informal contacts with staff simply to get to know those who are providing the services. They may also value opportunities to meet other parents for mutual support and to exchange information. That some parents sought more from Beech House than the provision of direct services was borne out by the responses of the 14 parents who were in a position to comment on what their expectations of Beech House had been at the time it opened. Almost half the responses indicated that the parents concerned had had no firm, preconceived ideas. Seven families had hoped among other things, for specific services such as playschemes and short-term respite care, with one parent wishing to see Beech House as the base for doctors clinics for children. Two families had thought little further than Beech House as a headquarters for the Youth Club. Six parents had clearly wanted something more than service provision from Beech House, for five parents expressed a desire for some sort of centre which they felt would belong to the users, in addition to specifying some hoped - for services, while a sixth parent had not anticipated anything more than a social centre. The value placed on parental involvement, and on opportunities for mutual support as referred to by Ayer and Alaszewski (1984) was apparent here among these long-standing members: "We wanted a total centre, families using it in the daytime, very much as a community centre". "I wanted a family and friends I wouldn't otherwise have, an opportunity to be with people who understand, people who can share my experiences... I wanted it for my child for the future, group activities, a drop-in point to have a cup of tea". "I wanted a flexible service, responding to individuals' needs and families' needs, one that I felt I owned, not rigid like statutory services. I wanted opportunities for parents - any parent with a problem - to be involved, and opportunities for mentally handicapped people themselves to be involved". "At that time we needed a creche and somewhere for parents to meet informally. We wanted somewhere to take our problems where we could ring up and know we wouldn't be fobbed off".

How, then, did the parents interviewed feel about the provisions available through Beech House for involvement and contacts of the type described, as distinct from the provision of specific services?

Contacts with the Society

None of the non-member families seemed to have any contact with the Society. Some had never thought about the issue and five families emphasized that they did not want to get involved. Some non-members were unaware of the role of the Society in relation to Beech House. To one family, it was their local parents' support group, rather than the Society, which was relevant to their needs because of the distance from Beech House of the family's home. There were, however, four non-member families who would have liked more contact with the Society in spite of the fact that they lived at a distance.

The responses of the ordinary Society members indicated that for most of them there was minimal contact with the Society, mainly through the Newsletter. One of these parents expressed a desire for more social activity based on the Society but generally the lack of contact did not seem to be a matter of concern. One parent commented on the importance of knowing the Society was there: "Contact isn't important to us, but the back-up is, knowing that it's there. We don't have much contact"

Members of the Executive seemed to have contacts mainly with each other. For some this was, though a matter of regret, inevitable. There were comments on
the pressures on time, the need for parents to arrange substitute care in order to participate in outside activities and the 'terrible apathy' of parents generally.

In the event of worries over the Beech House services, nonmembers and ordinary Society members would choose to approach staff rather than the Society, while members of the Executive were far more inclined to raise such matters with the Chairman or in Committee.

Overall therefore, apart from Executive members, there was little enthusiasm among users for taking advantage of either the formal opportunity offered by the Society to participate in service management, or for the use of informal contacts with members of the Executive to influence the services provided. Half the non-members had no interest in contacts with the Society and most ordinary members were satisfied with minimal contact. Even so, this means there were a few families who felt something was lacking in this area of their relationship with Beech House.

Contacts between parents

Some members of the Executive were pessimistic about the chances of involving more parents in organized activities. The Executive members themselves were far more likely than ordinary Society members and non-members to participate in activities such as parents' evenings and the Saturday Club, which provided opportunities for parents to meet together. Seven Committee members said they did not know families other than fellow-members of the Executive. One member felt no need for such contacts and another, although the family had enjoyed contacts with other families in the past, doubted whether it was possible for the Society nowadays to provide the right environment: "Since Beech House started we miss the contact with families. We used to know everyone - now we don't. There are staff changes, people in the Society whose names we don't know. We feel alienated.... The influx of all the money has made it a business rather than a Society"

Another commented: "Parents don't get together. They have lost that strength now that they had. There is not enough contact between parents. ....There is no sense of belonging.... Why do people join the Society? Because there is something in it for them. Others join because of their youngsters. Beech House is still a somewhat exclusive service for those in the know"

During the interviews with non-Executive families there were a number of references to the benefits of parents meeting together. While some parents felt no need for more contacts than they already had, through schools or existing parents' support groups, and others said it was something they never thought about or did not want, there were seven families (three non-members and four ordinary Society members) who would have welcomed more opportunities to meet other parents through Beech House. One parent felt particularly strongly the need for mutual support and information: "I would have liked to have opportunities to meet other families. The Home Care Assistant kept saying she would introduce me to the mothers of other children with the same handicap but she never did and I wonder why. There could be a register with the type of handicap and you could have support from parents who have had the same experience".... ...."The Home Care Assistant was kind and caring but she had no idea what I was going through".

Two parents referred to the new parents support group at the local Community Council, seeing this as having advantages over Beech House as a basis for mutual support: "Someone was saying to the social worker that the new parents support group might 'take away' from Beech House. It's not intended to do that. There are many families who are not in the Society" and "If you are not careful, you end up belonging to groups for everything - a group for Beech House, a group for school - you go from one to another. I think it's better to have a parents' support group at (the Community Council) which can reach all the children not at school and ones with children at the day centre".
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One parent, a Society member, felt that this new group might help to overcome the feeling of division she had experienced, between parents living near Beech House and parents living away from the town:— "There is a general attitude that Beech House is for people in the town. The parents who use it act as if it is their own local service. Beech House is just not aware enough of this feeling. Not enough is known about Beech House beyond (nearby village).... The Parent Teachers Association at school has folded and there is no representative body of parents at the school. That's partly why this parents' support group started ...."

Nonetheless, although a small number of parents saw a need for parents' support groups based away from Beech House, over a quarter of the non-members and ordinary Society members interviewed wanted more opportunities through Beech House to meet other parents for mutual support purposes. The remainder, however, did not feel a need for more involvement in such activity through Beech House. In some cases, this was not because parents did not value such contacts but because they were satisfied with the contacts with parents provided by other sources. Beech House itself did not seem to be currently providing the opportunities for mutual support described by Ayer and Alaszewski (1984) or for 'reciprocity' as described by Glendinning (1983), except for a minority of respondents.

Contacts with staff

Parents' responses concerned opportunities for parents as individuals to discuss services with staff, and also opportunities for parents to get together as a group to do so.

There was some concern generally, Executive members included, about a lack of opportunity for individual contacts with staff, though there were some members of the Committee who felt parents did not want such contact. The non-member families seemed to have fewer reservations about the situation than the ordinary Society members. Only two non-members expressed dissatisfaction, in one case because of the problems of communicating by 'phone and in the other because of insufficient opportunity to talk in person to the staff providing the service they had used. One non-member family explained their lack of interest in opportunities to discuss services with staff as due to a desire to see services developed much nearer home than Beech House.

Rather more concern was expressed by the ordinary Society members. One regretted the lack of contact with Beech House since their child had left the playgroup, another was unhappy about the problems of communication due to staff turnover and a third felt the staff needed more knowledge of the home routine so that services delivered could be consistent with the approach adopted by parents. Two other families referred to problems of distance and transport affecting opportunities to discuss services with staff.

Individual contacts with staff seemed mostly related to enquiries, practical arrangements about services received etc. To the research worker, the majority of non-members and ordinary Society members seemed remote from Beech House although some users clearly did not feel so and found the contacts by 'phone and through the Newsletter to be sufficient.

Overall, about one-third of respondents had raised worries/criticisms with staff and with one or two exceptions had been happy with the response. However, two of the non-member parents stressed the way in which feelings of gratitude hampered the expression of critical comments to staff. In the words of one:— "Parents feel grateful for any service, so you don't pick holes in what's offered. You are just glad to have it".

The researcher noted that in some cases the reservations about services which parents expressed to the researcher had not been mentioned to staff. During the interviews the researcher was asked many questions about the availability of
services and the names of staff members who could be approached for information or in order to request services. Such questions were a further indication of the limited contacts between parents and staff, in general.

Few of the parents interviewed had had contacts with staff through Programme Planning Meetings and none had yet attended a Review. Overall, of the 36 families interviewed, only three of their mentally handicapped family members had been the subjects of Programme Planning. None of these was from a non-member family. The parents who had attended a Programme Planning meeting seemed to have valued the experience. Seven families had received invitations to participate in Reviews, during the interview period, but had not yet attended a Review meeting.

A small number of parents made favourable mention of the Open Day, one or two saying they would welcome more such occasions. One parent recalled being asked for comments on the holiday playschemes.

Overall, therefore, parent users as individuals had so far experienced little formal opportunity to discuss services with staff, while the use of informal opportunities for such discussion seemed to depend on a number of factors, including the quality of the individual relationship between a family and the Beech House staff, distance of the family home from Beech House, and the willingness of parents to voice criticisms to staff. The new Review system seemed to hold the promise of more involvement for parents than had been the case in the past. However, as yet, there seemed little evidence that the role of 'co-worker', advocated by Currer and Summerfield (1984) and Pahl and Quine (1984), was a reality for more than a minority of parent users of Beech House.

Parents' views varied regarding opportunities for parents to get together as a group and express their feelings about Beech House to staff. Several parents emphasized the problems of living at a distance from Beech House and their lack of knowledge of what went on there, although one Society member living near to Beech House expressed a similar lack of information and inability to comment. Six non-member families and five of the Society members either did not feel they needed such opportunities or thought the distance they lived from Beech House rendered such involvement too difficult/inappropriate. One of these parents, a non-member, commented: "I haven't been able to go to anything, but there is no need for me to go. I know Beech House so much, the staff, through the Newsletter. The staff tell me what's going on".

This experience contrasts with the isolation from Beech House expressed by another non-member parent:- "We don't know what's provided. We haven't heard and we are too far away anyway. Is anyone in a similar situation to us?"

The ordinary Society members were rather more concerned than the non-members about the lack of opportunity for parents as a group to meet the staff to discuss services. Five parents wanted to see more such opportunities, with one of these emphasizing the desirability of informal get-togethers with staff:- "We need more informal opportunities, for example parents meeting over a coffee, meeting the staff, not just Tupperware parties or fashion evenings or wine and cheese evenings. I like the idea of a 'Drop-in Night'. Playscheme mornings could be the basis for informal meetings...."

In addition to their views on opportunities for parents to discuss services with staff, parents were also asked to comment on the opportunities for mentally handicapped users of Beech House to express their own feelings about the services they used. The Executive members revealed mixed feelings on this issue. Four members were not sure how this could be achieved, while two felt that the handicapped users would voice their views anyway. One member saw more leisure activities as an appropriate channel, and another recommended 'listening' to what handicapped people talk about in their daily routine. One member did not know what existed at Beech House already. Only one parent had firm ideas on
introducing formal provisions for such involvement:— "Where is the voice of mentally handicapped people? I want to see a committee of users.... It must be recognized that it is a service not just for parents but for mentally handicapped people. It permeates the Executive... 'We are parents, we know best'."

Few of the non-members and ordinary Society members were able to comment on this topic. In one case, for example, the parents said they had no opinion because their own handicapped relative would be unable to express any view. Two Society members approved the idea of such opportunities but were vague about how this should be arranged. One parent was enthusiastic about the involvement of the mentally handicapped person in Programme Planning, after past experience of this. The remaining parents could not answer the question beyond indicating that they had not had the sort of association with Beech House which would allow them to comment.

The expectations of the 'founder-members'

Five of the 14 respondents who were founder members had recalled an initial desire for something more than the provision of services ie. that Beech House should be some sort of centre which would 'belong' to the users of services. A number of founder-members did stress how vague their initial expectations had been.

When asked if they could say how far their expectations had been fulfilled, two of the founder-members clearly felt that Beech House did 'belong' to them and gained satisfaction from what they saw as the fulfilment of an expectation, or an expectation exceeded. As one parent commented:— "It is just to know that there is somewhere to go. Before, there was nobody to turn to... Elsewhere, services are provided by the establishment. Beech House is unique, it comes from the parents".

Four other founder-members made comments suggesting at least some disappointment on the issue of opportunities for parental involvement although their expectations may have been exceeded in respect of service provision. One of these members expressed an additional concern about the lack of involvement of mentally handicapped people themselves:— "I want to see more involvement of parents and mentally-handicapped people as two separate groups with representation in the decision-making process".

Among other reservations was a concern with a separation seen to exist between the services provided by paid staff and those provided by Society members, and a belief that "Families have lost getting together to fight for things". One parent had not found at Beech House the hoped-for informal meeting-place for parents. Another parent referred to a change in the Society the family had known:— "Beech House is not what we really hoped for, but we support it. The Society is more remote now, it is 'them' rather than 'us'... It is hard for parents to identify with the Society rather than Beech House".

A fourth parent concluded:— "Mentally handicapped people have had so little you are grateful to have any service. I am not criticizing the way Beech House has developed - that's the way it works - but it hasn't become the sort of 'community centre' I envisaged".

However, in spite of disappointment in particular aspects of the development of Beech House, there was communicated by the founder-members in general a feeling of satisfaction that Beech House had been created and had survived. As one parent emphasized:— "Any criticisms are only on the margins. In spite of everything, Beech House is an example, a source of stability, a point of reference. Beech House is an important influence, by its very existence".
Appendix VII: The family survey

Survey findings on the provision of direct services by Beech House

Parents were asked a range of specific questions on the contribution made by the Beech House services to the support of the family and to the care of their mentally handicapped family member. Questions covered issues of benefits to the family and to the individual, quality of service, whether any mistakes or confusion had arisen in relation to service delivery, whether any changes in provision over time had been observed, whether the parents would like to see any improvements in services, and whether the families experienced any problems in caring with which Beech House had not been able to help.

It was obvious that many of the parents were unhappy at the thought that comments they made might be construed as criticisms of Beech House. Answers were prefaced by such remarks as "I do not want you to think I am criticizing" and "They are doing a wonderful job". The feeling of gratitude that Beech House exists and for what it has done is very powerful. However, some parents had experienced worries and disappointment over certain aspects of the services provided, even though they were sometimes reluctant to identify these lest they seem unappreciative.

The patterns of service use had varied widely for the families interviewed, both in the number of different services used and in the amount of a given service used. Three families had made minimal use of Beech House and explained this as due to the fact that they did not feel they needed much help. A further nine families had made relatively little use of services available. In some cases this was attributed to a strong desire to remain independent, even if a need was experienced. In other cases, services once received had been withdrawn and the parents seemed to feel unable to raise this situation with Beech House. There were also examples of the application of eligibility rules leading to the removal of services once received. There were several families, therefore, who had not found through Beech House the regular, reliable, relatively permanent services advocated by Bayley (1973).

The benefits of using the service

The responses of parents regarding the benefits of using the Beech House services were, in general, highly positive, with respect both to the parents and the mentally handicapped person. Parents made general comments about the use of a range of services and specific comments on services on which they had considerable reliance. The general comments stressed the relief of the pressure previously experienced by the parents:- "It wasn't until Beech House that we realized what a strain we were under". "I contrast the situation now with what was available when X was between 6 and 10. We could have done with these services when we were younger. I used to dread the thought of eight weeks summer holiday".

There were also references to the benefits of 'breathing space', parents having a break, time to themselves, time to go out or to concentrate on other children in the family, of knowing Beech House is there:- "You feel there is someone there if you need help, if there is a crisis there is always someone to talk to. It is nice to know the service is there and that I am familiar with the people".

The majority of parents interviewed had used the Home Care service (16 Society members, 11 non-members) or the Sitting-in service (11 Society members, 7 non-members). Seventeen of these families had used both services, and tended in their comments to consider the benefits of the two services jointly. There were many favourable assessments of the help received from these services by parents caring at home, both by families who relied on the service regularly and those who had used it for special occasions. Four parents referred to the fact that these services had allowed the mother of the family to continue working. Typical favourable comments were:- "Home Care - I hate to think how I would have managed
over the last two years without them... The physical care required is very demanding, lifting etc." "Home Care and Sitting-in means being able to go out and know X is looked after by someone who understands. We could have done with it years ago".

There were a number of parents who indicated that they valued the personal relationship with the Home Care workers and 'sitters' they had come to know.

Although, overall, families who used Home Care/Sitting-in expressed considerable enthusiasm for the help they had received there were a small but significant number of parents whose enthusiasm for Home Care was tempered by their experiences of withdrawal or reduction of this service. There were two Society members in this situation, but because of their use of other services they had remained in touch with Beech House. They seemed philosophical about the reasons why the service they received had been cut back, though this was a matter of regret to these parents. In contrast, three of the four non-member families who had been subject to total withdrawal of Home Care had used no other care services and seemed, at the time of interview, to be completely out of touch with Beech House and confused as to why this should be so. The fourth non-member family had been judged no longer eligible to use Beech House services and was thus denied access to both Home Care and Sitting-in. All these families had lost the benefits they had experienced while using Home Care/Sitting-in. The research worker was not able to discuss these cases with staff, to find why these situations had arisen, as this would have allowed the respondents to be identified. However, it was clear there were cases of families who, for some reason, had not received a regular, reliable, relatively permanent service from Beech House, although other families had done so.

Over half of the families interviewed had used Beech House Respite Care service at least once, and a similar proportion had used the holiday playschemes. Again, the comments made by users on these specific services were highly favourable, on the whole, with frequent references to the opportunities for a break which the services offered. Respite Care tended to elicit such comments as 'marvellous', 'a godsend', 'the first holiday in years' and 'excellent'. There was similar enthusiasm for the holiday playschemes, especially the relief to parents of knowing that the long summer holiday is catered for:- "I would go mad for six weeks in the summer without it. I can cope for four days a week but not for seven. X is hyperactive and destructive and gets me up at 4 am".

Again, as with Home Care/Sitting-in, there were a few references to the contribution made by the playscheme to helping mothers hold down jobs. However, the favourable comments of some users on the playscheme provisions were qualified by their exclusion from the service due to the imposition of eligibility rules based on catchment areas. While the parents of some of the five families involved seemed resigned to this situation and were prepared to use the alternatives offered locally, others rejected these alternatives as unsuitable, and found their exclusion from a Beech House service they had previously used very hard to accept.

Other services referred to by limited numbers of parents as being of particular benefit to them included the playgroup, Adult Daycare, occasional summer activities for adults, care mornings, the Information/Welfare rights service, and the volunteer-run leisure activities. Some of the parents of users of Adult Daycare saw that service as of benefit to the individual, rather than the parents. Among users of the Information/Welfare rights service were families who had been helped with some specific problem related to obtaining benefits. The Newsletter seemed to be generally regarded as useful, as a source of information on events and on particular topics, as a means of keeping in touch. However, there were a few parents for whom little that appeared in the Newsletter was new information and one parent remarked that the information on events was sometimes out of date by the time of publication.
Overall, therefore, apart from the qualifications specified, the services provided by Beech House appeared to be highly valued by those parents who had made sufficient use of the various services to be able to assess the benefits they had received. However, the cases of families where a valued service had been withdrawn deserve special note.

The praise which the services attracted in relation to benefits to parents was echoed with regard to benefits to the individual, as perceived by parents. Again, there were situations where service use had been only recent or minimal, but the great majority of parents made positive assessments of the benefits of the Beech House services for their handicapped family members. There were numerous references to the development of independence, the desirability of mixing with people outside the family, the evidence of enjoyment of activities provided during Respite Care, Adult Daycare, playschemes, through the leisure services etc. Some handicapped individuals had established relationships with staff or other users of Beech House from which they gained satisfaction. One parent emphasized the benefit to the handicapped family member of the support provided for parents by Beech House:—"Generally, X benefits because the services mean we parents get support and that makes us better able to look after X. It means we are able to cope with difficult situations".

Only one parent judged that the use of Beech House services, while they benefited the family, did not benefit the handicapped family member in any way..."I don't feel Y benefits. Y is not fully aware of the environment. Y is not pleased to see me when we return home (after Respite Care). Y is happy as long as being fed".

The overall picture is one of enthusiasm for valued services on which both parents and their handicapped family members had come to depend, and which were seen as being of great benefit to parents in coping with their responsibilities for caring. At the same time it should be recalled that some families made little use of the range of services available, that there was considerable ignorance and misinformation about the services, that there was great variation in the amount of use of certain services, that a small number of families had experienced withdrawal of a service, and there existed both a degree of self-imposed rationing of certain services and of strong desires among parents to remain as independent as possible. Some problems of availability of concern to parents were also identified.

The quality of service

Ten out of 23 Society members and three out of 13 non-members identified some problem of quality in relation to service delivery. Non-members generally, it should be recalled, had used a far more limited range of services than had the Society members and Executive members.

Only three parents commented on the effects of lack of continuity of staff, the issue raised by Hartley-Brewer (1985) with regard to the Community Programme. One family, for example, had been disappointed to see the demise of the Befriending Scheme after the departure of the Activities Co-ordinator. A similar comment was made by another family with respect to Home Care, a regular arrangement having been discontinued after a Home Care Assistant left. Two other families were disappointed in the approach of the Home Care Assistants who had helped them on some occasions; one of these families found the regular arrangement with the Home Care worker had to be at a time inconvenient to them, because it needed to fit into the workers' routine. They also had insufficient time to talk to the worker about their handicapped family member. Another parent was unhappy that the Home Care worker brought along her own children. The same criticism was made by another family of the 'sitter' who had been sent by the Sitting-in service; the parents here felt that the sitter could not care adequately for the handicapped person while her own children were present. The same family
had found another sitter inexperienced in the care of people with a mental handicap, contrary to their expectations. Another parent felt that both Home Care workers and sitters needed a 'back-up' service to call on in case of emergency, should a crisis arise with which they could not cope alone.

One parent was unhappy that their mentally handicapped family member had not been changed during the course of a Saturday 'Care morning' but had said nothing to staff. "As it is a voluntary service you tend to keep quiet rather than complain"

Three parents made comments with respect to Respite Care. One found the 3 o'clock finish on Sunday afternoon did not permit a reasonable weekend away, as it exerted pressure for an early return. Another parent referred to a transport problem in getting the person to and from Beech House, but did not appear to have discussed the matter with staff. A third parent described the mentally handicapped family member as being bored during the weekend at Beech House, but the parent felt unable to mention this to staff believing them to be all 'volunteers', and that therefore it was unfair to complain.

Reservations about Adult Daycare were expressed by three parents. One was worried about the lack of choice in the mid-day meal provided and also about the cost of the meal. Another was concerned about the lack of a structured programme of activities for each individual, while a third was deeply anxious at the prospect of Adult Daycare ceasing for the summer, as it had in the past, in order to accommodate the playscheme. The parent felt this indicated that adults were somehow less important to Beech House than children.

Four parents offered comments on the volunteer-run leisure activities. Two regretted the existing Youth Club policy of excluding from the Youth Club those with behaviour problems or in wheelchairs. Two other families had found their mentally handicapped members returned unhappy and agitated from the Youth Club and Saturday Afternoon Club respectively, but the parents had been unable to establish the reasons for this.

Overall, only six of the 36 families had experienced any mistakes or confusion in the delivery of a service. In one case this arose due to discontinuity attributed to staff-changeover. In a second, there had been some muddle over arrangements for an outing, when summer activities were being provided for adults who did not normally attend Beech House. For the rest, there were minor problems over dates and workers not arriving due to car-breakdowns, which parents viewed philosophically.

The majority of all the parents interviewed (23 out of 36) had not observed any changes, for better or worse, in the services they used, and felt there had been consistency in provision. A further six families said they could make no comment on this, as they had not had enough contact with Beech House. Three parents said they had observed improvements, for example, in the increased number of sitters available, better general organization and in a wider range of services.

One parent, describing the services as 'Excellent' went on to say:- "Over the last eight months or so I have seen them beginning to struggle. I feel for them. I had no help before... I found Beech House. Now I see them going back and I am aware of pressure on Home Care".

Suggestions for improvements to services used

Parents were asked whether they would like to see any improvements made to the Beech House services they had used, and two-thirds of the respondents had suggestions to offer (18 Society members, 6 non-members). Nine parents wanted to see some extension to the Respite Care service ie. more frequent weekends, mid-week provision, holidays for children as well as adults (not available in the past, though planned for 1987). One of these families remarked that a respite care provision nearer to their home would be welcome while a tenth family explained
that their interest was in the establishment of a local short-term care facility rather than an extension to respite care at Beech House, which was so far from their home.

No other single Beech House service attracted as much comment as Respite Care. A number of improvements to other services were suggested, each advocated by one or two parents eg. more Home Care, an emergency service provided by Home Care/Sitting-in to cope with last minute requests for help; a back-up service for Home Care staff/Sitters; the need for holiday playschemes to run five days a week and at half-terms; changes to the eligibility rules which excluded certain children from the playschemes; Adult Daycare every day; programmes of individual development for those using Adult Daycare, with access to a multi-disciplinary professional team; more flexible hours for Adult Daycare; regular arrangements for holiday days for adults in the summer; more Discos; more interesting activities at Saturday Club; changes to the Youth Club practice of excluding those in wheelchairs and with behaviour problems.

Problems of caring with which Beech House had been unable to help

While similar topics to those outlined above also arose in parents' comments on problems experienced in caring with which Beech House had been unable to help, some additional issues were identified. Problems with the availability of Respite Care were again prominent, arising in the responses of seven of the 29 parents who identified a lack in the Beech House services. One further parent felt unable to use the Beech House respite care provision because of the severe behaviour difficulties of the mentally handicapped family member.

However, references to Respite Care were exceeded by those relating to provision for 'Living Away from Home'. The need for some form of long-term residential accommodation in the local community was identified by 14 parents, although a few added the proviso that Beech House alone could not encompass this on the scale required.

The lack of a Befriending Service was seen as a gap needing filling by two parents. Two families mentioned a need for help with transport, in order to attend leisure activities and the playgroup, which they assumed Beech House was unable to provide. Another family had accepted the inevitability of the mother leaving work in order to care for the mentally handicapped family member, assuming Beech House would be unable to help with the major demands of caring involved.

Other needs were each identified by one or two families as those with which Beech House had not been able to help:- a bathing service at Beech House; more activities at Beech House for young adults; a latch-key service after school, to be run by parents; someone to come in and provide overnight care when parents are exhausted from broken nights; impartial advice on drugs from someone with real medical knowledge; help with coping with severe behaviour problems in the home; easy access to books and other literature on mental handicap; help from Beech House for parents when children are first diagnosed - the personal touch; a register of parents who can be consulted for advice and information on a particular type of handicap; a local 'drop-in' centre.

So, while Respite Care and long-term residential accommodation in the community were major pre-occupations among the parents interviewed, a very wide range of other issues were identified by parents in relation to the provision of specific services.

Suggestions for general changes

When parents were asked to comment more generally on any other changes they would like to see at Beech House, 14 parents mentioned the desirability of permanent funding. There were two or three references to the need for more funding for a specific service ie. Respite Care, Home Care, and some parents
commented on the need for a permanent staff, or at least for longer contracts for staff. One parent explained her view of the advantages of a permanent staff:- “A permanent staff would be lovely. I only recognize the Project Co-ordinator now. You could go in and know who’s who. Now I don’t feel at home when I go in. No-one knows who I am. In the beginning there were faces I got to know. I did go in more often when it first opened... you were encouraged to do so. That isn’t so, now. You would feel you were intruding.”

Such comments underline the desire of some families for rather more from Beech House than the supply of specific services, and suggest the way in which constant turnover of staff can create an atmosphere which does not encourage parental involvement.

A small number of families wished to see a change in the way families' needs were assessed by Beech House staff, as a basis for the allocation of services. Four of these families were non-members and one a Society member. One parent felt that the needs of single-parent families were such that they should be able to have more access to services than two-parent families. Another remarked on the way the family’s needs had changed: - "The Home Care organizer came in the beginning. Since then... the family's needs have become completely different. The organizer really needs to come again. Can they make arrangements to come and see people after a time, to see if their needs have changed?"

A similar comment was made by another parent: - "If they haven't seen a family for a given period, someone should visit a family or the family should be invited to go to Beech House so it is sure they are not being left out. ... We find it hard to ask"

This parent’s argument, reminiscent of that of Currer and Summerfield (1984), was that those who don't ask for services such as Home Care and Respite Care are in no less need than families who do ask, and Beech House staff should recognize this:- "Somebody at Beech House should stand back and say 'This person must be in need. They must be asked.' The service should be a cradle rather than a crane".

The issue of how Beech House decides who gets what was raised by another parent:- "What criteria are they using for who gets a service? If I had been in on discussions about criteria I could accept it, but I don't know how these decisions are being taken". The same parent wanted to see a more general change to a greater emphasis on the 'consumer'. "It's a staff-led service now, not consumer-led... I don't want to be a 'client' at Beech House... I want to see more flexibility. In future I hope Beech House will be more centred on the individual... It has got to be different to the statutory sector. They shouldn't stress 'individual' if it is only lip-service".

Although so few parents raised such issues in their responses to general changes they would like to see made at Beech House, they had nevertheless identified matters which were currently of great concern to staff within Beech House.

The expectations of the founder-members

Eight of the 14 founder-members made some reference to specific ways in which the services provided by Beech House had not come up to expectations, even if overall it was felt that Beech House had done more than anticipated, exceeding expectations in other aspects of its operation. Again, Respite Care was the service receiving most comment, with four founder-members feeling that the facilities were under-used and that a need existed for a much-expanded provision. Among the references to other services, each mentioned by one or two respondents, was the need to extend the playscheme and provide more help in the holidays; the lack of development of 'Living Away from Home'; the need for a 'latch-key' service. One founder-member regretted the continuation of an impermanent staffing system. Another saw a need for greater emphasis in staff training on 'values and awareness'.
Appendix VII: The family survey

The families' overall verdicts

Finally, to this picture culled from responses to a wide range of questions on service use can be added the families' own general verdicts on how they would have coped had the Beech House services not been available. Their answers confirm the existence among families of widely varying experiences of Beech House and dramatically different assessments of the role Beech House has played in helping with the responsibilities of caring. Their replies ranged from those which expressed, in the strongest terms, great reliance on Beech House to those which indicated little or no significance for Beech House as a source of help to the family. Comments typical of those who depended heavily on Beech House were: "I would have cracked by now. There would have been no going out... no social life. If I had been ill how would I have coped?... It would have led to anger, frustration, depression" and "It is beyond our comprehension to imagine life without Beech House. It is quite possible X would have had to go into care, though maybe not full-time".

In marked contrast were the views of parents for whom Beech House appeared to be a marginal influence: "We don't feel we have personally benefited from Beech House. 'Youth Club' existed before". "It wouldn't have made any difference to us coping".

Fifteen families (11 Society members, 4 non-members) fell clearly into the first group of those for whom life without Beech House was perceived as meaning not coping, or coping with great difficulty. Four Society members fell into the latter group, together with three families (all non-members) who found the question inappropriate because the services used had been withdrawn, after relatively short periods of use. As these families currently had no contact with Beech House, they were managing without the help of those services. There remained 14 families whose comments fell into a broad intermediate group. Nine parents (4 Society members, 5 non-members) indicated that although life might have become more difficult in some ways, with social life more restricted without Beech House, or no help available for special occasions/a particular difficult period, the parents would have carried on coping, as they always had in the past. For a further five parents (4 Society members, one non-member) their comments suggested that the most important thing about Beech House is that it is there. These families were currently making relatively little use of Beech House but seemed to gain great comfort and security from feeling they could, if necessary, turn to Beech House for help: "There is help available if I need it. I only use the playscheme and a bit of Home Care. It is knowing it is there. I can't imagine it not being there". Families other than these five also valued 'knowing Beech House is there', but did not give it the same central importance.

There was no direct relationship between the extent to which families used Beech House and their view that they relied on the service to help them cope. Some of the strongest expressions of dependence on Beech House came from parents only using the Sitting-in service once a fortnight, or the annual holiday playschemes, together with perhaps very occasional use of Home Care or leisure activities. The playschemes were to some mothers the indispensable service which enabled them to continue to work; the Sitting-in service had enabled other couples to go out together for the first time in years, and was a service without which life could have seemed insupportable. On the other hand, those feeling they would have coped no differently without Beech House were, with only one exception, parents who did make only limited use of Beech House.
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Appendix VIII: TABLES ON TRENDS IN THE INCOME OF REGISTERED CHARITIES

Table 1: Income of Registered Charities 1980 and 1985, by Source of Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fund Raising &amp; Donations</td>
<td>329.9</td>
<td>687.7</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>691.7</td>
<td>1,110.2</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>117.4</td>
<td>890.6</td>
<td>1,253.3</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees &amp; Charges</td>
<td>160.5</td>
<td>291.0</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>4,842.1</td>
<td>7,308.8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>4,802.8</td>
<td>7,672.3</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents &amp; Investments</td>
<td>234.4</td>
<td>399.1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>651.9</td>
<td>972.2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>888.3</td>
<td>1,398.4</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants from Statutory Bodies</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>93.0</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>547.7</td>
<td>1,108.7</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>578.9</td>
<td>1,375.7</td>
<td>138.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Activity &amp; Other</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>117.4</td>
<td>240.2</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>135.2</td>
<td>278.4</td>
<td>106.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>771.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,515.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>98</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,519.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,738.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
<td><strong>398.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,291.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,650.1</strong></td>
<td><strong>73.5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Source: Charity Statistics 1981/82, 1985/86
2 Source: Sample data

Table 2: Trends in Real Income 1975-1985

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Source</th>
<th>1975</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>1985</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>% Change 1975-85</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Em</td>
<td></td>
<td>Em</td>
<td></td>
<td>Em</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Raising &amp; Donations</td>
<td>653.6</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>455.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>895.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>+ 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees &amp; Charges</td>
<td>621.5</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>2,455.0</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>2,772.0</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>+ 237.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rents &amp; Investments</td>
<td>523.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>463.0</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>505.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>- 3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants from Statutory Bodies</td>
<td>175.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>295.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>497.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>+ 183.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Activity &amp; Other</td>
<td>205.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>100.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>- 51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,409.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,727.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,569.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>+ 89.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sample data

Appendix IX: TABLES ON PUBLIC SECTOR SUPPORT FOR VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS*

The total amount provided in 1987/88 represents a cash increase of 4.6 per cent on the level of provision in 1986/87. In the period between 1979/80 and 1987/88 the level of Government support to voluntary bodies has risen by 237% (in real terms 91.6%).

(Source: Hansard 16th May 1989)

Table 1: Central Government Grants to Voluntary Organisations 1981/82-1987/88

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Fisheries &amp; Food</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defence</td>
<td>2,637</td>
<td>2,361</td>
<td>2,544</td>
<td>3,295</td>
<td>3,544</td>
<td>4,828</td>
<td>5,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Science</td>
<td>12,381</td>
<td>11,175</td>
<td>14,318</td>
<td>16,543</td>
<td>18,093</td>
<td>16,209</td>
<td>7,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>23,207</td>
<td>26,356</td>
<td>27,120</td>
<td>29,100</td>
<td>30,316</td>
<td>32,383</td>
<td>42,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>1,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment: Direct grants</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>1,229</td>
<td>2,178</td>
<td>2,556</td>
<td>3,812</td>
<td>8,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Urban Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>37,500</td>
<td>48,500</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>78,300</td>
<td>98,300</td>
<td>86,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign &amp; Commonwealth Office</td>
<td>584</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Social Security</td>
<td>12,775</td>
<td>15,482</td>
<td>23,123</td>
<td>30,658</td>
<td>32,046</td>
<td>35,076</td>
<td>38,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>15,396</td>
<td>15,559</td>
<td>18,899</td>
<td>17,088</td>
<td>18,300</td>
<td>19,541</td>
<td>21,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>691</td>
<td>923</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>1,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lord Chancellor's Department</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland Department</td>
<td>20,298</td>
<td>9,490</td>
<td>12,091</td>
<td>13,711</td>
<td>16,601</td>
<td>14,975</td>
<td>14,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overseas Development Administration</td>
<td>2,393</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>10,772</td>
<td>24,027</td>
<td>31,233</td>
<td>26,823</td>
<td>42,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Office: Direct grants</td>
<td>5,515</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,824</td>
<td>7,413</td>
<td>8,247</td>
<td>8,970</td>
<td>9,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Urban Programme</td>
<td>3,159</td>
<td>4,927</td>
<td>8,750</td>
<td>10,209</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>16,208</td>
<td>20,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade &amp; Industry</td>
<td>4,965</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>6,221</td>
<td>7,370</td>
<td>8,053</td>
<td>8,659</td>
<td>9,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>936</td>
<td>971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh Office: Direct grants</td>
<td>2,448</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>3,021</td>
<td>4,915</td>
<td>5,954</td>
<td>8,498</td>
<td>5,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Urban Programme</td>
<td>2,988</td>
<td>2,682</td>
<td>1,325</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>2,375</td>
<td>2,849</td>
<td>3,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>140,904</td>
<td>150,970</td>
<td>182,270</td>
<td>234,411</td>
<td>267,777</td>
<td>278,498</td>
<td>292,916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes
1. The figures in this table exclude grants made for religious activities, to educational bodies which form part of the established education system (e.g. adult education, research institutes, independent schools) and to the arts. The 1987/88 figures are taken from the Written Answer in Hansard 16th May 1989, 120-121.
2. The sum listed for DES grants is lower than in previous years because (1) responsibility for grants to village halls and community centres has now been transferred to local government; and (2) a number of other bodies included hitherto are no longer classified as voluntary bodies.
3. The figures for 1982/83 onwards do not include MISC payments, for which see Table 2.
4. Includes contributions from Department of Education & Science, Department of Health & Social Security, and Department of Transport.
5. England only (see also Scottish Office and Welsh Office).
6. Excludes grants to work preparation units (similar to YTS/YOP grants), grants to voluntary sector organisations under the Scheme programmes, a grant to the NI Arts Council and grants to housing associations.
7. Overseas Development Administration's total consists solely of grants to various British charities for work in overseas relief and development.
8. The 1982/83 figure includes Foreign & Commonwealth Office grants.
9. During 1985/86 there was a decrease in requests from voluntary agencies for grants in support of disaster, refugee and other emergency relief measures. That programme is, by its nature, very much dependent on the occurrence of catastrophes. The other forms of support from the aid programme for voluntary agencies for their longer-term development work increased substantially during 1986-87.
10. The 1982/83 and 1983/84 figures are estimates only.
11. Grants totaling £1.3m were made in 1983/84 to English regional organisations for promotional activities in the UK and overseas. Although these grants were included in previous years, they have now been summed on the grounds that bodies concerned are not appropriately described as voluntary organisations.

Inland Revenue Statistics for Charities 1987/88

Each year Charity Trends reviews the publication Inland Revenue Statistics to note taxation trends and reliefs made available to charities. The well presented statistics contained in this annual work show interesting long-term growth records but they need careful interpretation.

As may be expected many gifts to charities remain unquantifiable and accordingly tax relief accruing to donors (and thus indirectly to charities) cannot be calculated. It is only where a gift is shown in a formal tax assessment or a tax repayment calculation that the relief can be created into a statistic. Moreover, it is clear that no official record is kept of charity income exempted from tax and so the total picture of gifts and the consequent income created is not available. Capital gains tax reliefs on gifts remain almost a complete mystery.

The salient statistics relating to 1987/88 are as follows:-

Number of UK income taxpayers: 24.2 million
Higher rate payers included above: 1.3 million
Total number of charitable covenants: 3 million
Total tax collected by the Inland Revenue in 1987/88: £564.358 million
Total recorded relief for charities within above figure: £239 million

Made up as follows:-
Tax relief for charities in covenanted gifts: £410 million
Inheritance Tax savings for charitable gifts from estates where there is a liability (Figures not available for estates with no liabilities.) £229 million

Peter Maslen
Charities Aid Foundation

* From Charities Aid Foundation, (1989). Charity Trends. Charities Aid Foundation: Tonbridge. These tables are reproduced by kind permission of the Charities Aid Foundation.
Table 2: Grants from Non-Departmental Public Bodies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Bdy</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Agency,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Projects Programme</td>
<td>980</td>
<td>4,300</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>7,820</td>
<td>8,250</td>
<td>8,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Training Scheme (ex Y.O.P.)</td>
<td>857,700</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>132,300</td>
<td>132,400</td>
<td>125,000</td>
<td>118,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Programme</td>
<td>51,130</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>366,000</td>
<td>490,000</td>
<td>664,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action on Community Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Volunteering Programme</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Community Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Corporation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.G. England</td>
<td>489,300</td>
<td>987,300</td>
<td>778,962</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>45,014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>92,300</td>
<td>108,300</td>
<td>111,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>85,700</td>
<td>90,485</td>
<td>95,124</td>
<td>99,673</td>
<td>128,136</td>
<td>125,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>8,907</td>
<td>11,612</td>
<td>11,122</td>
<td>12,114</td>
<td>12,657</td>
<td>13,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>5,757</td>
<td>7,702</td>
<td>6,148</td>
<td>8,204</td>
<td>8,701</td>
<td>8,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>9,870</td>
<td>11,473</td>
<td>12,415</td>
<td>15,446</td>
<td>18,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>9,870</td>
<td>11,473</td>
<td>12,415</td>
<td>15,446</td>
<td>18,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Council for Wales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission for Racial Equality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryside Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countryside Commission for Scotland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Conservancy Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Education Council</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland &amp; Islands Development Board</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal Opportunities Commission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>852,843</td>
<td>1,451,861</td>
<td>1,490,079</td>
<td>982,075</td>
<td>927,222</td>
<td>925,919</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes
1. No figures are available for the majority of non-departmental public bodies, but those listed here are thought to be the most significant sources of finance.
2. Formerly known as Manpower Services Commission.
3. The Training Agency makes payments to voluntary bodies under other programmes, but these cannot be given in detail except at disproportionate cost.
4. Payments made through Department of Economic Development, Northern Ireland.
5. In 1985/86 and 1986/87 the payments to housing associations were double counted, also being included in a separate table.
6. These figures are the totals for grants and guarantees made by the Arts Councils, some of which are not made to voluntary bodies.
7. Includes grants made to Scottish and Welsh Arts Councils.
8. In April 1988 the Development Commission merged with its main agency, the Council for Small Industries in Rural Areas, to form the Rural Development Commission.
9. The figure for 1987/88 relates to support for rural services and voluntary bodies.
10. Includes £573,000 in both 1984/85 and 1985/86 for the purchase of nature reserves.

Government Departments also make grants and payments to housing associations and societies. Figures for the past three years are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1985/86</th>
<th>1986/87</th>
<th>1987/88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
<td>£000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enquiries</td>
<td>944,000</td>
<td>842,700</td>
<td>923,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland Office</td>
<td>29,648</td>
<td>41,571</td>
<td>43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of the Environment</td>
<td>105,734</td>
<td>107,511</td>
<td>116,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>58,600</td>
<td>59,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,090,182</td>
<td>1,048,442</td>
<td>1,137,959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Public Sector Support for Voluntary Organisations 1987/88

| Total £3,680 million |

- **Government Grants in Housing Areas**, S. England (£1,123m)
- **Local Authorities** (£951m)
- **Central Government** (£253m)
- **Health Authorities** (£234m)

**Notes**

Figure for local authority support includes grants, fees, mandatory and discretionary rate relief (see pages 58-59).

Figure for health authority support (see pages 52-51).
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