

Title: Beyond Empowerment: The Spires Homeless Centre and the Information Practices of their Homeless Service Users.

Student number: 20115832.

Year of submission: 21/22.

Module code and title: INST0062 Dissertation (21/22).

Supervisor: Dr Alison Hicks.

Degree programme: This dissertation is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the master's Programme in Library and Information Studies, UCL.

Word count: 14,618

Referencing: Harvard

Abstract

This study examines the Spires Homeless Centre (London, UK) - as a site of homeless information practice and information literacy education. It traces the role Spires' staff in building users' confidence and bridging trust gaps - to enable pedagogical practices to be employed. This study also examines how homeless users themselves are seeking and using information independently of Spires – and explores the information accessibility barriers encountered.

Through qualitative methods, this study found that the homeless participants' information practices are strongly linked to trust (in services, peers, and other homeless people) – and that Spires' approach to relationship building forms the bedrock of their ability to extend information services.

This study demonstrates how information literacy education is taking place at Spires, including active learning, social exchange, and mentorship - and brings out the barriers to learning. This is one of few studies to consider the information literacy educator role in a social support setting.

Significantly, this study examines how the rough sleeper homeless subgroup are employing embodied information practices to manage their own personal safety and obtain information unavailable via services. This is the first study to examine the embodied information practices of the homeless.

The study expands our understanding of homeless information practices, including the role of experiential knowledge, social exchange, and trust – and establishes homeless services as sites of information literacy education.

Declaration

I have read and understood the College and Departmental statements and guidelines concerning plagiarism. I declare that:

- This submission is entirely my own original work.
- Wherever published, unpublished, printed, electronic or other sources have been used as a contribution or component of this work, these are explicitly, clearly, and individually acknowledged by appropriate use of quotation marks, citations, references, and statements in the text. It is **14618** words in length.

Table of Contents

1- Introduction	8
1.1 Definitions	10
1.2 Study background	11
1.3 Research objectives	12
2- Literature Review	13
2.1 Approach	13
2.3 Everyday life information seeking	14
2.4 Everyday IL.....	16
2.5 Social information exchange.....	17
2.6 Homeless services as information services	20
2.7 Information barriers.....	21
<i>Digital environments</i>	23
<i>Personal barriers</i>	25
2.8 Gaps in the literature	25
3- Methodology	27
3.1 Methodology approach	27
3.2 Research methods.....	28
3.3 Participant selection.....	29
3.4 Data collection and analysis	30
3.5 Data Quality	32
3.6 Limitations	33
4- Findings	34
4.1 Contextual needs.....	34
4.2 Users approaches to Information.....	34
<i>How are users seeking information?</i>	34
<i>How are users utilising the information found?</i>	38
<i>Managing information</i>	38
<i>Presenting information</i>	39
<i>Physical and emotional support</i>	40
4.3 Barriers to information finding and use	41
<i>Systemic / Institutional</i>	41
<i>Personal / social</i>	45
<i>Trust</i>	46
4.4 Spires' staff and information accessibility	50
<i>Information accessibility needs of users</i>	50
<i>Mediating the accessibility of information</i>	50
<i>Information transmission/learning</i>	52
5- Discussion	58
5.1 Learning.....	58

<i>The role of Spires</i>	58
<i>Informal unstructured learning</i>	59
<i>Embodied information practices</i>	60
5.2 Spires' teaching	61
<i>Identifying user's information needs</i>	61
<i>Formal structured learning</i>	63
<i>Empowerment</i>	65
6- Conclusion	67
6.1 Research objectives	67
6.2 Contribution	68
6.3 Recommendations.....	69
6.4 Future research	70
Bibliography	73
Appendix A – Interview questions	80
Appendix B – Interview transcript initial coding	82
Appendix C – Midpoint coding and categorisation	85

Acknowledgements

This study would not have been possible without the guidance, expertise, and insights of my dissertation supervisor Dr Alison Hicks. Our discussions, and her inspiring insights about how people interact with information in unexpected ways, helped me persevere with the data, and realise the potential of this study.

This study's initial stages are indebted to the UCL Community Research Initiative for Students, and I am grateful to Dr Anne Laybourne and her team for the exciting work done by the initiative to connect students with the voluntary sector to conduct research.

Lastly, I would like to thank the team at The Spires Homeless Centre for hosting the study, assisting with participants recruitment, and being generous with their time. Above all, I thank the homeless users at Spires who participated in the study, for their openness, and allowing me the opportunity to hear about their experiences.

1- Introduction

This study focuses on the Spires Homeless Centre (Spires), examining the information practices of its homeless service users and the information literacy (IL) interventions of service staff. Spires was founded as a homeless centre in Streatham, London, in 1989 (Spires Homeless Centre, 2022). Since its inception, Spires has evolved from focussing on meeting users' primary needs (food, clothing) to wider support (benefits, housing, immigration, drug, and alcohol dependency). All these everyday life needs engender a search for information – with associated practices to access and utilise information found.

This study was made possible through the UCL Community Research Initiative, which connects students with the voluntary sector to conduct service level research. Using a combination of literature review and semi-structured interviews, this research aims to build a detailed picture of the information practices and IL learning taking place at Spires. Within a case study context, this research hopes to increase understanding of the information practices of the homeless, and of support services as possible sites of IL building. It is hoped that the insights will be useful to others providing informational support to the homeless.

A homeless individual is broadly defined as 'someone who does not have access to permanent safe and secure housing' (Stevenson *et al*, 2007, p.420). In practice, this includes those sleeping on the street, within temporary accommodation (shelter, hostel), squatting, at risk of violence or abuse from home, or living in poor conditions that affect health (Shelter, 2022). There are myriad root causes of homelessness

including domestic violence, eviction, relationship breakdown, and disaster (fire, floods).

Researching homeless information practice is vital to improving information services to this community and understanding how they find and appraise information (through services, socially, and independently), and the barriers which impede information access and use. Whilst some research exists which interrogates how individual contexts (rough sleeper, hostel accommodation etc) may impact users information practices, no existing research examines the information education role of homeless services. A homeless individual could be a young parent living in temporary accommodation, or an older person with chronic health issues living on the street. These individual contexts are crucial to understanding homeless information needs and practices.

Providing information services that are most useful and thus most used, becomes a simpler task when target audiences are more defined and more specific. Different homeless groups have different information needs, but all users' information needs must be assessed individually (Hersberger, 2005, p.199).

The Spires user group encompasses contextual variation, making it a good site to conduct research into the information practices of the homeless, and into Spires itself as a site of IL learning. The homeless population are a difficult group to access for research (and have received little prior research attention), making this a unique opportunity to further our understanding of homeless information practices.

1.1 Definitions

Throughout this work, the term “homeless individuals” will be used to encompass all participants, including those in temporary accommodation (hostels). The term “rough sleepers” (those living on the street) is used when the study’s findings directly relate to this subgroup. Such findings may be unique to this subgroup and not necessarily indicative of the wider homeless population.

This paper employs the term “information practices”, when referring to (homeless individuals) processes for seeking, understanding, and acting upon information. As noted by Savolainen *et al* (2009), the alternative term “information seeking behaviours” focuses on habituated behaviour, prioritising routinised actions within environments. This behavioural definition does not account for the myriad other influences upon information use, including trust, structural barriers (poverty, addiction, poor health), and the wider landscape of interconnected social practices (employment, organisational procedures etc). The term “information practices” provides a more encompassing definition which interrelates social practices with individual approaches to information. As Schatzki (2002, p.87) states, social practices are ‘temporally evolving, open-ended sets of doings and sayings linked by practical and general understandings, rules, and structures’, this definition applied to information practices acknowledges that practices evolve relatively to their wider social environment, allowing this study to use a term which includes the role of social, embodied, and behavioural practices within information use.

1.2 Study background

The site-specific information practices of different groups have been the subject of many studies. However, they usually focus on academic and workplace contexts - and few examine the community context. The realm of social support for the homeless represents a specific community IL landscape (Lloyd, 2010), where users must acquire situational information practices to engage successfully and access support. This study examines homeless individuals' information practices, to deepen provider understanding of routes and preferences for information access and use - and to discover personal and environmental barriers which impact upon users' practices. This study will appraise Spire as an IL educator, considering how various interventions may constitute a form of IL teaching.

There has also been little research into the information practices of homeless individuals, and where it exists it is dated and heavily weighted towards North America. From an Everyday Life Information Seeking (ELIS) position applied to homelessness, Hersberger (1998, 2002, 2005, 2011) has been the most prominent researcher in the field - examining public libraries' understanding of homeless users' information needs, and how information is shared socially amongst the homeless community.

1.3 Research objectives

This study aims to:

- Explore how the lived reality of homelessness shapes the information practices of homeless individuals.
- Explore how embodied information practices factor into the informational lives of the homeless.
- Examine what IL education role Spires is playing in the lives of homeless service users.
- Develop a set of service recommendations for those delivering information services to the homeless.

This study begins with a literature review, identifying key research in the Library and Information Science (LIS) field and beyond – scaffolding an understanding of homeless information practices, and the role of support services therein. The literature review also highlights gaps in the existing research, signalling areas that this study hopes to extend.

The study then presents the research methodology, including the study's conceptual underpinning and research methods employed. The interview findings are subsequently presented, drawing out moments of significance, which are discussed in relation to existing research, to present new insights. The study ends with a concluding chapter summarising the study, presenting recommendations, and highlighting areas deserving of future enquiry.

2- Literature Review

2.1 Approach

The literature review's purpose is to increase understanding and identify research gaps surrounding the information practices of homeless individuals. Much IL research centres on the workplace or academic contexts – an easier group to access. Limited research has been undertaken into homeless individuals' information practices. This is partly due to funding hurdles, with homelessness being relatively low down in the socio-political agenda. It is also due to the ethical hurdles of undertaking research with the homeless, who have multiple co-vulnerabilities (mental and physical health, addiction, contact with criminal justice system).

The databases used to search for journal articles were the Library and Information Science Abstracts (LISA) and the Library Science Database through ProQuest. I searched using keyword strings, including: "homeless*" OR "refugee*" OR "rough sleeper*" AND "information" OR "librar*" OR "information practices" OR "information seeking*" OR "information behaviour*" OR "information literacy". Due to the limited research on homeless information practices, and the homogenising nature of the word "homeless", the synonyms "refugees" OR "rough sleepers" were used to capture subgroups of the homeless, increasing results. It is important to note that refugees and those seeking asylum may or may not be homeless - but do share some commonality in terms of information needs. From the results I followed citation chaining to discover literature outside of LIS, which included important areas of overlap (public health, homeless service appraisal, digital exclusion, and harm reduction).

UCL Explore was used to search for literature primarily on homeless service appraisal. Grey literature was sourced using Google Scholar, with important results including statistics and service insight reports produced by different UK homeless services (Shelter, Centrepoint, Crisis).

2.3 Everyday life information seeking

Everyday life creates a need for information (health, recreational, financial, educational) and requires acts of information seeking. This Everyday Life Information Seeking (ELIS) has been most thoroughly researched by Savolainen (2008, 2009). Savolainen demonstrated that problem centred information needs often involve accessing the most easily available information sources - and are situationally and contextually bound. Chatman's (1991) 'small world' ELIS theory proposed that for socially marginalised information seekers, social environments intersect with shared pursuits, social expectations, and financial situations to galvanise information behaviours for community members - resulting in 'first level' information gathered through personal experience or via trusted individuals, being preferred over 'second level' information, originating from those outside, which is seen as not being applicable to their lived realities (Savolainen, 2010, p. 1783).

Hersberger (1998. 2005) utilised Chatman's small world theory to find that homeless individuals' information needs are also often problem centred, and related to their everyday lives (finances, housing, health). In presenting these needs, Hersberger illuminated the tendency of services and wider public discourse to homogenise the

homeless user, resulting in the complexity of their individual information needs being missed - and the contextual nature of their information practices, misunderstood.

The everyday context is crucial. A CEO and a homeless person who both need to find a new place to live are basically asking the same question. However, the CEO will have many more options, and thus seeks – and retrieves – much more information. Often there are many more information providers able and eager to provide that information to the CEO (Hersberger, 2005, p. 200).

Since Hersberger's research, others have narrowed the definition of "homeless", highlighting the contextual factors that influence information seeking. Increasingly, age, homeless status (e.g., rough sleeper, temporary accommodation), specific information need, and root causes of homelessness (refugee, asylum seeker) have been used as qualifiers to build a more nuanced understanding of how specific groups seek, access, and use information.

ELIS studies have uncovered a range of demographic related information needs and behaviours that are not always problem centred. For example, Woelfer (2014) researched how homeless young people find and interact with music as an information source, discovering that it plays a significant social and emotional role in their lives. Markwei and Rasmussen (2015) also applied Chatman's small world theory to homeless youth in Ghana, highlighting the pivotal role of social groups in fulfilling their everyday information needs. These studies are some of the few to consider how homeless individuals social and emotional needs are met through different sources.

2.4 Everyday IL

Lloyd (2010) highlighted the importance of understanding the contextual nature of information practices, terming these contexts 'information literacy landscapes' and expanding out how different settings (community, education, workplace) shape the information practices of individuals.

Discourse, social order, and an array of practices, structure and shape the information landscape, giving it a specific character, and agreed ways of performance. The structuring of a landscape enables access to certain types of information (Lloyd, 2010, p. 139).

There is an absence of research considering the contextual application of everyday information practices of the homeless. Although refugees do not mirror the homeless, they do overlap in terms of needs (housing, health, financial) which means studies into their information practices are useful in building some understanding of the homeless user. Mansour (2017) considered the information practices of Syrian refugees, finding that new financial and emotional burdens reconfigured their information practices. Lloyd *et al* (2017) elaborated further, finding that young refugees information practices are constructed through their engagement in everyday spaces (schools, online, youth groups) as embodied knowledge sharing.

Most recently, Ahmadinia (2022, p.18) examined refugees' health seeking behaviours, finding that 'while many health information and healthcare services are accessible in Europe for refugees, many of these individuals are unaware of their existence or how to access them'. These studies showed that emotional turmoil and stress can alter information practices, with users becoming cut-off from other lines of dissemination by privileging social access to information.

These studies have determined information practices as being highly contextualised, with any successful intervention needing to specify the needs and situ of a subgroup. Additionally, the research is heavily weighted towards refugees' information practices, as a potential homeless subgroup, which may not be indicative of other homeless groups - and creates an unhelpful dichotomy of the deserving between "intentional" and "unintentional" homelessness. As Herberger (2005, p.199) stated 'there is a perceptual issue of "deserving" versus "undeserving" individuals of existing and often limited services that underpins all discussions on homelessness'. This perception risks translating within information services as "worthy" vs "unworthy" users. Significantly, this broader perceptual issue may be a contributing factor to the absence of research in the area.

2.5 Social information exchange

As Savolainen (2010) signalled, problem centred information seeking can involve individuals engaging with the most easily accessible information source. For the homeless, this can be other members of the homeless community, which enables them to avoid sharing personal information with services or accessing resources digitally. There has been little research within LIS around how information is transferred socially within the homeless community. Within sociology, Mitchell (1987, p.39) built on the work of Granovetter (1973) to research the concept of 'strong and weak ties' in relation to the social support relationships of homeless women: strong ties representing family and peers, and weak ties the relationships with social support staff. Mitchell determined that weak tie relationships play in fact a pivotal role in emotional resiliency, support access, and information flow.

Leading from Granovetter and Mitchell's work, Hersberger (2003) traced how information is shared within the homeless community itself. Hersberger highlighted that previous homeless social network research had used geographical tools to explore information exchange and diffusion. Hersberger saw qualitative interviews, combined with Chatman's (1996) concept of 'information poverty', as a more useful model to examine social information exchange. Hersberger's findings indicated that information is a form of social capital that is embedded within different social support networks. She proposed that homeless users maintain strong, weak, and hybrid ties with different individuals and services - with homeless parents more likely to trust individual service staff (weak ties) as an information source, and rough sleepers more likely to employ self-protective behaviour and accept new information selectively.

Although not focussed on the homeless, Lloyd *et al* (2014) found that experiential knowledge sharing is a constitutive part of the information practices of those with chronic illnesses, for whom weak tie relationships offer new perspectives on information. Chronic health conditions often do factor into the lives of the homeless, and users maintain weak tie relationships with support service staff (shelters, day centres). Lloyd and Hersberger's research are some of the only attempts to consider social information exchange amongst the homeless (and socially disadvantaged) through qualitative methods.

Outside of LIS, researchers within public health and urban planning have considered how information travels through the homeless population. Almquist (2020) used

spatial network models to consider how information disseminates amongst the homeless population - highlighting that it cannot be assured that health and service information gets distributed successfully by the homeless community. Almquist found that information sharing is uneven, with age a determining factor - younger homeless individuals are more likely to share information with one another.

Rice and Barman-Adhikari (2014) considered the use of social media as a tool of information exchange amongst homeless youth, reporting that many used social media to share information with other rough sleepers, family, and friends – but struggled to use this as a bridge to access housing or employment resources.

Bernier *et al* (2021) researched the use of information and communication technologies (ICT) by vulnerably housed sex workers, highlighting their use in managing occupational health, by sharing information on dangerous clients and locations to avoid. These studies update our understanding of information diffusion within the homeless (and vulnerably housed) community, to include the use of smart phones as a now ubiquitous information sharing tool.

Much existing research presents social exchange positively - not addressing user trust, and the negative aspects of social information sources, e.g. misinformation, emotional labour. There has also been no research into the embodied information practices of the homeless, with existing research within the workplace setting (Lloyd and Olsson, 2014) citing the importance of bodily sensorial practices in workplace learning (nurses, firefighters).

2.6 Homeless services as information services

The ways that homeless services (day centres, shelters, hostels) and information services (libraries) understand and meet the information needs of the homeless is important for this study, as it considers the information role of Spires. It is striking within LIS literature, that homeless services are not positioned as information services, despite them providing such services (resource access, information accessibility support, signposting to other services).

Buchanan and Nicol (2018) and Buchanan *et al* (2019) considered the informational intermediary role of healthcare nurses, finding that they are supporting socially disadvantaged users' source and understand information - though refuted that such interventions could be considered a form of IL education. This study was one of the first to consider the IL educator role of non-librarians, however, by limiting their definition of IL to a narrow academic centred skill/authority-based approach, the ability to draw parallels with an entirely different context of information practice was greatly restricted.

Outside of LIS, much research appraising homeless services considers how they understand homeless individuals' personal needs. It does not consider users' information practices in relation to their ability to access services. Warnes and Crane (2000), and May *et al* (2010) have examined how homeless services understand homeless users' needs, and the accessibility interventions around welfare benefits, physical health, and housing. They focus on the initial management of complex needs (mental and physical health, addiction, contact with criminal justice system) to enable the subsequent meeting of users' primary needs (housing, financial stability).

Desjarlais (1997) considered how mental health, language, and cultural backgrounds can further the marginalisation that homeless individuals face. This highlights that homeless services deeper understanding of individual context and needs could enable a more targeted informational support. It also highlights how the user profile contains multiple characteristics (poverty, poor physical and mental health, cultural background) that can further marginalise by restricting resource access.

Outside these studies, there is little research which appraises homeless or other social support services as information service provisions in their own right - and none which aligns homeless service staff as information professionals, considering how they may undertake resource selection, IL education, or other interventions to increase information accessibility, and build user's information practices. This study aims to do this, by examining Spires as an information service, considering the roles of support staff as information professionals.

2.7 Information barriers

Public libraries

Homeless individuals face multiple barriers to information, both environmental (social attitudes, scarcity of services, inappropriate modes of dissemination) and personal (mistrust, addiction, poor health). Those providing information services to the homeless need to understand these barriers to ensure an effective provision.

Research has explored libraries themselves as being the creators of barriers to information. Randall (1985) and Hersberger (1998, 2005) demonstrated how public libraries cast homeless individuals as “problem patrons” whose personal hygiene,

social relationships, and nature of information needs are seen as incompatible with public libraries offering - and deter other users from the service. This disconnect between public libraries and the homeless has also been confirmed by Mars (2020), Dowell and Liew (2019), McKeown (2016), and Kaplan (2020).

Other research has appraised how public libraries regulate and provide for the information needs of the homeless. Dowdell and Liew (2017) and Bardoff (2015) found that socio-culturally ingrained assumptions about homelessness, and the prioritisation of other (housed) users, through policy and provision, can lead to unmet information needs of the homeless user.

Zhang and Chawner (2018) found that rough sleepers use public libraries to meet both information needs and physiological needs (sleeping, warmth) – but can suffer from poor staff / patron relationships. Pressley (2017) surveyed public librarians to better understand the relationship between staff and homeless patrons, finding that concerns around patrons' mental health and staff safety, impacted libraries ability to extend services. Similarly, Williams (2021) examined boundary management as a tool used by public librarians to manage their service encounters with the homeless, arguing that supporting homeless individuals requires 'acknowledgement that this is labour that public librarians do. As part of that, support for these efforts is required, in terms of training and the development of policies that support librarians' (Williams, 2021, p. 15). This shows that librarians struggle to deal with the complex needs of the homeless (mental health, addiction, contact with criminal justice system), and that support services may be better equipped to provide information services respective of user's complex needs (Crisis, 2021).

To unpack where users' complex needs intersect with their information needs (and support library staff), Dowd (2018, p.20) outlined 'empathy-driven approaches' to effectively serve the homeless community and avoid conflict in the public library setting. These included debunking misconceptions around homelessness, unpacking users' needs, and providing advice for managers in how to regulate for this user relationship through policy. Dowd also prioritised effective user communication 'If we have compassion for the most vulnerable but are too afraid to have a conversation with them, our compassion isn't worth much. The revelation is in the relationship' (Dowd, 2018, p.24). Dowd advocates in libraries for what homeless services have long understood, that building trusting user relationships is key to enabling targeted support to homeless service users.

In this vein, Hill and Tamminen (2020) examined Canada's public library services collaboration with homeless services, discovering increased staff knowledge of homeless support needs, and an improved ability to link users with suitable resources as a result. Hersberger (1998), Giesler (2018), and Kaplan (2020) also examined public libraries collaborations with homeless services, finding that cross disciplinary relationships between services, equipped public librarians with a deeper understanding of homeless persons information needs. This highlights the potential of cross disciplinary partnerships when designing effective information services for the homeless.

Digital environments

Some studies have explored information accessibility barriers presented by ICT. Hersberger (2003) considered whether a lack of digital access affected homeless

individuals access to information, finding they preferred accessing information face-to-face, and didn't discern an information vacuum by not engaging with information online. However, this research was conducted in 2003, before portable internet connectivity became widespread. Twelve years later, Lemos and Frankenburg (2015) conversely demonstrated that ICT usage amongst the homeless was widespread, with study participants frequently using smartphones to access information. Similarly, McInnes *et al* (2013) considered how homeless individuals' access to ICT may positively affect their ability to engage with healthcare services.

Homeless persons used mobile phones to connect with helping professionals, including clinicians. They used the Internet to obtain information about medical conditions and other health-related issues. Some reported that mobile phones helped them stay sober and clean because they could reach out to a support network to help them fight drug cravings and prevent relapses (McInnes *et al*, 2013, p. 21).

This shows that, instead of being a barrier, ICT may be improving information access for the homeless by providing new avenues to seek and manage information.

As the digital information landscape has evolved, some information is now solely available online. Burton (2015) considered how different homeless services make information available (online, telephone, face-face) and whether some routes have a negative accessibility impact - finding a preference for face-to-face exchange. In the case of refugees, Lloyd (2020) highlighted how the speed and complexity of digital information delivery can overwhelm individuals. Applied to the homeless context, Harris (2020) examined how the digitisation of the welfare landscape has impacted homeless users - finding that it presented significant barriers to information use.

Participants considered the digitization of welfare benefits to place a significant burden on homeless people, believing it to be informed by assumptions and expectations which are at odds with the lived reality of many homeless people (Harris, 2020, p. 151).

Personal barriers

Another barrier that has not been explored widely is the trust of homeless individuals in information providers. It has been examined by Martzoukou and Burnett (2018), Lloyd *et al* (2017) and Oduntan and Ruthven (2021) in relation to refugees' information practices, finding that mistrust in services impacts information access. The aspect of trust in relation to statutory services has been examined by Zakrinson (2014), and Van Den Berk-Clark and McGuire (2014), emphasising:

[The] Importance of contextual relationship factors in understanding trust in providers. Ongoing social support from friends and other health professionals to obtain needed tests and treatment was found to be positively associated with provider trust (Van Den Berk-Clark and McGuire, 2014, p. 1285).

This shows that pre-existing, trusting social relationships, help bridge user trust in statutory services. This is important for this study, as the services studied similarly act as information providers.

Significantly, the literature does not examine homeless individuals' trust in social and institutional sources specifically. Nor does it consider social and institutional sources as possible sites of misinformation, and how homeless individuals approach misinformation.

2.8 Gaps in the literature

This literature review has demonstrated numerous themes relevant to the information practices of homeless individuals, with the following evidence gaps:

- The IL education role of homeless services (how do homeless service staff understand the information practices of service users? What teaching / instructional methods do they use within their user engagements).
- The embodied information practices of the homeless.
- How social and institutional trust / mistrust factors into the information practices of the homeless.
- How the homeless approach misinformation and the relationship between misinformation, trust, social and institutional sources.

3- Methodology

3.1 Methodology approach

This study employs a qualitative methodology. Qualitative research is an iterative process, allowing the scope and objectives to evolve as the study progresses (Denny, 2019). It includes interviews and field observation as data collection techniques - and purposive sampling (recruiting study participants based on their shared experiences related to the research question). Qualitative methodologies are useful for small scale IL research as they provide participants an opportunity to share their thoughts - and the interviewer the ability to posit follow up questions around areas of surprise. As this study's focus is to examine a specific community of information practice (Spires), a qualitative methodology is appropriate.

The study adopts a grounded theoretical approach to data analysis (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). Grounded theory involves theoretical sensitivity, allowing categories to emerge directly from the data - the aim of which is to root the research in the lived reality of participants, allowing social processes to be analysed (Lloyd, 2021, p. 68). As Lloyd (2021, p. 67) outlines, an aim of a grounded theoretical approach (applied to IL research) is to enable the researcher to:

- Deepen their understanding of information practices as they apply to individuals and environments (outside of education).
- Enable the generation of patterns and relationships that are rooted in data (field observations, interviews).
- Research social relationships and group behaviour as they apply to IL.

Research findings that result from a grounded theoretical approach can be used to build frameworks and recommendations (Lloyd, 2021), potentially useful to information service providers. As part of our objective is to appraise Spires as an information service, a methodology that lends itself to the reconceptualisation of findings into service level insights is useful.

3.2 Research methods

Semi-structured interviews were chosen as the most suitable data collection technique, creating an informal environment akin to a conversation - encouraging participants to share and reflect on their own experiences (Lloyd, 2021, p. 80). This enables us to learn more about the individual detail of lived experience, and how homeless information practices may be constructed through different environments. A list of interview questions served as a conversational guide (appendix A), and follow-up questions were used to expand areas of interest. Interview questions were designed from reading existing research in the field and themes that emerged from field observations.

A face-to-face approach was selected, due to uncertainty around participants' ability to access IT, and the desire to build a rapport with service users.

In keeping with a grounded theoretical approach, field study / observation can be used to gain insights into how participants seek, and interact with, information on the ground. I chose to visit Spires before undertaking the interviews with study participants, as an opportunity to see how Spires' staff and service users interact with one another and the wider information architecture (notice boards, flyers, signage). Two observational visits were made on the 21st and 22nd February 2022.

These helped in learning how users are being supported in accessing information in practice, and the work that Spires' staff do to support users' physiological needs (food, clothing, hygiene).

3.3 Participant selection

Due to the possible vulnerabilities of the homeless user group (mental health, disability, sex work, addiction) and where these vulnerabilities may intersect with consent, coercion, and confidentiality - high risk ethical approval was sought and obtained by the UCL Research Ethics Committee, and a purposive, priori sampling approach adopted (Pickard, 2013, p. 64).

Spires encompasses a wide profile of users who are either, rough sleepers, housed in temporary accommodation, or recently rehoused. Service users may have the following complex needs: substance misuse, contact with the criminal justice system, poor mental and physical health. Spires employ a team of 12, whose specialist support areas include: drug and alcohol, immigration, women's services, and housing (benefits and tenancy). Spires estimate that 140 homeless individuals are provided with specialist support throughout the year, and approximately 100 per month receive ad-hoc support (food, clothing). The women's service supports an average of 40 women per month via street outreach (Wilson, 2022).

A purposive priori sampling approach was followed: Spires created a pool of 15 potential service user participants, from which I then randomly selected five. One of Spires criteria was to ensure that the pool of participants was considered stable, i.e.,

not vulnerable, and able to speak about their information practices. Two staff were also selected randomly out of a pool of five.

On the 22nd of February visit, I explained the project verbally to participants and gave them a hard copy information sheet. Each participant had the consent form explained to them, and subsequently signed. A one week cooling off period was provided between consent and the interview dates on the 3rd and 4th March. One potential participant refused the original invitation to take part, and another participant withdrew from the study before data collection (due to other commitments) – with another participant selected from the participant pool. The final participant list is set out in table 1.

Pseudonym	Age range	Profile
Graham	45-55	Rough Sleeper
Andrea	35-45	Temporary accommodation
Vicky	25-35	Recently rehoused
Bill	25-35	Rough Sleeper
Ellen	25-35	Temporary accommodation
Pauline	45-55	Spires staff
Lauren	35-45	Spires staff

Table 1: Participants

3.4 Data collection and analysis

Interviews took place in a private room at Spires. All participants were given the choice of having a staff member present, but all were happy to be interviewed alone. Each interview lasted approximately 45 minutes and was audio recorded.

Audio recordings were transcribed using Otter.ai transcription software, checked against the original recording, and amended to ensure accuracy. Participants names, identifying locations, and the names of others mentioned were altered or redacted to

ensure anonymity. The original audio recordings were then deleted, as per the ethical approval.

Open coding is used to establish linkages and themes within the data. As Charmaz (2014) describes, a grounded theoretical approach involves developing categories, discovering variations within categories, and then bringing these together into an analytical framework, to make sense of the social processes under consideration - in this case the information practices of the homeless. This method allows me to actively seek out moments that are unexpected, and surprising within the data - as opposed to focussing on number of instances, or data that conforms to an established topic.

Transcripts were open coded to reveal emergent themes and areas of surprise (appendix B). Coding was done via Microsoft Word, with 121 codes generated initially, which were eventually refined to 67 codes, organised into nine categories (appendix C). These nine thematic categories aim to allow the narrative of staff and users information practices to be analysed.

The age and scarcity of research in the area, and socio-culturally ingrained ideas about homelessness, challenge the avoidance of theoretical preconceptions when coding the data - but I hoped by being aware of this, and attuned to discovering the unexpected, this risk was mitigated.

3.5 Data Quality

This study has considered the ethics involved in research with potentially vulnerable participants. This includes procedural ethics, through the UCL Research Ethics Committee, which required stringent considerations to ensure informed consent, confidentiality, and avoid coercion.

With data collection taking place at Spires, situational ethics are important (Tracy, 2010, p. 847). This means considering whether the benefits of the study outweigh any possible negative effects to participants (e.g., distress). Participants did deviate from discussing their information practices during the interviews, to more personal disclosure - which presented situationally bound ethics decisions. This meant steering conversations back to participants information needs, ensuring that they were happy to continue, and consulting with staff if I believed they may be distressed.

This study strives for 'confirmability' (Shenton, 2004, p.72), meaning that findings are a result of the thoughts and feelings of participants, not the researcher. Asking open questions, and only prompting when a question is not understood, gave participants the space to speak for themselves. Establishing and sharing the audit-trail also means observers can track the decisions made throughout the study, back to their original inception.

3.6 Limitations

A small-scale qualitative approach means that the data collected will not be indicative of the wider homeless population, but applicable to the case study context of Spires. However, it is hoped that this research can provide insights into the information practices of a particular homeless service community, which can be built upon in future research.

Spires' staff involvement in user participant selection could also be considered a study limitation, as participants may not be wholly representative of all service users. However, this was ethically essential to avoid the selection of participants in crisis.

As someone with no lived experience of homelessness, it is difficult to fully comprehend the complexities and individual realities of homelessness. Therefore, it is possible that I bring to the study my own unconscious biases about homelessness - learned socio-culturally. However, conducting field observation at Spires over two days, prior to participant interviews, gave me the opportunity to hear service users' and staff's individual experiences of homelessness, and the myriad root causes. I hope by doing this, I have corrected any prejudicial assumptions about homelessness I may have unconsciously had.

4- Findings

4.1 Contextual needs

Participants discussed the primary needs that precipitate their information practices. These relate to accessing housing, welfare support, improving living conditions, immigration, physiological needs (food, warmth, safety) and parental needs.

Participants' needs were context specific, with rough sleepers focused on physical safety, food, and shelter. Temporarily housed participants raised financial support, improving living conditions, immigration, and parental needs. All these needs engender a search for information, and present information accessibility challenges.

4.2 Users approaches to Information

This first thematic category analyses how participants seek and use information independently of Spires - with findings indicating the importance of social sources, and physical discovery when gathering information. The section then examines how participants are utilising information found, including information management strategies and the presenting of information to ensure personal safety.

How are users seeking information?

Participants were asked to consider how and where they look for information, independently of Spires. A key finding of this study is that users are seeking information via physical and social discovery (travelling to different services, or via word of mouth). This approach allows users to connect with experiential information,

which is more immediately accessible, and “tried-and-tested” by others. This raises issues around the labour users are expending to find information, and the accuracy of the information sourced.

An initial way users’ spoke about discovering information is via other homeless people, who are seen to hold experiential knowledge on how to access food, shelter, and financial support. Graham is a long-term rough sleeper, and discussed other homeless people as being a primary source of information.

‘[you find information] from the homeless people, yeah. That’s how you find out anything. If someone is looking for something to eat, you say look go there.’ – Graham

For Graham, other homeless people are a source of information for multiple needs, such as food, or finding a service that can help with benefit applications. Accessing information via other homeless people is partly driven by proximity - being the most readily available source, it saves time. The quote suggests that other homeless people have useful experiential knowledge of accessing support successfully, and that this anecdotal information may be unavailable elsewhere.

Information can be sought to help ensure users personal safety. As Graham discussed, this information is often transmitted experientially, via shared stories or direct observation.

‘Some poor fool on Charing Cross Road, he was asleep, 3 in the morning, they were coming from a nightclub somewhere, you know the lighter fuel, they sprayed him with it. Sleeping in a doorway is stupid, you gotta hide away somewhere.’ - Graham

Information can be gathered incidentally via lived experience, and subsequent knowledge sharing amongst the homeless community. For example, knowledge of how to stay safe when sleeping rough may not be available via support services.

Another way in which users can discover information is via other services, by looking at notice boards, or leaflets. Ellen discussed discovering information by using the local library as a springboard to connect with multiple information sources.

'I used to get an awful lot of stuff from the library, pick up leaflets and everything, [leaflets] had food banks, women's' days, a lot of things for mums and kids. It's nice to go in and sit in there quietly.' – Ellen

Here, the local library has connected Ellen with information to fulfil multiple needs.

The physical format of leaflets can be chosen for their familiarity i.e., users will have enduring experience of receiving information in this way (healthcare, schools). They are also practical, easily transportable reminders, which avoids users having to remember complex information. The self-service delivery of leaflets also saves time and emotional labour - avoiding users having to verbally unpack their needs to others to access information.

Some users can discover information or stay updated via the internet, As Vicky discussed:

'[I find information from] Facebook, Instagram, TikTok. Or sometimes I check on things and go to the news. So, I just google, 'what happened in UK'. I just google 'UK news today'. Because sometimes my son not allow me to look at 8 o'clock news. Because I'm so busy. I love the morning news, very fast news.'

– Vicky

For Vicky, time pressures factor into information seeking. Having parental responsibilities means she needs to update herself expediently. Time pressures may factor into her default use of Google to access current affairs, not showing a preference for certain sources based on other criteria (reliability, political leaning), and instead opting for the most readily available.

Users who do not routinely access the internet are more reliant on traveling to in-person services for information and support. Graham shared how he travels to different services across London, depending on his needs.

'[I go to] other day centres, in Camden town near the zoo. It's like here, same sort of thing, you go in and say what your problem is, and they help you out. On Christmas, it was the crisis at Christmas mob. Depends on the time, and what I need.' – Graham

This illustrates how rough sleepers may be expending more temporal and physical labour to find information, compared to more stably housed users. The disjointed nature of support services reinforces the need for information hubs (e.g., public libraries) as services that can connect users with multiple information sources, reducing their labour. The quote also demonstrates Graham's reflexivity, he knows what support is available, where - and alternates depending upon the nature of his need.

Once information is found, users can then evaluate it, appraising its trustworthiness and applicability to their individual circumstances. Peer support from friends or family can provide a chance to discover and check the reliability of information. Andrea spoke about how she finds and assesses information sourced.

'I found it [support service] - my friends showed me Citizen Bureau in Sydenham. Niece is come to my house and helping me understand letters and things.' – Andrea

Andrea's quote demonstrates the role friends/family can play in helping evaluate information sources. As seen with Lloyd (2014) they may be selected as they are the most readily available way of checking information reliability, or as an established relationship - they are trusted to assess whether a piece of information is needs appropriate. This helps give users confidence in their information use.

How are users utilising the information found?

Once information has been gathered, users are utilising it to meet physiological (personal safety, food, shelter), or social needs (interaction, knowledge sharing, relaxation) - by employing personal strategies to manage, present, and share the information they have found.

Managing information

Remembering appointments, directions, or a course of action, is vital to users' ability to action housing, immigration, or benefit information successfully. This requires individuals to have a process in place to absorb and embed understanding.

'I write it down, I put it on my fridge. 'Monday, I going such and such', place it on my fridge, so I always open my fridge – I know that I have an appointment.'
- Vicky

'I'll draw a picture. Someone will say to me, 'you've got an appointment at such'. Alright then, I draw . . . basically a map to where I was going.' – Ellen

As seen with Rifa-Valls (2011) both instances demonstrate how physical and visual learning strategies help with retaining and recalling new information, either by visually repositioning it, or by requiring the body to recursively engage with it. These strategies are also portable, adaptable to the peripatetic realities of homelessness – and may help users in translating complex institutional information.

Presenting information

Rough sleepers can be at risk of violence from both outside and inside the homeless community. Knowledge sharing can be used to re-present the self and manage risk. Graham discussed the need to create a reputation within the homeless community, to ensure personal safety.

‘You have to make a reputation for yourself that you’re a dangerous bastard. If they kick ya your gonna fight back. You have to do that, if you don’t do it, they’ll boot the face off ya, they’d kill ya stone dead.’ - Graham

For Graham, utilising risk-based knowledge involves presenting yourself through body and demeanour, as someone who may fight back. Graham subsequently acts as an information source, by creating a reputation that can then be disseminated back through the homeless community via word of mouth. As seen with Lloyds (2007) examination of firefighters acting as bodily information sources for others, Graham is utilising information exchange within the homeless community to ensure his own personal safety.

Physical and emotional support

Participants shared how their information use is interlinked with physical and emotional support. This can include connecting with information to receive food and warmth or emotional support in parenting or wellbeing practices.

‘On a pissy rainy day, to come and sit down [at Spires] and drink tea or something. At other places it’s hard.’ – Graham

Graham shares how a need for physical comfort and emotional support can drive his engagement with an information sharing space, demonstrating the symbiotic relationship between information discovery and physical/ emotional support.

Support services can therefore play a role similar to other users’ social groups or wellbeing practices.

‘I like to see people, talk to people. I don’t have friends; I don’t have anybody because my sisters they live in Europe. Bring them together, a woman’s group. women together with children, what you do at home, what you do with the children. Share things.’ – Vicky

‘I watch movies, I put myself in a way to laugh and have fun. But mostly I listen to music, I used it to sleep, to wake up. All music. That calms my brain to put me back in life.’ – Bill

Vicky discusses how social information sharing enables her to meet her emotional and parental needs. Homeless individuals can be isolated from peer support, and actively seek an environment where they can share information. For Bill, music enables him to remain calm, grounded, and open to receiving information by helping

build emotional resilience. This reinforces the relationship between information and emotional support.

4.3 Barriers to information finding and use

This second thematic category centres on barriers to information, as experienced by participants.

Systemic / Institutional

We found that barriers to information access are constructed or exacerbated by the policies, information delivery methods (online, appointments), and service offerings (times, locations) of different support services.

Service conditions and the user profile can intersect to stymie information access and deepen marginalisation for people with complex needs.

‘The Citizens Bureau is not like Spires. With my bad leg, you go there, it is raining. You stay outside, is not very good.’ – Andrea

For Andrea, the information barriers presented by her health conditions are compounded by services not factoring in the negative accessibility impact that standing outside in poor weather can have. These negative experiences can impact users’ willingness to revisit support services – creating a fruitless cycle where information needs are environmentally deflected.

Organisations can also impose restrictions to manage the number of individuals seeking support; this can reduce accessibility for the most vulnerable.

‘You have to be very early, nine it opens. You make a queue, you stay outside, they call you 1,1,1 forward. maybe [allow in] 10 people, then finish. When I go now, I’m given an appointment after I found this French lady, appointments now at 11, and I was happy.’ – Andrea

Early opening times, long queues, and limited availability negatively impact Andrea’s ability to access informational support. Foreign language also presented an accessibility barrier (Andrea is French speaking). Once she was able to connect with French speaking support, she could remedy the accessibility barriers she was facing.

Some users view the UK Government as the ultimate architect of the information landscape, and specifically benefit entitlement and access routes. Graham felt the Government have a poor understanding of homeless individuals’ accessibility challenges, with inappropriate routes of information dissemination serving to isolate users.

‘The government are stupid, an ordinary thick person from the street, who has no education, they never gone to college, and they expect us to go and do something online and all that. We don’t know how to start, we wouldn’t know what to do in the first place. Plain stupidity, the government are plain stupidity. They think everybody has a college education like they have, and they have not.’ – Graham

As explored by Harris (2020) the digitisation of support services to the homeless has put the onus on individuals to manage claims and administration online, with digital literacy and hardware access barriers to this route. Graham also exhibited mistrust in the Government, which may affect his receptiveness to information via this route.

Beyond the welfare system, many support services have pursued a digital by default policy in the dissemination of information.

'People have said to me 'well we have done it online for you', it's all online, or on a text. I am too stupid, I don't know what a text is, I don't even know how to find a text on that [points to phone]. When they say 'we're gonna text you', I say don't do that whatever you do, if you need to speak to me again, ring me on my number and talk to me one to one. Don't send me no text, I won't know how to look for a text. I have not got a clue. Ringing, that's the only way for me.' – Graham

For rough sleepers like Graham, support services sharing information with him online and via text has resulted in vital information being missed. As seen with Lloyd (2020) the advance of online communication technologies disadvantages transient populations and can entrench social marginalisation.

The contradictory seeming nature of housing law and entitlement also presents barriers to understanding and information use.

'They give you all this information. They say 'well, you can't stay here. You can't go there. You can't do this and you can't do that. But if you do this and you do that'. [they say] 'oh but you can't leave the property. If you leave the property you're making yourself intentionally homeless'. So, what do you want me to do? If I don't leave, I'm in breach of the thing [tenancy agreement], but if I do leave, then I'm making myself intentionally homeless. how does that work?' - Ellen

Here Ellen discusses how the stress of being threatened with homelessness was compounded by contradictory information being shared by housing services. This can create an impression that information providers are not "on your side", isolating users when they are trying to discover the best course of action from the information provided.

Ellen found supported housing rules equally destabilising.

'You get bombarded with stuff where I live. You got a set of rules on one panel, you got three different sets of rules on the wall, and then you got a set of rules on the door, and you're being given another set of rules when you come in.' – Ellen

Ellen discussed the overwhelming nature of supported housing rules, being given altered sets of information, at different times, via different routes, creates a sense of confusion. This again can isolate the user, sharing information as a rules-based high stakes test that users pass or fail. Failure to understand resulting in the loss of accommodation.

Participants ability to use information can be highly dependent on the actions of others. Ellen discussed how slow information sharing between the prison service and housing agencies impacted her ability to receive support.

'It was a matter of presenting myself as homeless on the day that I left [prison] with someone from the prison. It was like – 'ah you still got such and such amount of time remaining'. And [then] It's like lastminute.com. And then everyone runs around like headless chickens.' – Ellen

Unpacking personal needs (to receive support) can mean difficult emotional labour for users. The ineffective collaboration described will have been hampered by Ellen's reduced ability to seek and act on information for herself due to being incarcerated - with reduced ability to plan, and no agency to act independently. This contrasts with the ease in which Ellen accessed leaflets at the library, which provided her with the ability to gather/act upon information independently.

In addition to the disconnect between services, the attitudes and behaviours of support service staff can present a barrier to information.

‘If when I go there [Citizens Advice] I don’t find the same lady [staff member], then I’m not lucky, others there are maybe rude, coming to make fun [of me], make me no want to go back.’ – Andrea

Here Andrea describes that the value of support received depends on which staff she encounters. As explored by Desjarlais (1997) and Zhang and Chawner (2018) bias and negative social attitudes (towards homelessness, culture, or race) can affect homeless individuals’ information access routes.

Personal / social

As well as the institutional barriers users raised, personal situations, individual information approaches, and social interaction can present information barriers. The threat of homelessness causes fear and stress, and this stress can alter individual’s information practices.

‘When I saw internet, I have no choice than to call. Because I needed help that moment.’ - Vicky

As explored by Hersberger (2011) fear or stress may impact on the user’s ability to make decisions around information services, with urgency or immediacy as factors that reduce the spectrum of sources available to the homeless individual. This means users in crisis can’t be selective about where or to whom they go, sometimes because of the scarcity of support services in an area.

The reality of cohabiting in temporary accommodation creates stress. This new social reality may alter the individual's information practices and their social trust.

'They put you in a hostel. It's alright, roof over your head, three meals a day. Problem was you get pricks, junkies, and smackheads. People say, 'can you lend me 20 quid I give it back to you Thursday'. All this nonsense. You soon have to put a stop to that as well.' – Graham

Although a source of information for Graham, cohabiting within the homeless community creates stress and relationship difficulties, which is a possible counterpoint to social information sources. Graham thus exhibits self-protective behaviour, again learnt experientially, of how to cohabit in the hostel environment.

In contrast, an absence of social support can negatively impact individual information behaviours. Users are often finding and using information in isolation, and desire peer support when deciding upon a course of action.

Trust

Trust can be significant determinant to users' information practices, with users showing mistrust in both institutional and social information sources.

To feel trust, potential users need a clear awareness of a service offering prior to engagement. Ellen and Bill spoke about how unclear service advertising and routes of transmission can affect trust.

'It's not advertised widely [Spires], I mean it's on the internet, but not everyone has got the internet, and not everyone has got a phone, an awful lot of people just don't like them. It would be nice to be able to send people here, and them not [to] feel so hesitant.' - Ellen

‘When I got here, I saw the spelling of the name, but I didn’t know what they were on about. I couldn’t think, what did I expect?’ – Bill

The stress of seeking information in crisis can thus be compounded by confusing messaging about how the service can support you.

Discovering information services via inaccurate signposting can also affect trust.

‘It may be misinformation that’s brought them to us. For example, the job centre, constantly send people here. As soon as people say they are homeless, ‘go to Spires, they will sort you out. They have got accommodation’. And that’s a fallacy.’ – Pauline

This shows how a lack of joined up services might result in users feeling let down by encountering an unreliable information source – with users expending physical labour and time to connect with information that does not address their needs.

In reverse, trusting the reliability of an information service can also stem from the profile of other service users.

‘I like it because my friend was here from my country. and other friend who speaking [my language] is coming here.’ – Andrea

In this quote, Andrea shares how meeting other service users who spoke her native language (French) contributed to her confidence and trust in using Spires. Users from outside the UK may have to work harder to discover a supportive community. As seen with Lloyd (2014) the coethnic profile of other service users can contribute to trust in information sources.

Homeless individuals share their experiences of trusted information providers with one another, which helps tackle individuals' hesitancy to seek information.

'I can pass on the knowledge that I have [from using the service] to other people. And I can see why when people come here sometimes, they get a bit wary, they don't want to lose things [from sharing personal information].' – Ellen

Ellen shares her experiences of using support services with other homeless people, to help overcome trust concerns they may have - potentially caused by negative previous experiences with services.

To address mistrust, support services and users can invest time in building relationships.

'It's getting to know people, the people in the group. because I used to come on the art day, it was really nice. I'd sit and talk, or make things, crack jokes. So, there was quite a few months of doing that.' – Ellen

Ellen describes how she learnt to trust Spires over time, by being involved in groups, with a space to chat informally and build relationships with other users and staff. This reinforces the finding that other homeless people are a crucial tool of trust building for services - helping reassure individuals that services do not have ulterior motives. As Hersberger found (2003), users can view support staff as friends (hybrid ties), who take the time to build a relationship.

Trust can also be built through advocacy. Dealing with statutory services can be daunting - with language, and social confidence presenting barriers to users' successful communication with services.

'Spires have power, they say [on the phone] 'I am support worker at Spires', [people on the other end of phone] they go quiet.' – Andrea

Andrea recounts the respect that was shown to Spires' staff (in comparison to herself, feeling that she was often dismissed in her informational interactions). As Lloyd (2010) notes, advocacy contributes to building trust between user and staff - and can help serve as a template for the user's own future informational exchanges.

Sometimes mistrust can be well founded. The homeless community are the most readily available information source but can be a source of misinformation, demonstrating the complex relationship between reliance and trustfulness, and between people sharing the same needs and competing for limited resources.

'Some [other homeless] people have a black heart; they'll send you to empty buildings and that for spite. They'll send you to an old wreck of building and say, 'that's the Spires', in the middle of a park.' – Graham

Graham shared how other rough sleepers can deliberately misdirect those seeking support. This shows how rough sleepers are expending more physical labour to meet their informational needs - with misinformation degrading trust in other homeless people (their most readily available information source).

4.4 Spires' staff and information accessibility

This final set of thematic categories examines the experiences of Spires staff, including strategies used to mediate the accessibility of information, and approaches to user education.

Information accessibility needs of users

The Spires' staff we interviewed identified numerous information needs facing users. These included understanding benefit entitlements, immigration information, managing personal finances, understanding life administration, drug, and alcohol support, and accessing harm reduction information (safe drug use, sexual health).

Mediating the accessibility of information

One of the key information roles of staff identified as part of this study is mediating the accessibility of information. This mediation role includes user advocacy, strategies to debunk organisational jargon, often requiring some subject specialism to mediate the accessibility of information.

Staff try to address organisational literacy by using their subject knowledge to unpack the jargon of the housing, benefit, and immigration sectors.

'It is about debunking the fear that comes with a lot of this stuff. [I say] let's speak to them [the council]. 'Oh, no' [user says]. Let's speak to them, they're sending you this. For example, a rent arrears letter, 'they're going to kick me out!' No, they want to know whether you're in there or not, so just talk to people. But it is terrifying when you're in that situation. Its explaining, this is not high court, you know. And it's about knowing those different levels.' - Pauline

Not understanding the terminology used by statutory services, or where in a process they might be (formal or informal), causes fear and stress for individuals, in turn making it difficult to engage with information. Staff aim to increase the accessibility of this information by unpacking the truth/rationale behind organisational correspondence for users.

Information accessibility support goes beyond explanation: it can involve accompanying individuals to appointments, clarifying administrative processes and how they apply to user's particular circumstances.

'Sometimes [I] go with them to appointments, so that you help them there. Because it's all very well saying, go there, and then they don't know what they've got to do there. I think that a lot of language can be a real barrier to them. Just understanding what it is that is available.' – Lauren

This demonstrates how difficult the institutional structures and demands involved in informational exchange can be for users.

To provide ongoing support, staff must maintain a trusting support relationship. However, acting as an intermediary between individuals and statutory services can challenge this relationship.

'It's hard because we are one of those in-betweens. We're not the mental health team. We're not a government body. So, we sit above friendship, because we're professionals, but below corporate. We are that middle ground. So that is hard. It's like being middle management, you have to have a foot in each camp, and try and be Switzerland.' – Pauline

Pauline outlines the challenge of building / maintaining trust with service users to understand their needs fully, whilst acting as an intermediary between user and statutory services. Intermediating can mean relaying disappointing news to users regarding entitlements (housing, benefits) and, as seen with Ellen's point around service wariness, this might erode user trust.

One important aspect of increasing information accessibility is to set realistic expectations with users about what may be the possible outcomes of their information use.

'I think they [users] just turn up and they think we can just sort it, magic wand, and here you go, you have got property. And sometimes there's sort of an expectation that they're entitled to everything when they're not.' – Lauren

Lauren shares how part of her mediator role is tackling misconceptions individuals have about support available, and their entitlement to access it. Setting realistic expectations may not be welcomed by individuals but it will save them time in the future. As this study has found, false expectations can be the result of misinformation (or confusing information) from other services or social sources.

Information transmission/learning

Spires' staff have developed instructional methods to help embed knowledge with the users. Their approach to instruction involves outreach, visual and active learning techniques.

An informational support provision is dependent on individuals discovering a service in the first instance, and then building trust so users engage in a learning opportunity. As this study has found, the initial reach for information involves considerable emotional and temporal labour by users.

'I think outreach, even day outreach, [is about] getting out there, you know, talking to people out on the street, or visiting them where they are staying or their hostels. You know, meeting them halfway.' – Lauren

Lauren discusses how individuals may be reluctant to seek support, unaware of services, unable to attend at advertised hours, or apprehensive of what sharing personal information may involve. Outreach work is about easing the path to information (not putting the onus of labour entirely on the individual).

Even once a homeless individual is supported within a trusting service relationship, their orientation to learning can be impacted by mistrust, complex needs (mental and physical health, addiction, contact with criminal justice system) and cultural and language difference.

'Language, mental health. It is not the information. It is about ability to receive and understand it. And act on it. We can try to relay information. But it's about, making people resilient enough, strong enough and supported enough to hear that.' – Pauline

'It's not necessarily because they haven't understood [the information], it's because they've realised [acting upon it] is going to take them down a different path, and they don't want to go down that path.' – Lauren

This shows that users can avoid information for fear of possible negative consequences, highlighting how it can be the relationship between trust and

personal information disclosure which takes time to overcome. This reverberates with Andrea and Graham's points around how service mistrust and negative experiences impacted their ability to find information. Other times, as seen with Lloyd and Hicks (2022), high stress situations result in a refusal to participate as a response to information saturation. The mediator's role in bridging trust, building confidence, and managing complex needs (addiction, mental and physical health) can one again be key to reorienting users towards learning.

Guiding users' information practices includes the setting of expectations.

'Sometimes you have to take the air out of the balloon a lot, bursting their bubble a lot of the time. You don't want to be negative, you're like, that is great but unfortunately.' – Pauline

Support services have a duty to describe a realistic picture, to save the user time, avoiding them pursuing something which may be fruitless. Staff must strike the right balance between providing hope, giving users the courage to apply information – and instilling realism to avoid disappointment which may be disempowering.

Spires' staff are also employing instructional strategies, such as visual mapping, interactive workshops, and task break downs. Enabling users to understand how information intersects with organisational processes, and then guiding information use, which can require visual instruction.

'I draw, where you do a flowchart almost, of how the procedures would work. So, if I can draw a picture mentally for them. I think that sticks.' - Pauline

'A [user] needed support to understand a court process. Just had no idea. And we ended up literally drawing what would happen, and then she got it.

Until then she just could not visualise or understand what was going to happen when she had to go to court.’ – Lauren

Both staff members shared how they visually map out how information flows through other organisations (courts, welfare system) and where the users fit in. As shown by Grushka (2009) and Hicks and Lloyd (2018), representing information exchange pictorially helps users retain and recall information for future use.

When information practice requires the use of IT systems, practical, active learning can be beneficial.

‘With Universal Credit, I like to get them on it doing it themselves. On the account, and get them to play with it, when we have got that luxury of time.’ - Lauren

This finding shows that active, participatory learning techniques are helping users apply information within the digital environment - by physically engaging them, and creating a low stake, experimental environment.

For some users, breaking down information into smaller units can help avoid information overload.

‘I break it down. If that means you have to see them twice a week, then that's what I'll do. That's what I try and do, otherwise it's too much, do this, do that, then they end up doing nothing. You've just completely overwhelmed them, so it's just breaking it down.’ – Lauren

The layered, task orientated nature of information use (applying for benefits, housing, attending appointments) can overwhelm many. Lauren describes how

breaking large tasks down into smaller ones provides an opportunity to check understanding and progress – akin to the ‘chunk and check’ strategy used by healthcare professionals to relay information and ensure user understanding (Nielson-Bohlman *et al*, 2004). This strategy helps build users information management tools for the future.

The aim of these educational interventions is to build users confidence and enable them to use that information.

‘I would quite often encourage them to do it if they can do it. And then letting them reap the benefit of that. it can be small things. I'll fill in the form with you, but now you need to go and post it. You need to go and get the stamp. it might seem quite small, but actually [it is not].’ - Lauren

Lauren sees the staff role as one that guides and educates users around information use, by using different teaching strategies (interactive and visual learning) akin to a mentor role, which recognises otherwise unrecordable achievement. The eventual goal being that they can apply this learning independently.

The overarching aspiration is the user’s eventual independence from Spire services. When users act with information and receive positive results, this can reinforce successful behaviour. However, a path to independence is not always clear cut - with fear, avoidance, and the other barriers discussed, complicating this route. Pauline was concerned about users’ dependence on information accessibility support. This dependency can be created by other services, or Spire itself.

‘It did create a lot of dependency [shift to Universal Credit], people thought that’s not my job. That was huge, informing people. That yes, this is your

responsibility. It is not for us to do. [It] caused loads of tension and conflict. We went out to visit all the people that were going to be impacted. We did project groups, steering groups. Everyone had visits, we had training sessions to explain how it would work.' - Pauline

Pauline discusses the balance between providing support and managing everything for an individual. This indicates that Spires are trying to teach individuals the skills to eventually manage information independently. However, the structural barriers faced by users are profound (poverty, addiction, poor health), and are not easily solved. A tension emerges whereby staff question why people are recursively seeking support, indicating the limitations of learning provisions when they intersect with social deprivation.

5- Discussion

This study found that the reality of homelessness shapes individuals information practices, by introducing them to new information landscapes - which require attendant practices to access and use information. As Lloyd (2010) discussed, community information landscapes (such as Spires) are closely aligned to lifelong learning and the promotion of individual empowerment. Yet, identifying these IL contexts within the community is difficult, because the information work done in these settings is not framed within the 'library-centric' IL prism (Lloyd, 2010, p.146). A key finding of this study is that Spires do represent one such IL landscape - with staff deploying skills, resources, and learning opportunities to make information accessible, and build users information practices. This chapter will focus on two key themes that emerged from the findings. The first explores the information practices of the homeless, including the role of informal unstructured learning and embodied information practices. The second theme examines the IL teaching role of Spires' staff, how it is enacted, and the barriers that impact its effectiveness.

5.1 Learning

The role of Spires

User groups like the homeless, with multiple deprivations, (e.g., health, education, employment) can be reluctant to seek informational support from recognised, but general, information services (libraries), instead connecting more readily with peers and/or support workers for their information needs (Buchanan and Nicol, 2018). This study found that participants felt comfortable meeting their information needs through Spires' staff, often over recognisable information services. Previous studies by

Mitchell (1987) and Lloyd (2014) have shown that the weak tie relationship between users and support staff can be beneficial to users, by introducing them to an expanded information base and practices.

Informal unstructured learning

This research found that participants information practices were impacted by their social interactions both inside and outside of Spires, citing increased service trust, and resource discovery as a result. This shows that amongst the homeless community (who can have limited access to resources) users are more reliant upon accessing/testing information socially.

The peer group element to Spires was cited by participants as an important outlet for information sharing to meet their needs (parenting information, service discovery etc) and guiding use. This demonstrates that users discern benefits from opportunities for informal social learning, which may be otherwise unavailable due to being isolated from peer and family support. As Lloyd (2014, p. 59) highlighted in the case of refugees, social outlets help individuals orientate themselves within a new information landscape, with peers serving a confirmatory role (checking whether information or understanding is valid) and a mediation role (helping others understand nuance within the new information landscape). Cameron *et al* (2004, p. 34) also highlighted the importance of peer recognition for homeless learners, as often their achievements go unrecorded.

This study found that Spires are providing a social space which is key to a wider application of user's information practices. Lloyd *et al* (2010) highlighted the

importance of social information sharing for refugees, with other community members able to provide some information that service providers cannot. Billet (1996, p. 276) also underscored the importance of social sources of knowledge within a community of information practice, stating that knowledge appropriation serves to guide users in the deployment of information and problem solving.

Whilst Spires users are sourcing socially held knowledge through group interaction (observation, guidance, sharing experiences), possible barriers to participation exist, including mistrust in other homeless people, and individual complex needs. Equally, user designed social groupings may exclude others on the grounds of race, cultural identity, or disability (Billet, 1996, p. 210).

Embodied information practices

This study found that the rough sleeper subgroup is drawing upon the corporeal knowledge of their own bodies, and the embodied knowledge of the wider homeless community to both connect with other information sources and ensure personal safety. Such embodied information practices can be enacted in situ, i.e., on the street.

Personal safety was one of the biggest challenges rough sleepers faced, with this study finding that participants were using their bodies to mitigate risk, by observing others, or using their bodies in different ways. With rough sleepers facing violence and victimisation on the street, negative experiences are retained and recalled as knowledge sharing amongst the homeless community, with participants subsequently enacting this knowledge (e.g., deciding where to sleep, who not to bed

down with). Individuals are also using this knowledge to re-present themselves (through action / demeanour) as someone “not to be messed with”. As seen with Lloyds (2007) study of firefighters embodied information practices, rough sleepers’ bodies are an information source, an arena of embodied knowledge, that is being drawn on by the community to manage risk.

5.2 Spires’ teaching

The positioning of Spires’ staff as an intermediary between users and statutory services, makes them well placed to deliver IL education based on the homeless users’ urgent needs (housing, finances, health). This study found that staff are playing an important IL educator role, by employing pedagogical practices and subject specialism – to enable users to access information and understand the structure of the support information landscape. This chimes with Lloyd *et al* (2013) finding that refugee support staff were deploying strategies to mediate information for users to increase its accessibility. Spires’ staff showed a deep understanding of how homelessness impacts learning, including the increased time needed to build trust, tackle low self-esteem, and ameliorate previous negative experiences of learning spaces, reflecting the findings of Cameron *et al* (2003, p. 26).

Identifying user’s information needs

This study found that Spires staff’s ability to fully identify users’ information needs was dependent on establishing trust, and overcoming their wariness around personal information disclosure. As Chatman (1996, p.197) highlights, people need to trust information sources, ‘otherwise why run the risk of telling others about our private

lives'. This becomes especially pertinent when complex needs are present (addiction, poverty, contact with the criminal justice system). Unclear service messaging, digital accessibility, misinformation (or confusing information) from social and institutional sources, and previous negative user interactions with statutory services, were all found to challenge the establishment of trust.

Previous studies by Buchanan and Nicol (2018) and Lloyd (2013, 2019) have highlighted the role that informational intermediaries play in building trust, before assessing informational needs. Official crime statistics would suggest that the homeless are not often the victims of crime compared to the general public (Metropolitan Police Service, 2018), but this differs from the experience of support service staff and the homeless themselves, with a report finding the homeless to be 17 times more likely to have experienced violence compared to the general public (Sanders and Albanese, 2016). That the homeless don't readily report crime illustrates how trust impacts users' willingness to share information – entrenching the marginalisation of the most vulnerable.

This research has demonstrated that Spires' staff are using their sustained engagement with users to identify their everyday information needs and bridge the trust gap. As Chatman (1996, p.196) indicates, users can employ secrecy and deception 'even in situations where informing might lead to assistance', because of the risk that information disclosure results in adverse impacts. For Spires, tackling this involved providing emotional support and reassurance, and initially meeting physiological needs (food, clothing) as a crucial relationship building tool. Hersberger (1998, 2011) and Lloyd *et al* (2017) also found that for the homeless and refugees,

the meeting of physiological needs (food, clothing) acts as an initial trust building step, which then enables more targeted informational support by services.

At Spires, once a support relationship is established, staff are able to engage users in conversations to discover more informationally dependent needs (housing, benefits, immigration law). Previous research (Buchanan *et al*, 2019. Lloyd *et al*, 2013, 2020) has explored the active role of information intermediaries (nurses, refugee support staff) in identifying the information needs of users and then connecting them with other information sources outside of their subject specialism. However, Spires' staff are using their areas of specialism (housing, drug and alcohol, immigration) to provide targeted informational needs assessments, and the connection to relevant information sources.

Formal structured learning

A key theme that emerged from the findings was the role of support staff in constructing guided learning environments for service users. Spires' staff were found to be employing different pedagogical practices to orientate and adjust users to the social support information landscape (Lloyd, 2014). These included: assessing their primary learning needs (developing life skills, building confidence and self-esteem), helping them set informationally dependent goals (complete forms, attend appointments), and improving their needs based subject knowledge around housing, benefits, and immigration (Cameron *et al*, 2003, p. 32). This approach shares an affinity with the academic librarian teaching role, which utilises the reference interview, informational tasks (database searching, referencing), and learning outcomes, to deepen users' subject knowledge.

Spires staff reported employing active learning techniques, such as practical workshops, to teach users how to manage information online. They also utilised visual mapping to depict information flows and guide situationally dependent information use – and they utilised ‘chunk and check’ strategies (Nielson-Bohlman, 2004) to ensure user understanding. Lloyd *et al* (2017) also found that refugee support staff are using visual and verbal strategies (flowcharts, task breakdowns) to increase the accessibility of information for users and orientate them in the wider structure of the support information landscape. Spires’ staff were also recognising users otherwise unrecordable information-based achievements, such as completing a task (or part of a task), building their confidence.

As Lloyd (2010) highlights, community-based IL settings can be focused on a library-centric skills approach, often equating good IL with the use of IT and digital information skills. However, although Spires did engage users in skills training recognisable to librarians, they also delivered a broader notion of IL - acting as an intermediary between users and other services, visually and verbally unpacking social processes (court hearings, immigration law), or physically mediating information use (accompanying to appointments) – using these as “teachable moments” for service users. By enacting learning in situ, staff can test understanding and provide teaching at the point of need – as opposed to librarians, whose teaching often takes place in the idealised library space, uncoupled from its real-world application.

Spires' staff understood that user learning is impacted by individual context (e.g., addiction, rough sleeping), which requires a holistic approach to IL, moving away from a narrow skills approach. Spires' staff are approaching IL education within the context of social support, where unlike libraries, information is imbedded and its architecture opaque. Homeless users require urgent assistance, but do not always equate that assistance with information seeking and use. Equally, some users resist engaging in learning, either as a response to feeling overwhelmed, or through an individual anticipation of where proposed learning may lead them, deciding to disengage.

Empowerment

A theme emerging through this study is the relationship between lifelong learning and empowerment. Lloyd states that a key IL value 'is empowering people, regardless of modes of information access or delivery' (Lloyd, 2010, p114). However, for the homeless the structural learning barriers are multitudinous - with poverty, addiction, relationships breakdowns, poor health, and contact with the criminal justice system all challenging how effective any IL learning provision can be (Arellano-Douglas, 2020). Kabeer (1999, p.437) defines "empowerment" as 'the expansion in people's ability to make strategic life choices in a context where this ability was previously denied to them'. A hallmark of empowerment is the ability to implement choice, yet structural barriers such as poverty 'disempower by removing the ability to meet one's primary needs, and exercise choice' (Kabeer, 1999, p.437). It follows that users' basic needs must be met before the true potential of lifelong learning and IL can be realised.

Through this study, a difference clearly appears between recognisable information services (libraries), and support services. Whereas public libraries focus on continuous user engagement to enable learning and empower users to engage in 'active citizenry' (Yoshida, 2021), Spires wants to avoid creating a support dependency - positioning the service as a time-limited learning to independence. Yet the homeless do cyclically engage with both support services and libraries, as the structural barriers they encounter remain.

A disconnect emerges between an idealised version of IL, lifelong learning, and empowerment - that fails to recognise the limitation of such approaches against the backdrop of severe structural barriers (e.g., poverty, addiction, domestic violence). Spires approach to IL education suggests that staff understand the inability of learning provisions alone, to truly address these barriers - with the vagaries of IL's "empowerment" narrative doing little to resolve them. Instead, Spires chooses to focus on targeted IL education to enable users to assimilate the new support information landscape (benefits, housing entitlement etc), equipping them with a degree of agency and self-sufficiency. Spires educational approach is holistic, combining IL with other forms of support (food, clothing, shelter, emotional, advocacy) to alleviate, if not resolve, the challenges homeless users face.

6- Conclusion

This concluding chapter revisits the study's research objectives against our findings. The study's wider contribution to the IL and homeless service fields are then laid out, and recommendations for those delivering information services to the homeless presented. We then identify areas worthy of further research.

6.1 Research objectives

This study set out to explore how the lived reality of homelessness shapes the information practices of the homeless, and how embodied information practices are being employed by the homeless. The study also aimed to examine the IL education role of Spire, developing a set of service recommendations for those providing information services to the homeless.

This study has demonstrated that the lived reality of homelessness does shape individual information practices. Homeless individuals were engaging in numerous information activities which enabled them to connect with support services, apply for benefits, secure housing, understand organisational processes (immigration, court hearings), and manage personal safety.

Further findings demonstrated that trust played an important role within participants' information practices, influencing source selection, and information use - with support staff relationships and peer-to-peer information sharing helping to bridge trust gaps. Equally, we found that trust could be eroded by misinformation from other services and the wider homeless community. This demonstrates that any successful

intervention into homeless information practices, must consider the navigation of trust.

The study also traced the importance of personal safety for the rough sleeper community, finding that they are employing embodied information practices to manage their own personal safety and practice self-care.

Significantly, this research has established the homeless support service as a site of IL education. The IL strategies employed by Spires' staff move beyond a narrow skills approach (and a detached library-centred conception of empowerment through lifelong learning), to instead engage with the real-world application of information in situ (at appointments, liaising with services) – complemented by broader social support (shelter, food, clothing). This approach aims to enable users to understand the social support information landscape and how to navigate it through their information practices.

6.2 Contribution

This study is making several contributions to the IL and homeless service fields. Firstly, it contributes to IL education by extending our knowledge of how IL teaching takes place within the everyday context. Additionally, this study has built upon existing research into the role of IL mediators (Buchanan, 2018), highlighting how different educational interventions can help mediate the accessibility of information, and guide its use.

This study is the first in the UK to explore the information practices of the homeless, and the IL educator role of homeless service staff. This is significant, as it draws a connecting line between homeless individuals' information practices, the informational role of support services, and wider efforts to address social exclusion, all situated within the UK context.

This is also the first study to examine the embodied information practices of the rough sleeper community, specifically the use of such practices to tackle high levels of violence.

6.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings of this research, this study has recommendations for several groups, including homeless service providers, public libraries, and local authorities.

Those providing information services to the homeless should consider:

- Users' information practices are highly bound up with trust – with informal social mixing and relationship building an important trust bridging tool for services. The establishment of trust corresponds to user's receptiveness to learning opportunities. Services should invest in relationship building to ensure users' orientation to learning.
- The role of social information exchange within homeless users' information practices, with social or peer groups providing opportunities for users to compare experiences and guide information use. The social provision of services becomes especially important as the homeless often have little access to other social

sources (friends, family), to verify or test information with. As part of this, services should consider how they facilitate social groups and ensure representative participation.

- Embodied knowledge is being used by rough sleepers to manage personal safety and obtain street level risk information unavailable via services. Services should consider how they facilitate knowledge sharing amongst the rough sleeper community, and how they understand users' bodies as an information source for other community members.
- The importance of homeless service partnerships with information hubs (libraries, community centres) emerged through this study, where individuals can connect with information for multiple needs. This study found that users were expending a large amount of physical energy to engage with different services, and undertaking difficult emotional labour unpacking personal needs to access informational support. Information hubs circumvent the need for continuous personal disclosure to access information. This can be achieved through notice boards, signage, and leaflets. Highlighting the enduring importance of portable, recordable information which users can take with them.

6.4 Future research

The potential of IL provisions to empower homeless learners has been explored within this study, and yet as Kabeer (1999, p.461) points out, "empowerment" is a difficult thing to measure and foster, combining resources (informational, monetary,

social etc), and agency (life choices and their transformative potential), which becomes an unrealistic concept alongside the structural barriers homeless individuals face – meaning any IL provision to the homeless must address the long term resolution of users primary needs (food, clothing, safety, shelter, financial stability).

Our findings uncovered areas deserving of further research, including:

- A critique of the empowerment narrative of lifelong learning as it applies to learner groups experiencing social deprivation. How do IL and lifelong learning provisions take account of the structural barriers encountered by learners in a social support setting?
- A deeper examination into the embodied information practices of the rough sleeper community, including how such practices may be used to ensure personal safety, or meet social and emotional needs.

This study found that homeless information practices are interlinked with trust and social exchange - and has demonstrated the role of embodied information practices in managing risk for rough sleepers. The study has also traced the IL education role of the Spires Homeless Centre. These findings have wider implications for homeless and information services, in terms of service design and pedagogical practices employed. However, more work needs to be done to further differentiate between successful and unsuccessful IL education strategies within the homeless service context, and the relationship between embodied information practices, homelessness, and personal safety.

Bibliography

Ahmadinia, H *et al.* 2022. Health Seeking Behaviours of Immigrants, Asylum Seekers, and Refugees in Europe: A Systematic Review of Peer Reviewed Articles. *Journal of Documentation*, 78(7), pp. 18-41.

Almquist, Z W. 2020. Large-scale spatial network models: An Application to Modelling Information Diffusion Through the Homeless Population of San Francisco. *Urban Analytics and City Science*, 47(3), pp. 523-540.

Arellano-Douglas, V. 2020. Moving from Critical Assessment to Assessment as Care. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 14(1), pp. 46-65.

Bardoff, C. 2015. Homelessness and the Ethics of Information Access. *The Serials Librarian*, 69(3), pp. 347-360.

Bernier, T *et al.* 2021. The Use of Information and Communication Technologies by Sex Workers to Manage Occupational Health and Safety: Scoping Review. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 23(6), pp. 1-14.

Billet, S. 1996. Situated Learning: Bridging Sociocultural and Cognitive Theorising. *Learning and Instruction*, 6(3), pp. 263-280.

Buchanan, S and Nicol, E. 2018. Developing Health Information Literacy in Disengaged At-Risk Populations: Insights to Inform Interventions. *Journal of Documentation*, 75(1), pp. 172-189.

Buchanan, S *et al.* 2019. Information Behaviours in Disadvantaged and Dependent Circumstances and the Role of Information Intermediaries. *Journal of the Association of Information Science and Technology*, 70(2), pp. 117-129.

Burton, M. 2015. *Calling for Justice: Comparing Telephone and Face-to-face Advice in Social Welfare Legal Aid*. ProQuest Dissertation Publishing.

Cameron, H *et al.* 2003. *Crossing the Threshold: Successful Learning Provision for Homeless People*. London: Learning and Skills Development Agency.

Charmaz, K. 2014. *Constructing Grounded Theory*. 2nd ed. California: Thousand Oaks.

Chatman, E A. 1999. A theory of Life in the Round. *Journal of the American Society for Information Sciences*, 50(3), pp. 207-217.

Chatman, E A. 1991. Life in a Small World: Applicability of Gratification Theory to Information Seeking Behaviour. *Journal of the American Society for Information Sciences*, 42(6), pp. 438-449.

Chatman, E. A. 1996. The Impoverished Life-World of Outsiders. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 47(3), pp. 193-206.

Crisis. 2021. Rough Sleepers and Complex Needs. [online] Available from: <https://www.crisis.org.uk/ending-homelessness/rough-sleeping/rough-sleepers-and-complex-needs/> Accessed 16th June 2022.

Denny, E. 2019. Qualitative Research: What is it and What is it Not? *BJOG International Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology*, 126(3).

Desjarlais, R R. 1997. *Shelter Blues: Sanity and Selfhood Among the Homeless*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Dowd, R. 2018. *The Librarians Guide to Homelessness: An Empathy Driven Approach to Solving Problems, Preventing Conflict, and Serving Everyone*. Chicago: ALA Editions.

Dowdell, L and Li Liew, C. 2019. More Than a Shelter: Public Libraries and the Information Needs of People Experiencing Homelessness. *Library & Information Science Research*, 41(4).

Giesler, M A. 2018. The Collaboration Between Homeless Shelters and Public Libraries in Addressing Homelessness. *Journal of Library Administration*, 59(1), pp. 18-44.

Glaser, B G and Strauss, A L. 1967. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. New York: Aldine.

Granovetter, M S. 1973. The Strength of Weak Ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(6), pp. 1360 – 1380.

Grushka, K. 2009. Meaning and Identities: A Visual Performative Pedagogy for Socio-Cultural Learning. *Curriculum Journal*, 20(3), pp. 237-251.

Harris, J. 2020. The Digitization of Advice and Welfare Benefits Services: Re-Imagining the Homeless User. *Housing Studies*, 35(1), pp. 143-162.

Heaslip, V *et al.* 2021. How Do People Who Are Homeless Find Out About Local Health and Social Care Services: A Mixed Method Study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 19(1), pp. 46.

Hersberger, J. 1998. *Everyday Information Needs and Information Sources of Homeless Parents: A Study of Poverty and Perseverance*. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

- Hersberger, J. 2002. Are the Economically Poor Information Poor? Does the Digital Divide Affect the Homeless and Access to Information? *Canadian Journal of Information and Library Science*, 27(3), pp. 45-63.
- Hersberger, J. 2003. A Qualitative Approach to Examining Information Transfer via Social Networks Among Homeless Populations. *The New Review of Information Behaviour Research*, 4(1), pp. 95-108.
- Hersberger, J. 2005. The Homeless and Information Needs and Services. *Reference and User Services Quarterly*, 44(3), pp. 199-202.
- Hersberger, J. 2011. Resilience Theory, Information Behaviour and Social Support in Everyday Life. *Proceedings of the Annual Conference of CAIS*.
- Hicks, A and Lloyd, A. 2018. Seeing Information: Visual Methods as Entry Points to Information Practices. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 50(3), pp. 229-238.
- Hill, T and Tamminen, K A. 2020. Examining the Library as a Site for Intervention: A Mixed Methods Case Study Evaluation of the “Innovative Solutions to the Homeless” Project. *Journal of Library Administration*, 60(5), pp. 470-492.
- Kabeer, N. 1999. Resources, Agency, Achievement: Reflections on the Measurement of Women’s Empowerment. *Development and Change*, 30(3), pp. 435-464.
- Kaplan, S. 2020. Homeless Patrons Utilize the Library for More than Shelter but Public Library Services Are Not Designed with Them in Mind. *Evidence Based Library and Information Practice*, 15(4), pp. 174-175.
- Lemos, G and Frankenburg, S. 2015. Trends and Friends: Access, Use and Benefits of Digital Technology for Homeless and Ex-homeless people. [online] Available from: <https://lankellychase.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/01/Trends-and-Friends-2015.pdf> Accessed 1st May 2022.
- Lloyd, A. 2007. Learning to Put Out the Red Stuff: Becoming Information Literate Through Discursive Practice. *The Library Quarterly*, 77(2), pp. 181-198.
- Lloyd, A. 2010. *Information literacy landscapes: information literacy in education, workplace and everyday contexts*. Oxford: Chandos Publishing.
- Lloyd, A *et al.* 2013. Connecting with New Information Landscapes: Information Literacy Practices of Refugees. *Journal of Documentation*, 69(1), pp. 121-144.

- Lloyd, A. 2014. Building Information Resilience: How Do Resettling Refugees Connect Health Information in Regional Landscapes – Implications for Health Literacy. *Australian Academic and Research Libraries*, 45(1), pp. 48-66.
- Lloyd, A *et al.* 2014. The Health Information Practices of People Living with Chronic Health Conditions: Implications for Health Literacy. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 46(3), pp. 207-216.
- Lloyd, A *et al.* 2017. The Remaking of Fractured Landscapes: Supporting Refugees in Transition. *Information Research*, 22(3).
- Lloyd, A and Olsson, M. 2017. Being in Place: Embodied Information Practices. *Information Research*, 22(1).
- Lloyd, A and Wilkinson, J. 2019. Tapping into the Information Landscape: Refugee Youth Enactment of Information Literacy in Everyday Spaces. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, 51(1), pp. 252-259.
- Lloyd, A. 2020. Shaping the Contours of Fractured Landscapes: Extending the Layering of an Information Perspective on Refugee Resettlement. Elsevier.
- Lloyd, A M. 2021. *The Qualitative Landscape of Information Literacy Research: Perspectives, Methods and Techniques*. London: Facet Publishing.
- Lloyd, A and Hicks, A. 2022. Saturation, Acceleration, and Information Pathologies: The Conditions that Influence the Emergence of Information Literacy Safeguarding Practice in COVID-19 Environments. *Journal of Documentation*.
- Mansour, E. 2018. Profiling Information Needs and Behaviour of Syrian Refugees Displaced in Egypt. *Information and Learning Science*, 119(3), pp. 161-182.
- Markwei, E and Rasmussen, E. 2015. Everyday Life Information-Seeking Behaviour of Marginalized Youth: A Qualitative Study of Urban Homeless Youth in Ghana. *The International Information and Library Review*, 47(1), pp. 11-29.
- Mars, A. 2012. Library Services to the Homeless. *Public Libraries*, 51(2), pp. 31-35.
- Martzoukou, K and Burnett, S. 2018. Exploring the Everyday Life Information Needs and the Socio-Cultural Adaptation Barriers of Syrian Refugees in Scotland. *Journal of Documentation*, 74(5), pp. 1104-1132.
- May, J *et al.* 2010. *Swept Up Lives: Re-envisioning the Homeless City*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- McInnes, D K *et al.* 2013. Opportunities for Engaging Low-Income, Vulnerable Populations in Healthcare: A Systematic Review of Homeless Persons' Access to

and Use of Information Technologies. *American Journal of Public Health*, 103(2), pp. 11-24.

Mckeown, A. 2016. *Overcoming Information Poverty: Investigating the Role of Public Libraries in the Twenty-First Century*. Oxford: Elsevier Science & Technology.

Metropolitan Police Service. 2018. Freedom of Information Request: Victims of Crime Who Were Recorded as Homeless or No Fixed Address. [online] Available from: https://www.met.police.uk/SysSiteAssets/foi-media/metropolitan-police/disclosure_2019/december_2019/information-rights-unit---victims-of-crime-who-were-recorded-as-homeless-or-no-fixed-address-in-2018 Accessed 19th June 2022.

Mitchell, C. 1987. The Components of Strong Ties Among Homeless Women. *Social Networks*, 9(1), pp. 37-47.

Nielson-Bohlman, L *et al.* 2004. *Health Literacy: A Prescription to End Confusion*. Washington, D C: National Academics Publishing.

Oduntan, O and Ruthven, I. 2021. People and Places: Bridging the Information Gaps in Refugee Integration. *Journal of the Association of Information Science and Technology*, 72(1), pp. 83-96.

Pickard, A J. 2013. *Research Methods in Information*. 2nd ed. London: Facet Publishing.

Pressley, T. 2017. Public Libraries, Serious Mental Illness, and Homelessness: A Survey of Public Librarians. *Public Library Quarterly*, 36(1), pp. 61-76.

Randall, S. 1985. The Homeless in the Public Library: Implications for Access to Libraries. *Reference Services Division of the American Library Association*, 25(1), pp. 110-120.

Rice, E and Barman-Adhikari, A. 2014. Internet and Social Media Use as a Resource Among Homeless Youth. *Journal of computer-mediated communication*, 19(2), pp.232-24.

Rifa-Valls, M. 2011. Experimenting with Visual Storytelling in Students Portfolios: Narratives of Visual Pedagogy for Pre-Service Teacher Education. *The International Journal of Art and Design Education*, 30(2), pp. 293-306.

Sanders, B and Albanese, F. 2016. "It's no Life at all" Rough Sleepers Experiences of Violence and Abuse on the Streets of England and Wales. [online] Available from: https://www.crisis.org.uk/media/20502/crisis_its_no_life_at_all2016.pdf Accessed 19th June 2022.

Savolainen, R. 2010. Everyday Life Information Seeking. In: Bates, M J. 2015. Encyclopaedia of Library and Information Sciences. 3rd ed. Boca Raton: CRC press.

Savolainen, R. 2008. Source Preferences in the Context of Seeking Problem-Specific Information. *Information Processing and Management*, 44(1), pp. 274-293.

Savolainen, R. 2009. Small World and Information Grounds as Contexts of Information Seeking and Sharing. *Library and Information Science Research*, 31(1), pp. 38-45.

Savolainen, R *et al.* 2009. The Behaviour / Practice Debate: A Discussion Prompted by Tom Wilson's Review of Reijo Savolainen's Everyday Information Practices: A Social Phenomenological Perspective. *Information Research*, 14(2).

Schatzki, T. R. 2002. *The Site of the Social: A Philosophical Account of the Constitution of Social life and Change*. Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Shelter. 2022. Shelter: What is Homelessness? [online] Available from: https://england.shelter.org.uk/housing_advice/homelessness/what_is_homelessness Accessed 1st June 2022.

Shenton, A. K. 2004. Strategies For Ensuring Trustworthiness in Qualitative Research Projects. *Education for Information*, 22(2), pp. 63-75.

Spires. 2022. The Spires Centre: For Homeless and Disadvantaged People. [online] Available from: <http://www.spires.org.uk/> Accessed 5th June 2022.

Stevenson, J *et al.* 2007. Reclaiming Bodily Dispositions Through the Humanities: Homeless People Learning. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training*, 59(4), pp. 419-434.

Tracy, S. J. 2010. Qualitative Quality: Eight "Big-Tent" Criteria for Excellent Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(10), pp. 837-851.

Van Den Berk-Clark, C and McGuire, J. 2014. Trust in Healthcare Providers: Factors Predicting Trust Among Homeless Veterans Over Time. *Journal of Healthcare for the Poor and Underserved*, 25(3), pp. 1278-1290.

Warnes, A M and Crane, M. 2000. *Meeting Homeless People's Needs: Homeless Development and Practice for the Older Excluded*. London: Kings Fund.

Williams, R D. 2021. Vulnerability, Boundary Management, and Providing Information Services to People Experiencing Homelessness. *Public Library Quarterly*, (ahead of print).

Wilson, M. (matt@spires.org.uk) 5th July 2022. "UCL Spires Study" Email to Andrew Lacey (Andrew.lacey20@ucl.ac.uk).

Woelfer, J P. 2014. Turned Souls: The Role of Music in the Lives of Homeless Young People. ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Yoshida, Y. 2021. Public Libraries as Places for Self-Directed Lifelong Learning: Narratives of Empowerment. *Information Research*, 26(1).

Zakrinson, T L *et al.* 2004. Homeless Peoples Trust and Interactions with Police and Paramedics. *Journal of Urban Health*, 81(4), pp. 596-604.

Zhang, H and Chawner, B. 2018. Homeless (Rough Sleepers) Perspectives on Public Libraries: A Case Study. *Library Review*, 67(4), pp. 276-296.

Appendix A – Interview questions

To Service Users

1) Before you used the Spires Centre:

When you first became homeless:

- what sort of help were you after? (most urgent and/or most worrying to you)
- how did you find out about help available?

Prompt: Talk to friends? Word of mouth? Council?

- Why did you approach them? Did you discount any options because they knew they wouldn't be helpful? Why did you think this?
- With what you found initially, how did you decide what to do next?

Prompt: How did you know what to believe, and who to trust? What information or people did you ignore/avoid?

2) As a Spires Centre Service user

- How did you find out about the Spires Centre?
- Which of Spires services do you access? E.g. help with benefits or housing
- Have Spires ever helped work something out for you?

Prompt: benefit/housing - How did they do that? What did they do to help you?

- How did you know you could trust Spires? E.g. Could get help there
- What makes you trust the information Spires gives you? *Prompt:* housing advice for example
- Within Spires, do you trust certain sources of information over another?

Prompt: more likely to ask one member of staff over another? Why?

- Has there ever been a time when you felt you were being given too much information?

Prompt: what information was it? How did it make you feel?

- Has there ever been a time when you needed to remember important information? What was the best way to do this? E.g. do you have a system in place
- Have you ever avoided or ignored any information Spires provided you with? What might be a time when you would do this?
- Have you ever received incorrect information from Spires? E.g. Information that didn't help you – what was this?
- Who/where else do you also currently go to for help

Prompt: other charity?

- Do you use the internet, and if so, what do you use it for? E.g. keeping in contact with people, playing games, Locating services?
- How do you think Spires could be better?
Prompt: For example, at keeping you updated? Letting you know about support available. How?

To Spires Centre Staff

- In your experience, what information are service users looking for?
- what information do you think they need?
- How do you guide them towards information they need but may not be actively looking for?
- Do your service users have (pre)conceptions about how you can help?
- How do you explain things to them?
Prompt: verbally? write things down? Why or why not? E.g. have you got other systems to help them remember information
- How do you make sure that they have understood the information you have given them?
- How do you think trust/mistrust affects where/from who users seek information?
- How do you manage information overload?
Prompt: giving large amounts of complicated information to users, benefits/housing information?
- Do you ever receive/pass on conflicting information?
Prompt: information changes
- Do you get the impression people ignore or avoid information you provide?
- What do you think are the biggest information challenges for this population?
- Apart from Spires, where do you think the service users get their information? E.g. if they need to find a location? Have you noticed any problems with their other approaches?
- How/do they translate information provided into action
- From your understanding of information needs, do you think there is anything else Spires should do (/do differently) to support them?

Appendix B – Interview transcript initial coding (extract)

Interviewer

I'll start with before Spires. You were saying about the prison, and then when he left or being connected with housing. When you first came out of prison, when you first felt you needed housing support, what kind of help were you after? what was the most urgent to you?

Ellen

It's a really difficult situation because I was in prison for fourteen years. (1) And they should have set me up with like proper housing, because I've got kids as well, but they didn't (16). And so when it came to like, the last few weeks, they were just took me to council. And they said, we'll sort out your housing. They basically, it was one of those things where if council didn't accept me, they could take them to court.

Interviewer

Because you had dependents?

Ellen

No. Like, just because of coming out of prison (1). And I was homeless, they had some sort of thing. So Council housed me. And then I've been in the same place - in a very small room in a hotel (2). Well, it's like three houses joined together and called a Hostel.

Interviewer

So when you were in prison, about to leave - How did you find out about help available? Did they connect you?

Ellen

I didn't. I had like, just over a week left, they couldn't do anything with my housing until I think it was a week or two weeks before I was leaving (3). But they should have technically sorted it out due to the amount of time I was there (12). And then, in the last, like few days, the last few days, I had to sign things for benefits stuff. And then it was a matter of presenting myself as homeless on the day that I left with someone from the prison who was going to take them to court if they didn't house me (3). So they put me in temporary accommodation. And that was three years ago, and I'm still in temporary accommodation (3).

Interviewer

And nobody had approached you before that whilst you were nearing release?

Ellen

No because it was like - ah you still got such and such amount of time we still got such and such amount of time (3). It's like last minute.com (12). And then everyone runs around like headless chickens. And then they're all like, I don't know why nothings not getting done. And then on top of that, when I left, I had to appear at the job centre and that.

Interviewer

you had to you had to approach them for help? They didn't come to you?

Ellen

No I had to go to the job centre. present at the job centre for what's it called?

Interviewer

Universal Credit?

Ellen

Yeah, something like that

Ellen

on that on that same day, so we went and did all that. And then I got all that sorted. And then when I went for my job things, I got signed off work. But when I went for my job, things they put me in touch with St. Giles trust (4). And St. Giles were the ones that helped me because I was only getting 130 pound a month and so they were giving me food vouchers, helping with clothing, shoes, all that sort of stuff (5).

Interviewer

How did you find out about St Giles trust? And did then they connect you up with all this stuff?

Ellen

From the Job Centre. Yeah, they did, they've been really great. They helped me like, they paid for me to get my passport done the first time (6) and then it was an absolute mission because the COVID hit. Then I had to wait again (3). And then they sorted it out this time. Which reminds me I'll get in touch with my work there actually.

Interviewer

how did you find out about Spires in the first place?

Ellen

Just um, I think it was St Giles. or somewhere else and someone said to me, oh you talk to Spires like, blah, blah (4). So, I came, and I was able to get breakfast here and like, get food and stuff (5). And I used to come and do the art on one day a week (9).

Ellen

I think someone at St. Giles told me about it. And I think it might have been the lady at the job centre (4). And then then you run into people as well – and they say oh yes, such and such (7). There is a booklet. And they're listed in there (4).

Interviewer

Right? Okay, so a booklet through the job centre?

Ellen

You can get it through the job centre, but you can get it in a few different places (4). it lists like loads of places like food banks, all that sort of stuff, because the job centre helped me with Food Bank and stuff first (5), as well, they were really good. They

were good. I can't say that they weren't because they were - the lady in the job centre was very helpful.

Interviewer

When you first started using spies, or even now, like, which services do you access?

Ellen

I don't really use the service that much anymore. Like, they helped me with my benefits and stuff (6). But other than that, there's not really much that they do now. At the beginning it was just getting my benefit sorted. But mostly that was St Giles. But (Spies) then help other people, you know, because they can help with the benefits, like getting those things sorted (6). And if you've got housing problems or arrears or whatever, they can help. sometimes there's a language barrier (8). So, if I'm walking and run into people on the way, I can help (7).

Interviewer

go between?

Ellen

like third party. I can act as a third party (7). Yeah. You know, I mean, because where I live, I often run into people, you know, and they ask, how do you know where the nearest AA thing is? You know, where the nearest you know, food bank is? Do you know where the nearest sthis is? then I say, Oh, I go to this place. And you can access those things from there (4). I'll just point them to here and explain it. And it depends, because some people i directed to St Giles, and some people I directed here. If it was more family (16), I would probably send them to St Giles. because they can more help with like the food (5).

Interviewer

When spires were helping you with benefit, how did they do that? How did they go about it?

Ellen

At first I had to go and have all these assessments and everything. So it's like, really annoying (3). But it was more like the go into the places. And then I just went for assessment. And then because I was signed off, and then I was completely signed off. then it was fine. At first, it was just, you know, like, go here, go there (3).

Interviewer

Do they help with that appointment stuff, setting them up initially?

Ellen

they don't really need to do that. Job Centre just sent a thing, and then I just go. But I know that it can be difficult for some people (6). And I also know that they can help them with that. And you can request someone to be there (6)(11).

Interviewer

Yes. So when you first came to Spires, how did you know that you could trust it?

Appendix C – Midpoint coding and categorisation

Categories

- Life management, physiological, and social/emotional needs (IN MAROON)
- Information strategies (IN GREEN)
- Barriers to information finding and use (IN BLACK)
- Trust in information sources (IN BLUE)
- Information mediation/accessibility (IN PURPLE)

Key

1. Housing need/eligibility for support
2. Living conditions
3. ~~Organisational housing barriers~~ 41. Organisational barriers to information access
4. Discovering services via other services
5. Physiological needs
6. Help with life admin
7. Service discovery via other homeless people
8. Physical barriers to information use
9. Social/emotional outlet
10. trust in other homeless people
11. bombarded with supported housing rules
12. Stress of sleeping outside
13. Personal information strategies - visual
14. Outdated knowledge/information
15. Loneliness
16. ~~Parenting and housing eligibility~~ 34. Parental information needs
17. Conflicting information
18. Frustration at slow progress of housing services
19. Service discovery via textual sources
20. Help with benefits
21. Help with housing problems
22. Building trust over time
23. Building trust through having physiological needs met
24. ~~Mistrusting other homeless people~~ 10. trust in other homeless people

25. Trust in service staff
26. Stress caused by others not following housing rules
27. Information overload caused by contradictory information
28. Frustration/inability to act on information
29. Receptiveness to information
30. Personal information strategy – analogy
31. Wariness of services
32. Mistrust due to negative experiences
33. Creativity
34. Parental information needs
35. Following own interests
36. Personal information strategies – physical discovery
37. Service discovery via internet
38. Service trust and textual sources
39. Informational support from friends and family
40. Foreign language support in accessing information
41. Organisational barriers to information access
42. Staff behaviour as barrier to information access
43. Service discovery via another service user
44. Changing benefit information/entitlement challenges
45. Trust in service due to other users speaking native language
46. English language learning
47. Complex immigration information
48. Mediation of information
49. Helping with organisation/time management
50. “Taking the time”
51. Reluctance to seek informational support
52. Internet classes
53. Internet access
54. Communication technology hurdles
55. Fear/ feeling overwhelmed as catalyst for service engagement
56. Authority of service provider
57. articulating information need
58. Spires as intermediary
59. Isolated from peer informational support

60. Misinformation online/information authority
61. Time pressures and information delivery
62. Protecting self from physical harm
63. Experiential knowledge of how to stay safe on the street
64. Harassment of rough sleepers by statutory services
65. Difficulties cohabiting in hostel
66. Low self-belief in own intelligence
67. Difficulties accessing information online
68. Overwhelmed by online information
69. Government understanding of homeless information challenges
70. Verbal transmission of information
71. Misinformation regarding utilities
72. Profit driven deception
73. Information seeking/support from dispersed services
74. Qualifying for financial/housing support
75. Unsure about what Spires offer
76. Friends as negative influence
77. "Learning experience"
78. Trust – racial information authority
79. Staying focused
80. "Internet twist brain"
81. Ulterior motives of online information
82. Current affairs as unrelated to self
83. Working on self
84. Misinformation and service discovery
85. Misinformation and social exchange
86. "Do everything for them"
87. Unclear scope of support offering
88. empowering users
89. resetting users expectations
90. Advocating for users
91. Insider knowledge
92. (repeat of 29)
93. guiding users information use/investment
94. Instruction strategies – visual

- 95. Instruction strategies – practice
- 96. Instruction strategies – Analogy
- 97. Struggle to adapt to welfare system changes
- 98. creating informational dependency
- 99. wariness of healthcare 31. Wariness of services
- 100. users sharing own information
- 101. Self-management of health conditions
- 102. Debunking jargon/legalise
- 103. fast changing housing information
- 104. subject specialism and information giving
- 105. harm reduction information
- 106. ability to follow tenancy rules
- 107. (repeat of 29)
- 108. Managing personal finances
- 109. travelling to dispersed support/information services
- 110. translating information into action
- 111. building confidence
- 112. Complex needs – support with daily life involving multiple services
- 113. Identifying needs
- 114. Disclosing personal information and housing/financial eligibility
- 115. Gaging understanding
- 116. Information sharing/collaboration with other services
- 117. Sharing personal information and support eligibility
- 118. Mistrust in statutory sources
- 119. Instruction strategies – breaking it down
- 120. Staff information needs
- 121. Service discovery via outreach